



November 18, 2025

Mr. Chris Hill
Department of Finance
915 L Street, 8th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Joshua Walden
County of Santa Clara
Office of County Counsel
70 West Hedding Street, 9th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110

And Parties, Interested Parties, and Interested Persons (See Mailing List)

Re: Proposed Decision

Internet Websites and Email Addresses, 24-TC-04

Statutes 2023, Chapter 586 (AB 1637); Government Code Section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b)

County of Santa Clara, Claimant

Dear Mr. Hill and Mr. Walden:

The Proposed Decision for the above-captioned matter is enclosed for your review.

Hearing: This matter is set for hearing on **Friday, December 5, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., at California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), First Floor Auditorium, 1220 N Street, Sacramento, California, 95814 and via Zoom.**

The Commission is committed to ensuring that its public meetings are accessible to the public and that the public has the opportunity to observe the meeting and to participate by providing written and verbal comment on Commission matters whether they are physically appearing at the in-person meeting location or participating via Zoom. If you want to speak during the hearing and you are in-person, please come to the table for the swearing in and to speak when your item is up for hearing. If you are participating via Zoom, you must use the "Raise Hand" feature in order for our moderators to know you need to be unmuted.

You may join the meeting via Zoom through the link below and can listen and view through your desktop, laptop, tablet, or smart phone. This will allow you to view documents being shared as well.

There are three options for joining the meeting:

1. Through the link below you can listen and view through your desktop, laptop, tablet, or smart phone using Zoom. This will allow you to view documents being shared as well. **(You are encouraged to use this option.)**

<https://csm-ca-gov.zoom.us/j/87042858244?pwd=jpC72G4BbiPmt7RmrGaUVMjBN1sdIP.1>

Passcode: 120625

2. Through one tap mobile on an iPhone in the US. This process will dial everything for you without having to key in the meeting ID number. If you have the Zoom application on your iPhone you can view the meeting and documents being shared as well.

+1408-961-3929,,87042858244#,,, *120625# US

+1408-961-3927,,87042858244#,,, *120625# US

3. Through your landline or non-smart mobile phone, either number works. You will be able to listen to the proceedings but will not be able to view the meeting or any documents being shared. If you would like to speak, press #2 to use the "Raise Hand" feature.

+1 408 961 3927 +1 408 961-3928 +1 408 961-3929 US Toll

+1 855 758 1310 US Toll-free

Webinar ID: 870 4285 8244

Passcode: 120625

Please don't hesitate to reach out to us for help with technical problems at csminfo@csm.ca.gov or 916 323-3562.

Testimony at the Commission Hearing: If you plan to address the Commission on an agenda item, please notify the Commission Office not later than noon on the Tuesday prior to the hearing, December 2, 2025. Please also include the names of the people who will be speaking for inclusion on the witness list and the names and email addresses of the people who will be speaking remotely to receive a hearing panelist link in Zoom. When calling or emailing, identify the item you want to testify on and the entity you represent. The Commission Chairperson reserves the right to impose time limits on presentations as may be necessary to complete the agenda.

Time to File Written Comments: If you plan to file any written document, please note that Commission staff will include written comments filed at least 15 days in advance of the hearing in the Commissioners' hearing binders, a copy of which is available for public viewing at the Commission meeting. Additionally, written comments filed more than five days in advance of the meeting shall be included in the Commission's meeting binders, if feasible, or shall be provided to the Commission when the item is called, unless otherwise agreed by the Commission or the executive director. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.10(b)(1)(A-B).


However, comments filed less than five days in advance of the meeting, the commenter shall provide 12 copies to Commission staff at the in-person meeting. In the case of participation by teleconference, a PDF copy shall be filed via the Commission's dropbox at <https://www.csm.ca.gov/dropbox.shtml> at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Commission staff shall provide copies of the comments to the Commission and shall place a copy on a table for public review when the item is called or, in the case of participation via teleconference, shall provide an electronic copy to the Commission and post a copy on the Commission's website, and may share the document with the Commission and the public using the "share screen" function. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.10(b)(1)(C)).

Mr. Hill and Mr. Walden
November 18, 2025
Page 3

Postponement: If you would like to request postponement of the hearing, please refer to section 1187.9(b) of the Commission's regulations.

Special Accommodations: For any special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device, materials in an alternative format, or any other accommodations, please contact the Commission Office at least five to seven *working* days prior to the meeting.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Juliana F. Gmur". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Juliana" and last name "Gmur" clearly legible.

Juliana F. Gmur
Executive Director

ITEM 3
TEST CLAIM
PROPOSED DECISION

Government Code Sections 50034(a)(1)-(2) & (b)

Statutes 2023, Chapter 586 (AB 1637)

Internet Websites and Email Addresses

24-TC-04

County of Santa Clara, Claimant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

The Test Claim alleges new state mandated activities and costs resulting from Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b), as added by Statutes 2023, chapter 586 (the test claim statute) effective January 1, 2024. The test claim statute requires that cities and counties ensure that their web pages and email addresses use either “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain names by January 1, 2029.¹

For reasons stated in the analysis, staff finds that the test claim statute imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514 and recommends the Commission approve this Test Claim.

