

## CALIFORNIA CITIES GANG PREVENTION NETWORK

# CASE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS OF LOCAL FUNDING STRATEGIES

*By Andrew Moore*

### INTRODUCTION

Over the past five years, teams of municipal, law enforcement and community leaders from 13 sites have participated in the California Cities Gang Prevention Network, an initiative sponsored by the National League of Cities and National Council on Crime and Delinquency. As the network sought to identify effective gang prevention approaches, local teams generated new evidence that supports the following proposition: Comprehensive efforts to reduce youth and gang violence and create safer communities – particularly those that balance prevention, intervention, and enforcement strategies – produce results that are stronger and more lasting than isolated programmatic efforts.

Cities rarely have access to a single funding source they can use to support implementation of a comprehensive plan. San Diego's experience in the 1990s, when that city was one of several participating in a federal demonstration project, approached this level of funding integration. In recent years, however, no similar federal opportunity has been available, nor have state governments stepped in to fill the void.

As a result, cities typically rely upon multiple funding sources to pursue comprehensive strategies, drawing from local, state, and federal government sources and occasionally from private philanthropy. Occasionally, through formal agreements, cities “blend” funding, combining resources from multiple sources into one pool. More often, cities “braid” funding by drawing upon multiple sources to support an individual or program, with tracking and accountability still tied to each original funding source.

To what extent does reliance upon multiple funding streams reduce efficiency and effectiveness, and undermine comprehensiveness? This policy question arises from the common

sense observation that pursuing, securing, executing, and reporting upon multiple grants invariably diverts at least some of the energies and focus of those seeking to administer comprehensive strategies – perhaps to the point of distraction, making it harder for them to see “the forest for the trees.” In addition, pursuit of available grants likely skews strategies, as availability of certain funding produces a de facto approach that may not be fully responsive to long-term needs. A narrow focus places a well calibrated balance among prevention, intervention, and enforcement at risk, and may turn attention away from the central task of embedding the balanced approach in neighborhoods for long-term sustainability.

The California Cities Gang Prevention Network undertook an analysis of the status and implications of multiple grant funding sources in the cities of Oakland, Salinas, and Santa Rosa to enhance understanding of the benefits and tradeoffs of this approach and to produce policy recommendations regarding future funding. Each of these cities – which vary by size, economic structure and demographics – has combined a range of funding streams to underwrite its gang prevention strategy. The network analysis yielded three main recommendations:

1. The local experience of single-source or coordinated funding should be replicated at the state and federal levels;
2. Funders need to reach agreement on common output and outcome measures for grantees to track; and
3. Federal and state policymakers should remove barriers in the interim to maximize local flexibility in braiding and blending funds.

The timing and substance of this analysis also suggests that the new Board of State and Community Corrections in California should embrace a leadership role in coordinating state-level funding.

## CONTEXT

This analysis of the implications of multiple funding streams occurs within a highly dynamic context. Recent years have brought some of the most difficult fiscal times in memory to municipal governments across California. Numerous cities have laid off police officers, recreation workers and other city staff members. Many cities have lost additional capacity through regularly scheduled furloughs and cuts to community and faith-based organization budgets. Moreover, since the network began operating, member cities have had only mixed success in establishing dedicated local funds for gang and violence reduction through ballot initiatives. This process proved fruitful in Santa Rosa, Oxnard, and Oakland (where special funding survived a recent continuation vote), worked to a degree in San Bernardino, and did not progress in Sacramento.

At the state level, the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy (OGYVP) conducted an inventory in 2008 of state and federal funding streams and programs that support youth crime prevention, intervention and suppression efforts at the local level. According to OGYVP, the results "revealed that 14 offices in eight agencies or departments allocated approximately \$1.5 billion to the local level (78 percent state funds and 22 percent federal funds) through 42 funding streams." OGYVP also identified 14 offices in nine departments or agencies that directly delivered services through 24 programs at an approximate cost of \$83 million (80 percent state and 20 percent federal), and \$600 million in state (77 percent) and federal (23 percent) funding streams with substantial "but largely untapped" capacity to reduce violence.

These funding streams and programs varied from large state and federally-funded juvenile justice, youth employment and afterschool programs distributed by formula or competition to relatively small grants targeted to specific localities or for use by community-based organizations. The state general fund, as well as special funds such as vehicle license fees, made many of these grants possible. Subsequently, the state has targeted some of the largest funding streams in this category for elimination or downsizing in efforts to eliminate the state's budget deficit, and also as it proceeds with realignment of juvenile justice services to shift operations exclusively to the county level.

In addition, prior to recent budget cutbacks, the federal government provided support to states and some localities directly through formula and discretionary grants for juvenile justice

and reentry, as well as occasional congressional earmarks. The specific future of these funding sources is uncertain.

## CITY FUNDING MIXES

The following discussion concentrates on dedicated or grant funding in three network cities. Notably, this analysis does not encompass the whole of each city's funding. The full range of funding typically includes some general fund support for relevant city staff positions and related functions in police, human services, and parks and recreation departments, as well as some positions in county government and community- and faith-based organizations. These general fund-supported positions and related activities are significant and deserve a more comprehensive analysis at some point. For the purpose of this analysis, however, the types of reporting and accountability to which general-funded city and nonprofit employees are subject – similar to public employees elsewhere – do not have a major impact on the complexity, administrative burdens, and losses in efficiency resulting from multiple, special-purpose funding sources.

## CASE STUDIES

### OAKLAND

In order to implement its 2010 Strategic Plan to Prevent Youth Gang Violence, the City of Oakland and its key partners in Alameda County currently manage a complex portfolio of grants alongside two large-scale dedicated funding streams focused on prevention and intervention. Indeed, the city assiduously pursued several federal and state grants in 2010-11 when the future of one of the dedicated funding streams was in doubt. However, grant success has also added to local complexity.

A high-level review of the special funding streams and grants most active in Oakland's gang and youth violence reduction efforts shows at least \$22.5 million in local, state, federal and private funding. Three main lead agencies, with dozens of overlapping partners and subcontractors, administer funds stemming from 12 separate sources. Major emphases of the grants and dedicated funding include gang intervention, early violence prevention, juvenile and adult reentry, transitional employment, and mentoring.

Project periods and reporting schedules vary widely, and city staff supplied the California Cities Gang Prevention Net-

work with a list of dozens of distinct measures and indicators against which the city must report for seven separate funding sources. Of note, most of these indicators track “process” or “output” measures. Most funders have not asked for “outcome” measures that show how a young person, a family, or a community has changed. On the other hand, for the city’s cornerstone Measure Y programs and for one federal grant, external evaluators closely examine individual programs, each strategy, and the initiative as a whole to understand changes in attitudes and behavior, and to assess the return on investment. Processes include matching individual data with juvenile justice records, California Department of Corrections data, and data from the Oakland Unified School District for a more complete picture of impact.

While grantees may experience funds as blended, thus reducing grantee reporting duplication, the extent to which funds are actually braided or blended in Oakland is limited. Oakland’s comprehensive plan strives to provide an overall context and objectives for the wide range of funding sources as a whole – although the flow of grant funds through multiple city and county agencies makes it challenging to administer the funds as truly blended and braided. As one city staff member observed, “This time of reduced staffing argues for more consolidated grants and longer grant terms.”

The staff member noted that the substantial scale and three-year term of some federal grants “has allowed moving forward more quickly, with minimal administration and more programming. This feels like a taste of something better” than usual, and Oakland is “seeing the impact of putting more [outreach workers] on the street.” In general, federal grant reporting has shifted to electronic formats more quickly, with state agencies lagging behind with paper reporting. The staff member called for state and federal agencies to come to agreement on how to define outputs in order to make reporting proceed more smoothly.

## Oakland’s Comprehensive Gang and Youth Violence Prevention Plan

Oakland’s plan, supported by infusions of dedicated and grant funds, features six major emphasis areas: prevention, suppression, intervention, reentry, community mobilization, and sustainability. The plan seeks to respond to the needs of a city with some 2,000 active members of 65 gangs in addition to many youth connected to loose “crews.” Particular issues for

Oakland at the time of the latest plan revision included a rise in juvenile involvement in gang and street violence, high levels of chronic truancy, and intergenerational gang involvement. The 2010 plan revision also identified several resource gaps: the need for additional law enforcement personnel, limited capacity and resources to provide services to gang-involved youth, and a lack of effective coordination of approaches and services at the local and regional levels.