Procedural History

The claimant filed the Test Claim on December 16, 2024.² The County of Inyo filed comments on the Test Claim on April 2, 2025.³ County of Monterey filed comments on the Test Claim on April 8, 2025.⁴ County of Santa Barbara and the Town of Truckee each filed comments on the Test Claim on April 10, 2025.⁵ The Department of Finance

¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 12 (Written Narrative).

² Exhibit A, Test Claim.

³ Exhibit B, County of Inyo’s Comments on the Test Claim.

⁴ Exhibit C, County of Monterey’s Comments on the Test Claim.

⁵ Exhibit D, County of Santa Barbara’s Comments on the Test Claim; Exhibit E, Town of Truckee’s Comments on the Test Claim.

(Finance) filed comments on the Test Claim on May 23, 2025.⁶ The claimant filed rebuttal comments on June 13, 2025.⁷

Commission staff issued the Draft Proposed Decision on September 19, 2025.⁸

On October 9, 2025, the claimant filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.⁹

On October 10, 2025, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.¹⁰

Commission Responsibilities

Under article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, local agencies and school districts are entitled to reimbursement for the costs of state-mandated new programs or higher levels of service. In order for local government to be eligible for reimbursement, one or more similarly situated local agencies or school districts must file a test claim with the Commission. “Test claim” means the first claim filed with the Commission alleging that a particular statute or executive order imposes costs mandated by the state. Test claims function similarly to class actions and all members of the class have the opportunity to participate in the test claim process and all are bound by the final decision of the Commission for purposes of that test claim.

The Commission is the quasi-judicial body vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and not apply it as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”¹¹

Claims

The following chart provides a brief summary of the claims and issues raised and staff’s recommendation.

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
Was the Test Claim timely filed?	Government Code section 17551(c) requires test claims “be filed not later than 12 months following the effective date of a statute or executive order, or within 12	<i>Yes, timely filed –</i> The test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024.

⁶ Exhibit F, Finance’s Comments on the Test Claim.

⁷ Exhibit G, Claimant’s Rebuttal Comments.

⁸ Exhibit H, Draft Proposed Decision.

⁹ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

¹⁰ Exhibit J, CSAC’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

¹¹ *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1281, citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
	months of incurring increased costs as a result of a statute or executive order, whichever is later.” Section 1183.1(c) of the Commission’s regulations defines “12 months” as 365 days. Government Code section 17557(e) requires: “A test claim shall be submitted on or before June 30 following a fiscal year in order to establish eligibility for reimbursement for that year.”	The test claim was filed on December 16, 2024, within 365 days of the test claim statute’s effective date.¹² The test claim is therefore timely filed. Because the test claim was filed on December 16, 2024, it establishes reimbursement eligibility for the 2023-2024 fiscal year, however because the test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, the potential period of reimbursement begins on January 1, 2024.
Does Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b), as added by Statutes 2023, chapter 586, impose a reimbursable, state-mandated program?	Government Code section 50034, as added by the test claim statute, requires that a local agency - here defined to mean “a city, county, or city and county” ¹³ - that maintains an internet website for use by the public or provides public email addresses for its employees ensure that the public websites and employee email addresses utilize either a “.gov” top-level domain or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain by January 1, 2029 ¹⁴ , and ensure that any non-compliant websites the city or county continues to maintain after	<i>Approve</i> – The test claim statute imposes a one-time reimbursable state-mandated program, beginning January 1, 2024. The program requires a city, county, or city and county, to ensure that their public websites (including webpages, web applications, and other related resources within the website) and employee email addresses utilize a domain name that contains either the “.gov” top-level domain or the “.ca.gov” second-level domain.

¹² Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 1.

¹³ Government Code section 50034(c).

¹⁴ Government Code section 50034(a)(1) and (b)

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
	January 1, 2029 redirects users to a compliant website. ¹⁵	

Staff Analysis

This Test Claim alleges new state-mandated activities and costs arising from Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b), as added by the test claim statute which require that cities and counties ensure that their web pages and email addresses use either “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain names by January 1, 2029.¹⁶ The Legislature found that because “adding Section 50034 to the Government Code addresses a matter of statewide concern and is not a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of article XI of the California Constitution,” this applies to all counties and cities, including charter cities.¹⁷ The purpose of the test claim statute is to provide assurance to the public that cities’ and counties’ websites and email addresses belong to the government agencies they claim to belong to. Under prior law many cities and counties used more commonly available top-level domains such as “.com” or “.org” for their website and email domain names, which made it easy for malicious actors to create fake websites or email addresses pretending to belong to a government agency.¹⁸ These would then be used to spread misinformation, or trick members of the public into making payments or disclosing personal information.¹⁹ The “.gov” top-level domain is only available to government agencies within the United States, and the “.ca.gov” second-level domain is only available to government agencies within the state of California.²⁰ When members of the public visit a city or county’s website with an internet address ending with “.gov” or “.ca.gov,” or email a governmental employee at such an address, they can feel confident they are not falling victim to a scam or hacker.²¹

¹⁵ Government Code section 50034(a)(2).