## Major Grant and Dedicated Funding Sources for Implementing Oakland’s Plan

### Measure Y

Measure Y, a voter-approved mechanism for collecting a special real estate parcel tax assessment, has been in effect since 2004 and now raises some \$19 million per year. Of this amount, the city uses \$4 million to keep fire stations open; \$9 million to sustain positions for problem-solving, truancy, domestic violence, and special victim unit police officers; and \$5 million for violence prevention programs, broadly defined. Through a competitive process conducted every three years, the city distributes the violence prevention funds across more than 30 public agency and nonprofit sector grantees. Oakland’s plan lists three types of prevention activities to be funded out of Measure Y: parent education and mentorship, youth outreach and recreation, and the interagency gang prevention collaborative focused on prevention in the city’s schools.

The plan also describes a role for Measure Y in funding five intervention activities: services for gang-involved families, violent injury victim support, young adult reentry support, wraparound services at the county juvenile justice facility, street outreach, and call-ins (For more information on these types of services, read or download network publications on *Developing a Successful Street Outreach Program: Recommendations and Lessons Learned*; *Bulletin 22: Operating and Managing Street Outreach Services*; and *Bulletin 7: Three Street Outreach Examples* at [www.ccgpn.org](http://www.ccgpn.org)).

By May 2011, Measure Y had consolidated its focus in four primary strategy areas: 1) domestic violence and sexually exploited minors; 2) comprehensive youth services in schools and at the juvenile justice center; 3) Project Choice pre- and post-release reentry support and employment; and 4) street outreach and crisis response.

## *Federal and State Funding*

Oakland successfully applied for and won several grants from federal, state, and local sources between 2010 and 2012, with the greatest focus being on intervention services for those already involved with gangs or the justice system. Federal funds included four grants totaling \$2.5 million per year: two from the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), which included one as part of a multi-site community violence prevention demonstration project to replicate the Chicago CeaseFire model and the other focused on juvenile offender reentry; one from the U.S. Department of Justice for adult reentry support under the Second Chance Act; and one Juvenile Accountability Block Grant via the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) for a youth court.

Additional federal funds for prevention and intervention flowed via three routes. The city's Community Economic Development Agency made available a small amount of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to field community health ambassadors. The Oakland Housing Authority offered 40 reentry housing subsidies with an average value of \$14,400 per subsidized unit. In addition, the Alameda County District Attorney's Office utilized Project Safe Neighborhood funds from the U.S. Department of Justice to support a truancy reduction project.

In addition to its federal grants and funding, Oakland received state or local grants totaling just over \$1 million from three sources, each of which helped support different aspects of the plan: 1) a state CalGRIP (California Gang Reduction, Intervention and Prevention Initiative) grant to conduct Aggression Replacement Training, one of a small number of "evidence-based practices" encouraged under CalGRIP; 2) support from CDCR and venture philanthropy partner Roberts Enterprise Development Fund (REDF) for a transitional employment program to replicate the approach of New York City's Center for Employment Opportunities (CEO); and 3) a small donation from Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) in support of street outreach.

## *Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (Measure K)*

The Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) distributes nearly \$10 million per year through 123 separate grants to more than 60 community agencies and collaborations for a

range of prevention-oriented services for children from birth to age 20. Oakland's 2010 Strategic Plan incorporates these services by reference. OFCY currently operates in six strategy areas: 1) early childhood, 2) school-based, out-of-school time programs, 3) community-based, out-of-school time programs, 4) summer programs, 5) wellness and healthy transitions, and 6) older youth programs. Services and programs address four components: keeping kids safe, forging connections with caring adults, promoting community benefit and enhancement, and grounding services in youth development or early childhood principles. Voters first approved the Kids First! initiative (otherwise known as Measure K) in 1996, setting aside three percent of the city's unrestricted general fund for OFCY. A special election in 2009 reauthorized this funding through 2022.

## *Other Funding Sources for Implementing Oakland's Plan*

Through various means, Oakland has assembled several other funding sources tailored to prevention, intervention, and enforcement purposes. These sources include:

- California's Proposition 10 tobacco tax pays for Alameda County's First Five – Every Child Counts, a program that supports the health, development and well-being of children from birth to age five. First Five supports efforts such as nurse home visitations and child care quality improvement.
- The Alameda County Health Care Services Agency calculates that it makes an annual investment of \$18 million in the Oakland Unified School District to support operating costs of school-based health centers offering a range of medical, behavioral health, and health education and promotion services. One major funding source for these centers is Medicaid through the Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) Program. The Atlantic Philanthropies made a major grant in 2011 to support construction of additional centers in Oakland.
- An additional \$1 million comes from the Kaiser Permanente health system via the East Bay Community Foundation to the Oakland Police Department's O.K. mentoring program, which is active in three high schools and includes collaborations with two local churches.

In addition, East Oakland is one of 14 neighborhoods statewide targeted by The California Endowment for its ten-year,



Building Healthy Communities initiative and related investments. Violence prevention is one of four key health-related outcome objectives of this initiative. In addition, a small number of nonprofit organizations providing services in Oakland receive grants from The California Wellness Foundation. In recent years, these grants have fallen in the range of \$50,000-\$60,000 annually.

Gang-related enforcement efforts in Oakland rely on a few special funding mechanisms or sources of personnel and expertise, including the multi-agency Alameda County Narcotics Task Force, the District Attorney's Office of Gun and Gang Prosecution, and the FBI Fugitive Task Force.

## Reporting, Accountability and Administrative Requirements across Oakland's Funding Sources

Unsurprisingly, given the panoply of funding sources, reporting and accountability standards in Oakland's various initiatives vary considerably, as does the presence of external evaluators. At least four professionals in the Oakland Department of Human Services (DHS) devote significant time to grant administration and relating to evaluators. A DHS staff member notes that staff generally experience state grant reporting as more time-consuming and detail-oriented than federal grants. Specific experiences across major funding sources run as follows.

### *Measure Y*

The Oakland DHS reports quarterly to the Oakland City Council on fiscal and programmatic measures. These measures derive from information that Measure Y grantees enter into a common database regarding activities, which may vary by type of funding. For instance, indicators related to incident reduction via street outreach differ from those for school-based violence prevention. By regulation, the city must spend three percent of Measure Y violence prevention and police department funds to evaluate the quality of implementation. Resource Development Associates (RDA), a local evaluation firm, has carried out several evaluations of the impact of Measure Y, the most recent of which was published in 2011. This report listed major findings at the initiative level regarding the number of clients served, client perceptions of improvements on risk and resiliency indicators, and re-arrest rates for juvenile and adult probationers served. For each of Measure

Y's three main investment strategies – wraparound/educational services for young people returning from the county juvenile justice center to Oakland Unified School District, young adult reentry and employment, and street outreach – RDA reported on a variety of headline indicators, including the number of former juvenile inmates re-enrolled in school, statistically significant drops in further justice system involvement, compliance with probation, and reports of referrals to employment by street outreach workers. RDA's report also delivered cross-cutting recommendations for program and strategy improvement.

### *Federal Grants*

Oakland's three main federal grants exhibit some consistency in output measures such as number of clients served or successfully enrolled in activities. The community-based violence prevention demonstration project requires reporting on some longer-term outcomes specific to individuals. These three grants do not require reporting on broader assessments of improved community safety.

### *Oakland Fund for Children and Youth*

OFCY requires its grantees to participate in the Fund's data management and evaluation systems. Grantees submit reports quarterly online, detailing finances and program activities. OFCY engages two local firms to evaluate its activities at the strategy and grantee levels. The composite grantee evaluation focuses on four main areas: outputs such as numbers served; program quality across dimensions of safety, support, interaction and engagement (with Oakland's efforts benchmarked against national comparison data); perceived impact on participants via surveys; and impact on academic success in terms of truancy and passage rates of the statewide high school exit exam.

### *Other Grants*

Reporting requirements for Oakland's replication of CEO's transitional reentry employment programs and for Aggression Replacement Training each focus mainly on outputs from specific purposes and elements of the projects. Under the CEO replication grant, Oakland must report on retention in employment for a one-year period following job placement.