¹⁶ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 12 (Written Narrative).

¹⁷ See Statutes 2023, chapter 586, section 3. Government Code section 20 defines “city” to include incorporated towns.

¹⁸ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, pages 2-3.

¹⁹ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

²⁰ Exhibit K (2), CISA, *Eligibility for .gov Domains*, <https://get.gov/domains/eligibility/> (accessed on July 23, 2025) page 2; Exhibit K (3), CDT, *Domain Name Requirements*, <https://domainnamerequest.cdt.ca.gov/Home/Requirements> (accessed on July 23, 2025), page 2.

²¹ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 4.

The claimant has over 79 websites with over 10,000 individual webpages, 40 web applications, and 32,690 employee email addresses that used its previous “.org” domain name, which must all be migrated over to a new compliant “.gov” domain name.²² The claimant alleges this has so far cost \$20,017 in fiscal year 2023-2024 for 199 hours of employee and third-party professional labor to begin this migration process, which it estimates will cost approximately \$918,868 in total.²³

Staff finds that the Test Claim was timely filed, as it was filed within one year of the test claim statute’s effective date.²⁴ The test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, and the test claim was filed on December 16, 2024, within 365 days following the effective date of the test claim statute.²⁵ The December 16, 2024 filing date establishes reimbursement eligibility for the 2023-2024 fiscal year, but because the test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, the potential period of reimbursement begins on January 1, 2024.²⁶

In addition, staff finds that the test claim statute imposes state mandated requirements, under both legal and practical compulsion, requiring cities and counties ensure their internet websites for use by the public (including webpages, web applications, and other related resources within the website) and public email address for their employees utilize either a “.gov” top-level domain name or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain name by January 1, 2029, and that any websites with a non-compliant domain name they continue to maintain after January 1, 2024 redirects users to a website with a compliant domain name. Standard definitions of the word “website” as well as consideration of the rules of statutory construction support the conclusion that the test claim statute’s requirements for “internet websites for use by the public” naturally extends to the component files that make up a website, including webpages, web applications, or other related resources.²⁷ These requirements are new, and they constitute a new program or higher level of service, as these requirements are both unique to cities and counties and provide a service to the public. In addition, evidence supports that there are costs

²² Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 30 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²³ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo), page 38 (Exhibit 1, Estimated Actual and Anticipated Costs of New Activities to Migrate County Websites to the .gov Domain Name in Compliance with Sections 50034(a)(1) and (2)).

²⁴ Government Code 17551(c).

²⁵ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 1.

²⁶ Government Code section 17557(e).

²⁷ Merriam-Webster, *Website* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/website> (accessed on July 10, 2025); Exhibit K (16), Encyclopedia Britannica, *Website Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/website> (accessed on October 30, 2025), pages 1-2; *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 566. See also, *Merced Irrigation Dist. v. Superior Court* (2017) 7 Cal.App.5th 916, 924; *People v. Ruiz* (2024) 104 Cal.App.5th 1027, 1032; *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193, 239.

mandated by the state, as the claimant has submitted substantial evidence of costs incurred exceeding \$1,000 and there are no exceptions under Government Code section 17556 that would apply to this test claim statute.

Conclusion

Based on the forgoing analysis, staff concludes that Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b), as added by the test claim statute, imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, beginning January 1, 2024, requiring a city, county, or city and county which maintains an internet website used by the public or provides public email addresses for its employees perform the following new, one-time, state-mandated activities:

1. Ensure that the Internet website used by the public (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) utilizes either a “.gov” top-level domain name or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain name by January 1, 2029.²⁸
2. Ensure any websites (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) with a non-compliant domain name the city or county continues to maintain after January 1, 2029 redirects users to a website with a compliant domain name.²⁹
3. Ensure that each public email address provided for the city’s or county’s employees utilizes a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name by January 1, 2029.³⁰

All other activities or costs requested in the Test Claim are not mandated by the state, but may be proposed for inclusion in the Parameters and Guidelines if they are supported by evidence in the record showing they are “reasonably necessary for the performance of the state-mandated program” in accordance with Government Code section 17557(a), and California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 1183.7(d) and 1187.5.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the Proposed Decision to approve the Test Claim and authorize staff to make any technical, non-substantive changes to the Proposed Decision following the hearing.

²⁸ Government Code section 50034(a)(1).

²⁹ Government Code section 50034(a)(2).

³⁰ Government Code section 50034(b).

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE TEST CLAIM

Government Code sections 50034(a)(1)-(2) & (b)

Statutes 2023, Chapter 586 (AB 1637)

Filed on December 16, 2024

County of Santa Clara, Claimant

Case No.: 24-TC-04

Internet Websites and Email Addresses

DECISION PURSUANT TO
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 17500
ET SEQ.; CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2,
CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7.

(Adopted December 5, 2025)

DECISION

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) heard and decided this Test Claim during a regularly scheduled hearing December 5, 2025. [Witness list will be included in the adopted Decision.]

The law applicable to the Commission's determination of a reimbursable state-mandated program is article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, Government Code sections 17500 et seq., and related case law.

The Commission adopted the Proposed Decision to approve the Test Claim by a vote of [vote will be included in the adopted Decision], as follows:

Member	Vote
Lee Adams, County Supervisor	
Deborah Gallegos, Representative of the State Controller, Vice Chairperson	
Karen Greene Ross, Public Member	
Renee Nash, School District Board Member	
William Pahland, Representative of the State Treasurer	
Michele Perrault, Representative of the Director of the Department of Finance, Chairperson	
Alexander Powell, Representative of the Director of the Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation	

Summary of the Findings

This Test Claim alleges new state-mandated activities and costs arising from Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b), as added by the test claim statute which require that cities and counties ensure that their web pages and email addresses

use either “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain names by January 1, 2029.³¹ The Legislature found that because “adding Section 50034 to the Government Code addresses a matter of statewide concern and is not a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of article XI of the California Constitution,” this applies to all counties and cities, including charter cities.³² The purpose of the test claim statute is to provide assurance to the public that cities’ and counties’ websites and email addresses belong to the government agencies they claim to belong to. Under prior law many cities and counties used more commonly available top-level domains such as “.com” or “.org” for their website and email domain names, which made it easy for malicious actors to create fake websites or email addresses pretending to belong to a government agency.³³ These would then be used to spread misinformation, or trick members of the public into making payments or disclosing personal information.³⁴ The “.gov” top-level domain is only available to government agencies within the United States, and the “.ca.gov” second-level domain is only available to government agencies within the state of California.³⁵ When members of the public visit a city or counties’ website with an internet address ending with “.gov” or “.ca.gov,” or email a governmental employee at such an address, they can feel confident they are not falling victim to a scam or hacker.³⁶

The claimant has over 79 websites with over 10,000 individual webpages, 40 web applications, and 32,690 employee email addresses that used its previous “.org” domain name, which must all be migrated over to a new compliant “.gov” domain name.³⁷ The claimant alleges this has so far cost \$20,017 in fiscal year 2023-2024 for 199 hours of employee and third-party professional labor to begin this migration process, which it estimates will cost approximately \$918,868 in total.³⁸

³¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 12 (Written Narrative).

³² See Statutes 2023, chapter 586, section 3. Government Code section 20 defines “city” to include incorporated towns.

³³ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, pages 2-3.

³⁴ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

³⁵ Exhibit K (2), CISA, *Eligibility for .gov Domains*, <https://get.gov/domains/eligibility/> (accessed on July 23, 2025) page 2; Exhibit K (3), CDT, *Domain Name Requirements*, <https://domainnamerequest.cdt.ca.gov/Home/Requirements> (accessed on July 23, 2025), page 2.

³⁶ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 4.

³⁷ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 30 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

³⁸ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo), page 38 (Exhibit 1, Estimated Actual and Anticipated Costs of New Activities to Migrate County Websites to the .gov Domain Name in Compliance with Sections 50034(a)(1) and (2)).

The Commission finds that the Test Claim was timely filed, as it was filed within one year of the test claim statute's effective date.³⁹ The test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, and the test claim was filed on December 16, 2024, within 365 days following the effective date of the test claim statute.⁴⁰ The December 16, 2024 filing date establishes reimbursement eligibility for the 2023-2024 fiscal year, but because the test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, the potential period of reimbursement begins on January 1, 2024.⁴¹

In addition, the Commission finds that the test claim statute imposes state mandated requirements, under both legal and practical compulsion, requiring cities and counties ensure their internet websites for use by the public (including webpages, web applications, and other related resources within the website) and public email address for their employees utilize either a ".gov" top-level domain name or a ".ca.gov" second-level domain name by January 1, 2029, and that any websites with a non-compliant domain name they continue to maintain after January 1, 2029 redirects users to a website with a compliant domain name. Standard definitions of the word "website" as well as consideration of the rules of statutory construction support the conclusion that the test claim statute's requirements for "internet websites for use by the public" naturally extends to the component files that make up a website, including webpages, web applications, or other related resources.⁴² These requirements are new, and they constitute a new program or higher level of service, as these requirements are both unique to cities and counties and provide a service to the public. In addition, evidence supports that there are costs mandated by the state, as the claimant has submitted substantial evidence of costs incurred exceeding \$1,000 and there are no exceptions under Government Code section 17556 that would apply to this test claim statute.

Thus, the Commission finds that Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b), as added by the test claim statute, imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, beginning January 1, 2024, requiring a city, county, or city and county, that maintains an internet website for use by the public or public email addresses for its employees to perform the following new, one-time state mandated activities:

1. Ensure that the Internet website used by the public (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the

³⁹ Government Code 17551(c).

⁴⁰ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 1.

⁴¹ Government Code section 17557(e).