## SANTA ROSA

Through its *Strategic Work Plan 2008-12: Reclaiming our Youth for Their Families, Schools, Communities, and Futures*, the Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force in Santa Rosa developed a comprehensive framework with five goal areas. The plan established strategic goals regarding awareness, prevention, intervention, enforcement, and measurements, with an overarching goal of cutting gang violence in half in five years. The plan outlined a number of indicators for the following desired outcomes: an informed and involved public, children and parents with increased assets, a reduction in the number of gang-involved youth, safe schools and neighborhoods, and an integrated delivery system with documented outcomes (For more information on Santa Rosa's process for developing the plan and the task force, see the network strategy paper, *Implementing a Citywide Gang Violence Reduction Strategy: Three Promising Examples*, at [www.ccgpn.org](http://www.ccgpn.org)).

The 2008 plan's analysis of challenges and emerging trends focused on three items. First, the 2005 California Health Kids Survey (CHKS), administered in schools, revealed that more than 1,000 teens reported they were in or had been in a gang. In addition, the plan implied that Santa Rosa had an excessively high baseline level of gang-related incidents. Third, CHKS and surveys of community-based organizations identified gaps in prevention and intervention services. An annual series of community forums with youth, parents, schools, and community-based organizations led to an updated assessment of community needs, and aided the task force in revising funding priorities for the city's CHOICE (Communities Helping our Indispensable Children Excel) gang prevention and intervention grant program.

### Grants and Dedicated Funding Sources for Implementing the Santa Rosa Plan

To implement the strategic work plan – and in particular to make a major shift toward offering a full continuum of services that spans prevention, intervention, and enforcement – Santa Rosa has drawn upon several funding sources. The city raised new local tax funds along with several state grants. In addition, Santa Rosa generated resources through several partnerships. Annually, grant funds supporting plan implementation total about \$2.7 million, plus another \$1.8 million in local matching funds. As in Oakland, a listing of Santa Rosa's multiple cash funding sources does not account for the

number of hours contributed to the comprehensive effort by schools, hospitals, probation and child welfare workers, the faith community and others.

### Measure O

City leaders and task force members understood that stable funding would be essential to put a continuum of services in place. Well before developing the strategic work plan, the Santa Rosa City Council introduced the Measure O quarter-cent sales tax for consideration on the November 2004 ballot in order to fund public safety efforts and a continuum of gang prevention and intervention programs. Because polls suggested that neither enforcement nor prevention would carry the day with voters, the overall goal of public safety provided the dominant frame for the initiative. Measure O proceeds are allocated as follows: 40 percent to police initiatives, 40 percent to fire services, and 20 percent to gang prevention and intervention programs. Voters approved Measure O by an overwhelming 73 percent for a 20-year run.

Measure O provides roughly \$1.4 million per year for gang prevention and intervention initiatives, and this total is supplemented by \$500,000 per year in city general funds. With these combined funds as the base, the CHOICE grant program administered by the city's department of recreation, parks and community services supports programming by nine local agencies. Examples of funded programs include the Boys and Girls Club, awareness programs, job readiness, afterschool and mentoring programs and a street outreach worker initiative. Regulations steer 35 percent of the CHOICE funding to in-school violence prevention and conflict resolution education, as well as grants to local nonprofits providing related services that will enhance youth asset development and reduce risk factors.

Each agency receiving Measure O funds must provide a minimum of a 20-percent cash match for every Measure O dollar received. Consistently over the last five funding cycles, agencies have exceeded a 100-percent cash match. The city and matching funds support 10 employees – two on the city payroll, the others in the grantee organizations.

### Other Funding Sources

Santa Rosa has relied upon several other state and local sources of grant funding to support its plan. These sources include:

- Proposition 49: After School Enrichment and Safety grants averaging \$250,000 per year support afterschool programs conducted by the recreation, parks and community services department in partnership with Santa Rosa City Schools.
- Change for Kids: Additional funding of \$30,000 for afterschool enrichment flows from a partnership with the Santa Rosa Utilities Department. These funds derive from “rounding out” of monthly bills and one-time donations by local residents.
- The Redevelopment Neighborhood Revitalization Program: This state funding source of \$210,000 each year (until a 2012 phaseout) has supported efforts by the city attorney and police and fire departments to address needs in low-income housing areas.
- CalGRIP grants, the most recent for \$316,000, support evidence-based programs such as Strengthening Families through a subcontract with Community Action Partnership, and anger replacement therapy through a subcontract with California Youth Outreach.