⁴² Merriam-Webster, *Website* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/website> (accessed on July 10, 2025); Exhibit K (16), Encyclopedia Britannica, *Website Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/website> (accessed on October 30, 2025), pages 1-2; *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 566. See also, *Merced Irrigation Dist. v. Superior Court* (2017) 7 Cal.App.5th 916, 924; *People v. Ruiz* (2024) 104 Cal.App.5th 1027, 1032; *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193, 239.

website) utilizes either a “.gov” top-level domain name or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain name by January 1, 2029.⁴³

2. Ensure any websites (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) with a non-compliant domain name the city or county continues to maintain after January 1, 2029 redirects users to a website with a compliant domain name.⁴⁴
3. Ensure that each public email address provided for the city’s or county’s employees utilizes a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name by January 1, 2029.⁴⁵

All other activities or costs requested in the Test Claim are not mandated by the state, but may be proposed for inclusion in the Parameters and Guidelines if they are supported by evidence in the record showing they are “reasonably necessary for the performance of the state-mandated program” in accordance with Government Code section 17557(a), and California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 1183.7(d) and 1187.5.

The Commission therefore approves this Test Claim.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

I. Chronology

01/01/2024	Government Code Sections 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b) were added by Statutes 2023, chapter 586 (AB 1637)
12/16/2024	The claimant filed the Test Claim. ⁴⁶
04/02/2025	County of Inyo filed comments on the Test Claim. ⁴⁷
04/08/2025	County of Monterey filed comments on the Test Claim. ⁴⁸
04/10/2025	County of Santa Barbara and the Town of Truckee each filed comments on the Test Claim. ⁴⁹
05/23/2025	The Department of Finance (Finance) filed comments on the Test Claim. ⁵⁰

⁴³ Government Code section 50034(a)(1).

⁴⁴ Government Code section 50034(a)(2).

⁴⁵ Government Code section 50034(b).

⁴⁶ Exhibit A, Test Claim.

⁴⁷ Exhibit B, County of Inyo’s Comments on the Test Claim.

⁴⁸ Exhibit C, County of Monterey’s Comments on the Test Claim.

⁴⁹ Exhibit D, County of Santa Barbara’s Comments on the Test Claim; Exhibit E, Town of Truckee’s Comments on the Test Claim.

⁵⁰ Exhibit F, Finance’s Comments on the Test Claim.

06/13/2025	The claimant filed rebuttal comments. ⁵¹
09/19/2025	Commission staff issued the Draft Proposed Decision. ⁵²
10/09/2025	The claimant filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision. ⁵³
10/10/2025	The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision. ⁵⁴

II. Background

A. The Domain Name System

Every computer connected to the Internet has a unique Internet Protocol (IP) address, which consists of a complicated string of seemingly random numbers. Navigating the Internet using these complicated strings would be difficult from a user perspective, so the Domain Name System (DNS) was created to help users find their way around the Internet. The DNS is like an address book where IP addresses are registered as associated with a unique (and often easier to read and remember) string of characters called a domain name.⁵⁵

Domain names are read by breaking the domain name into sections which are each separated by a dot character. Each domain name contains at least two sections: the top-level domain and the second-level domain.⁵⁶ Some domain names also use an optional subdomain, or even multiple subdomains (sometimes also called third-level domain, fourth-level domain, etc.). The sections in a domain name are always arranged in a hierarchical order, starting with the lowest level (the second-level domain or the lowest subdomain if subdomains are used) and ending with the highest level (the top-level domain). No two domain names can use the exact same combination of subdomains, second-level domain, and top-level domain, though it is easy to create functionally infinite similar-looking domain names through variations on the different sections (i.e., “example.com,” “thisisanexample.com,” “example.org,” “doyouneedan.example.com,” “thisisan.example.com,” “example.thisisan.com,” and “thisisan.eggssample.com” would all be valid unique domain names using different combinations of subdomains, second-level domains, and top-level domains).

⁵¹ Exhibit G, Claimant’s Rebuttal Comments.

⁵² Exhibit H, Draft Proposed Decision.

⁵³ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

⁵⁴ Exhibit J, CSAC’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

⁵⁵ Exhibit K (4), ICANN, *The Domain Name System*, <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dns-2022-09-13-en> (accessed on July 22, 2025) page 1.

⁵⁶ Exhibit K (5), ICANN, *Acronyms and Terms – D*, <https://www.icann.org/en/icann-acronyms-and-terms?nav-letter=d&page=1> (accessed on July 22, 2025), page 8.

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is an international organization responsible for coordinating the maintenance and procedures of the servers and databases that allow the DNS to function, mostly by delegating authority over specific functions to other organizations. One such group is the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), which maintains the database of all the top-level domains recognized by the DNS.⁵⁷ When the DNS was originally created, there were only a few available top-level domains, such as “.com,” “.org,” “.edu,” or “.gov.” Since then, ICANN has introduced procedures to allow additional top-level domains to be proposed and added to the system.⁵⁸ There are now over 1,250 top-level domains.⁵⁹

Each top-level domain is managed in turn by an administrator that maintains a database listing all second-level domains registered under it. To create a second-level domain so they can register domain names under it, an applicant contacts the administrator, often through a registrar, with the proposed second-level domain. These administrators each have their own rules for registering a second-level domain under their top-level domain, such as restricting who may apply for a second-level domain or for what purposes the domain name may be used. Once a second-level domain has been approved, the applicant can then register the domain name created from that unique combination of top- and second-level domain in the DNS so that it directs users to the intended IP address, which is on a server maintained by either the domain name owner or a domain name hosting service. The owner of that second-level domain can also in turn create its own database of subdomains and register domain names using those subdomains.

The “.gov” top-level domain is one of the original top-level domains from when the DNS was first implemented. Originally it was intended exclusively for U.S. federal government agencies, however in 2003 it was made available to government entities from all levels of U.S. government, including states, territories, tribes, counties, cities, special districts, and school districts.⁶⁰ The administrator for the “.gov” top-level domain is the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), an agency under the United States Department of Homeland Security. To apply for a second-level domain under the “.gov” top-level domain, the person applying for the domain on behalf of their organization must verify their identity by providing their state-issued ID, social security number, and phone number, and during the application process must provide information about the type of government organization they represent, the organization’s name and mailing address, the name and contact information of a senior

⁵⁷ Exhibit K (6), IANA, *Root Zone Database*, <https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db> (accessed on July 22, 2025).

⁵⁸ Exhibit K (7), ICANN, *Briefing Note – Overall Summary of the Paris Meeting*, June 2008, <https://archive.icann.org/en/meetings/paris2008/briefing-note.html> (accessed on July 22, 2025) pages 1-2.

⁵⁹ Exhibit K (6), IANA, *Root Zone Database*, <https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db> (accessed on July 22, 2025).

⁶⁰ Exhibit K (2), CISA, *Eligibility for .gov Domains*, <https://get.gov/domains/eligibility/> (accessed on July 23, 2025) page 2.

official within the organization with authority to authorize the request, the organization's current website, the preferred domain, the intended purpose of the domain, the applicant's contact information, and the names and contact information of other employees from the organization; they must also annually reaffirm that they are still actively using the domain name, they are following CISA's requirements, and to update contact information, as needed.⁶¹ Although there is no fee for applying for a ".gov" domain, CISA does not provide DNS hosting services, or host ".gov" websites or email; and applicants are responsible for acquiring those services themselves.⁶² Besides ".gov" domains reducing public uncertainty because only verified U.S. government organizations can register ".gov" domains, CISA ensures that ".gov" domains are secure by requiring multifactor authentication, requiring secure HTTPS connections, enforcing its rules for allowed use of the domain, publishing a complete list of all ".gov" domains, and making recommendations for security best practices.⁶³

The California Department of Technology (CDT) administers the ".ca.gov" second-level domain for the state of California. The CDT allows California state entities, counties, cities, state-recognized tribal governments, Joint Powers Authorities, and independent local districts within the state of California to register subdomains under the ".ca.gov" second-level domain.⁶⁴ To apply for a proposed subdomain, the person submitting the application on behalf of their organization provides their name, email address and phone number; the name of the organization they are applying for; the proposed domain name and its intended purpose; and the contact information for their CIO or CIO equivalent, Administrative, and Technical contacts. They must also annually file documents certifying the domain is still current and compliant with policies and guidelines.⁶⁵ There is no fee for applying for a subdomain, although CDT offers a DNS hosting service for state and other government entities for a fee.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Exhibit K (8), CISA, *Before You Request a .gov Domain*, <https://get.gov/domains/before/> (accessed on July 23, 2025), pages 2-3.

⁶² Exhibit K (8), CISA, *Before You Request a .gov Domain*, <https://get.gov/domains/before/> (accessed on July 23, 2025), page 6.

⁶³ Exhibit K (9) CISA, *Benefits of .gov Domains*, <https://get.gov/domains/benefits/> (accessed on July 23, 2025) page 2.

⁶⁴ Exhibit K (3), CDT, *Domain Name Requirements*, <https://domainnamerequest.cdt.ca.gov/Home/Requirements> (accessed on July 23, 2025), page 2.

⁶⁵ Exhibit K (10), CDT, *SIMM Section 40A – Internet Domain Name Taxonomy Instructions*, May 2023, pages 7-8.

⁶⁶ Exhibit K (11), CDT, *Website and Application Hosting – Windows IIS*, <https://cdt.ca.gov/services/website-hosting/> (accessed on July 23, 2025), pages 2, 17-20.

B. The Test Claim Statute

In 2023, the Legislature passed the test claim statute, Statutes 2023, chapter 586 (AB 1637). The test claim statute added Government Code section 50034, which states the following:

- (a) (1) No later than January 1, 2029, a local agency that maintains an internet website for use by the public shall ensure that the internet website utilizes a “.gov” top-level domain or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain.