In the near future and as a manifestation of close cooperation between city and county law enforcement officials, Santa Rosa also expects to gain access to a share of asset forfeiture funds amassed by the county. In keeping with the emerging regional focus of Santa Rosa’s efforts, the city plans to use these funds to spread the services of California Youth Outreach throughout Sonoma County.

In addition, Santa Rosa receives significant non-monetary contributions through redeployment of law enforcement personnel to support prevention efforts. For instance, a Santa Rosa Police Department gang unit sergeant and two detectives received training and have begun delivering the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) curriculum in city school classrooms. The county district attorney and sheriff have each assigned a staff person to work full time on the gang issue.

### Reporting, Accountability and Administrative Requirements

The city contracts with Community Crime Prevention Associates (CCPA), a local consulting firm, to assess the impact of activities funded through CHOICE. CCPA’s approach to evaluation is based on continuous quality improvement and a performance logic model. Reports from the evaluation pro-

cess are designed to help CHOICE grant recipients improve their services and to assist the city in holding contracted agencies accountable for efficiency and effectiveness. In addition to determining whether programs are meeting performance goals, the evaluation tracks population results to determine if key indicators are heading in a desirable or undesirable direction over time.

In contrast to the local evaluation designed for maximum funder and grantee usefulness, Santa Rosa city staff report that keeping track of different funding streams with different reporting requirements, outcome measures, and funding cycles proves demanding – and distracting from more important tasks. Soliciting grants, administering the CHOICE grant program, and tracking results takes the majority of the time of one staff person (the recreation, parks and community services department’s administrative technician), with support provided by the department’s research and program coordinator, CCPA, and an outside grant consultant.

## SALINAS

In response to a record-setting number of homicides in 2009, virtually all of which were gang-related, the Community Alliance for Safety and Peace (CASP) in Salinas/Monterey County developed and implemented the Salinas Comprehensive Strategy for Community-Wide Violence Reduction. With the vision of creating a “peaceful community,” the plan sought to address six significant problem areas identified through community listening sessions, research, and The California Endowment’s “Building Healthy Communities” initiative. These areas included: social and economic conditions, engaging and supervising youth, environmental design and urban planning, law enforcement, education and schools, and the impact of drugs and alcohol. The plan laid out several strategies, baseline data, and year one result targets, overall desired results, and measurement methods for each problem area.

To implement this plan, Salinas – a community that is smaller than Oakland or Santa Rosa and newer to comprehensive planning – has secured relatively few grants thus far, totaling some \$1.7 million annually. Supplementing these grants, an anchor general fund allocation by the Salinas City Council created and funds a new division of community safety with three full-time employees, including the director of community safety, who serves as the director of CASP. Funding from external sources includes successive grants from four state CalGRIP funding cycles, as well as a recent grant from the new

STRYVE program of the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and a YouthBuild grant from the U.S. Department of Labor. In addition to these state and federal grants, support for the Building Healthy Communities program in East Salinas comes from The California Endowment.

Salinas has used CalGRIP funding for a variety of purposes, including implementing the Boston Ceasefire strategy, supporting community prevention and intervention through subcontracts, sustaining street outreach and intervention case management, and supporting mentoring. The STRYVE grant enables the county public health department to conduct research, help pool data, and recommend additional prevention strategies. The Rancho Cielo residential program for Salinas youth utilizes the YouthBuild grant to provide work experience and education for an average of 30 residents per year. To supplement grant funding, the Monterey County Behavioral Health Department deploys a public health nurse in the Hebbbron neighborhood, and the city police department has assigned two officers to the same neighborhood.

As in other cities, reporting and accountability requirements vary across Salinas' grants. Much of the reporting required by CalGRIP focuses on outputs, whereas STRYVE support is mainly for capacity building. YouthBuild funding brings with it specific expectations in areas such as attainment of a high school diploma or GED, a construction certificate, and college credits, as well as literacy and numeracy gains. As an active network member cognizant of what constitutes anchor funding in other cities, Salinas notes that it has not yet created a dedicated fund for its gang prevention strategy.

## CONCLUSION: CROSS-CITY ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This overview of three cities' sources of grant and special funding provides a compelling reminder of the lost efficiencies and imperfect matches with overall city strategy that result from pursuing funding opportunities as they arise. The analysis also makes clear that the most flexible and thus strategically useful source of local funding flows from local tax

measures such as Measure Y in Oakland and Measure O in Santa Rosa. The state's CalGRIP funding comes the closest to mirroring the role of local tax measure funding, yet it has remained relatively limited in scope and available only for specific purposes. The benefits of the local tax measure model suggests the potential value of block granted state funding, which municipalities could fit to local strategic purpose, but the process of combining multiple funding streams into a block grant would also pose risks of an overall diminution of resources. Another approach would be for funding agencies at the state or federal level to issue joint requests for proposals. With respect to the types of plans cities are implementing, one could imagine a joint request from housing, health, and criminal justice agencies for proposals to fund comprehensive efforts that promote better outcomes in housing, violence reduction, and delinquency prevention.

In the near term, California's newly constituted Board of State and Community Corrections should undertake at least a coordinating role in the disbursement of the state's \$1.5 billion in funding for violence reduction and youth development. More narrowly, if funders cannot shift immediately to facilitate blending and braiding, they should adjust their policies so that staff time to write, manage and track proposals and related reports constitutes an allowable cost under their grants to local communities.

Recommendations regarding reporting also flow from these three case studies and parallel observations about funding. Reporting on grants currently is not well coordinated. The opportunity exists for funders to come to agreement on key outputs and outcomes to track, along with common definitions. In the interest of better understanding the effectiveness of public investments, funders could also focus more reporting attention on true outcome measures for individuals, neighborhoods and cities. To understand the impact and import of local gang reduction strategies, reporting needs to move away from individual reports on multiple specific grants and toward a new regime that emphasizes community-level, cumulative impact.



## REFERENCES

### East Oakland Building Healthy Communities/The California Endowment

[www.mycalconnect.org/oakland/Default.aspx](http://www.mycalconnect.org/oakland/Default.aspx)

### East Salinas Building Healthy Communities/The California Endowment

[www.mycalconnect.org/salinas/](http://www.mycalconnect.org/salinas/)

### Gang and Youth Violence State Program Inventory

[www.calgrip.ca.gov/documents/20090527\\_OGYVP\\_Program\\_Inventory.pdf](http://www.calgrip.ca.gov/documents/20090527_OGYVP_Program_Inventory.pdf)

### Models of Collaboration and Cost Sharing in Transition Programming; NCSET Information Brief by Joe Timmons, January 2007

[www.ncset.org/publications/viewdesc.asp?id=3447](http://www.ncset.org/publications/viewdesc.asp?id=3447)

### Oakland Fund for Children and Youth

[www.ofcy.org](http://www.ofcy.org)

### Oakland Measure Y Evaluation

<http://measurey.org/index.php?page=measure-y-how-do-we-know-it-works>

### Oakland O.K. Program

<http://okprogram.webs.com/>

### Oakland Strategic Plan to Prevent Youth Gang Violence, Revised May 2010

<http://measurey.org/index.php?page=oakland-gang-plan>

### Salinas Community Alliance for Safety and Peace

[www.future-futuro.org](http://www.future-futuro.org)

### Salinas Comprehensive Plan

[www.ci.salinas.ca.us/pdf/SalinasSWP.pdf](http://www.ci.salinas.ca.us/pdf/SalinasSWP.pdf)

### Santa Rosa Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force

<http://ci.santa-rosa.ca.us/departments/recreationandparks/programs/MGPTF/Pages/default.aspx>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The California Cities Gang Prevention Network acknowledges the helpful contributions of city staff members and officials in Oakland, Salinas, and Santa Rosa. In each case, interviews helped produce the insights detailed above. In addition, city staff members prepared detailed charts describing the flow of special funds. Whereas city staff members reviewed case study drafts, errors of fact or interpretation remain those of the California Cities Gang Prevention Network alone.