(2) If a local agency that is subject to paragraph (1) maintains an internet website for use by the public that is noncompliant with paragraph (1) by January 1, 2029, that local agency shall redirect that internet website to a domain name that does comply with paragraph (1).
- (b) No later than January 1, 2029, a local agency that maintains public email addresses for its employees shall ensure that each email address provided to its employees utilizes a “.gov” domain name or a “.ca.gov” domain name.
- (c) For purposes of this section, “local agency” means a city, county, or city and county.⁶⁷

The test claim statute noted the addition of Government Code section 50034 addresses a matter of statewide concern, and as such applies to all cities, including charter cities.⁶⁸ The Legislature made the following findings explaining its reasoning behind this statute:

- a) The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), within the Department of Homeland Security, sponsors the “.gov” top-level domain and makes it available solely to United States-based government organizations and publicly controlled entities, including California’s local agencies.
- b) California’s local agencies qualify for a “.gov” domain name without paying any fee.
- c) Using “.gov” increases security by enforcing multifactor authentication on all accounts in the “.gov” registrar, requiring browsers to only use a Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS) connection with “.gov” domains, and enabling the addition of a security contact, making it easier for the public to alert the agency about potential security issues with the agency’s online services.
- d) The Government Operations Agency oversees the “.ca.gov” second-level domain, the Department of Technology manages the registration, change, and renewal process for “.ca.gov” domain names. Agencies are not required to pay any fee for a “.ca.gov” domain.
- e) To administer the “.ca.gov” second-level domain, the Department of Technology has established policies and protocols consistent with federal policy, including, but not limited to, the federal Interagency Committee on Government

⁶⁷ Government Code section 50034, as added by statutes 2023, chapter 586, section 2.

⁶⁸ Statutes 2023, chapter 586 (AB 1637), section 3.

Information's Recommended Policies and Guidelines for Federal Public Websites and the federal .gov Registrar administered by CISA.

- f) Users of websites or other internet services with a “.ca.gov” domain can be assured they are accessing an official California governmental resource.⁶⁹

Legislative analysis explained that a major concern this statute was intended to address was reducing the risk of members of the public being fooled by fake government websites, and ensuring the public's confidence that a city's or county's websites are legitimate. The original top-level domains were intended to be exclusively used by particular groups, and while some such as “.edu,” and “.mil” have retained their exclusivity, others such as “.com,” and “.org” have not and can be easily obtained by just about anyone, not to mention the numerous other top-level domains that were added over the years.⁷⁰ Because cities and counties were not previously required to use “.gov” domain names, and because the application process for receiving a “.gov” domain name can be a bit time-consuming, many cities and counties chose to use easier to obtain top-level domains such as “.com,” “.net,” or “.org.”⁷¹ Because so many cities and counties use domain names with these commonly available top-level domains, it is very easy for a malicious actor to register their own similar-looking domain name and create a fake website or email addresses pretending to belong to that government agency.⁷² These fake websites can even be made convincing enough that search engines mistakenly present them as legitimate search results, and as the use of these top-level domains is so widespread among cities and counties, members of the public have no reason to be suspicious and there is no quick, convenient way to verify the authenticity of the website.⁷³ The fake websites can then be used to spread misinformation or trick members of the public into making payments or revealing private information to these malicious actors.⁷⁴ “The main benefit of this measure will be to ensure that members of the public know that when they access a California local governmental website with an internet address ending with “.gov,” or “.ca.gov,” or email

⁶⁹ Statutes 2023, chapter 586 (AB 1637), section 1.

⁷⁰ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 2.

⁷¹ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, pages 2-3.

⁷² Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

⁷³ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

⁷⁴ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

a government employee at such an address, that they are not going to be the victim of a hacker's fake website.”⁷⁵

The Legislature acknowledged that there would be vast discrepancies in what would be required for local agencies to transition to a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain. On one end of the spectrum, Ventura County’s Chief Information Officer summarized the migration process in seven steps: 1) clone the site; 2) mass change all ventura.org references to the new “.gov” name; 3) internal testing for some weeks; 4) add domain to DNS (local and outside); 5) redirect “.org” to “.gov” while keeping both sides in synch and active; 6) press release; 7) decommission old “.org” site.⁷⁶ He estimated this could be done in a matter of days plus about a week of miscellaneous technical support, would largely be done by the county’s hosting service plus one full-time employee, and could be done within their existing budget.⁷⁷ In contrast, the County of Sacramento had recently gone through the process of voluntarily migrating to a “.gov” domain, which involved changing all websites, web applications, emails, and active directory accounts for over 12,000 employees and contractors, as well as updating applications and systems access rights to accommodate the change.⁷⁸ This took 15 full-time IT professionals over 14 months to complete.⁷⁹ One large urban local government asserted it would need to contract outside labor to complete the project because its current IT staff had a high number of other high-priority projects.⁸⁰ The Assembly Committee on Appropriations acknowledged that “Local agency costs to migrate their systems include IT costs, often for vendors, as well as labor costs and indirect costs, such as changes to outreach and promotional materials. Some agencies may also have costs for media campaigns to alert the public to the changes.”⁸¹ A coalition of local agency organizations against the bill identified additional activities that would be required and would incur costs, stating that:

⁷⁵ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 4.

⁷⁶ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 5.

⁷⁷ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 5.

⁷⁸ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

⁷⁹ Exhibit K (12) Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

⁸⁰ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis on AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 6. This statement was from when the Legislature was considering a deadline for compliance of January 1, 2025, as opposed to January 1, 2029.

⁸¹ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3

...While applying for and obtaining a .gov domain has no fees, there are significant costs that an agency must budget for to recode, establish corresponding e-mails, network login changes, single sign-on/multi-factors authentication, encryption keys, revising and redesign website/url links, updating social media and external entities. All of these costs are increased to co-exist both the previous site to auto-direct to the newly acquired .gov domain. Also, the cost and time it would take to migrate may disproportionately impact small-to-mid cities and counties adversely who may have insufficient IT staff or any dedicated IT staff, thus requiring them to contract out to outside vendors. Furthermore, the number and size of the departments will dramatically impact the costs as all fire, police, sheriff, libraries, utilities and municipal energy departments would be required, per AB 1637, to migrate to the new .gov domain.⁸²

As originally proposed, AB 1637 defined “local agency” as used in the test claim statute to mean “a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission, or agency thereof, or other local public agency.”⁸³ Local agencies objected to the time, effort, and expense that would be required to transition to a “.gov,” or “.ca.gov” domain. As originally proposed, the bill claimed that reimbursement pursuant to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution would not be required because the local agencies have fee authority sufficient to pay for the mandated program within the meaning of Government Code Section 17556.⁸⁴ The Assembly Committee on Appropriations disagreed with this reasoning, noting “it is unclear on what basis a local agency may charge a fee or other assessment to recover the costs of migrating to a .gov or .ca.gov domain,” and that charging a fee for access to a local agency’s website would likely conflict with Proposition 26.⁸⁵ This led to a closer examination of the fiscal costs of this potential mandate, which the Assembly Committee on Appropriations acknowledged would likely be in the millions of dollars statewide.⁸⁶ These costs would vary wildly between local agencies, with estimates for small or medium single-focused special districts ranging between \$6,000 to \$100,000, while larger special districts would

⁸² Exhibit K (13), Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 3.

⁸³ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis on AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 2. This is the same definition used in Government Code section 54951.

⁸⁴ Exhibit K (13), AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, section 4.

⁸⁵ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 1.

⁸⁶ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 1.

have costs between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000.⁸⁷ Estimates for larger counties were also in the low millions of dollars.⁸⁸ One suburban local government estimated its costs would be between \$750,000 and \$1 million, while a large urban local government estimated its costs to be \$6.3 million.⁸⁹ A coalition of local agencies that opposed the test claim statute alleged the statewide costs were likely to be in the hundreds of millions of dollars.⁹⁰ The high anticipated costs to local agencies caused the Legislature to amend the test claim statute, limiting its definition of “local agency” to only mean “a city, county, or city and county,” and to remove the claim that cities and counties have sufficient fee authority and replace it with the generic affirmation that if the Commission found it to contain costs mandated by the state, reimbursement would be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.⁹¹ Even with this change costs would still vary greatly, as they are largely dependent upon the size of the entity, the number of websites an entity manages, the number of employees, and the overall size and complexity of an entity’s internet presence.⁹² Some cities and counties estimated their costs between \$900,000 and several million dollars.⁹³ With 58 counties and over 480 cities subject to the test claim statute, that could result in total statewide costs upwards of \$484 million.⁹⁴ Estimates included a broad range of potential financial impacts, ranging from minor for cities and counties that had already largely completed this transition, to the low hundreds of thousands of dollars for smaller cities and counties with relatively small internet presences, to millions of dollars for larger and more sophisticated cities and

⁸⁷ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

⁸⁸ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

⁸⁹ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis on AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 6.

⁹⁰ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 4.

⁹¹ See Statutes 2023, chapter 586 (AB 1637), sections 2 and 4.

⁹² Exhibit K (14), Senate Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 2.

⁹³ Exhibit K (15), Senate Committee on Governance and Finance, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended May 18, 2023, page 3.

⁹⁴ Exhibit K (15), Senate Committee on Governance and Finance, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended May 18, 2023, page 3.

counties.⁹⁵ The Senate Appropriations Committee estimated aggregate costs somewhere in the tens of millions.⁹⁶

The Legislature identified a federal grant that could potentially be used to at least partially fund the costs of the test claim statute. The State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program allocated \$1 billion over four years to states for cybersecurity initiatives with a requirement that 80% pass through to local governments.⁹⁷ This grant program requires states to develop a cybersecurity plan which addresses 16 elements, two of which – following best cybersecurity practices and promoting recognizable online services – both call for transitioning to “.gov” domain names to achieve.⁹⁸ Applying this grant money towards the costs of the test claim statute would thus be an appropriate use of program funds. On December 27, 2022, the California Office of Emergency Services accepted \$8 million for the first year of funding from this grant.⁹⁹ Estimates show the state is likely to receive \$50 million in total over the four years of the grant program.¹⁰⁰ The Senate Committee on Appropriations noted however that this would likely only partially offset the statewide costs of the test claim statute.¹⁰¹ As of the time of writing, there have been no statutes specifically allocating this funding towards costs incurred to implement the test claim statute.

III. Positions of the Parties and Interested Parties

A. County of Santa Clara

The County of Santa Clara (claimant) filed the Test Claim on December 16, 2024, alleging that the test claim statute mandates cities and counties to ensure their web pages and email addresses use “.ca.gov” or “.gov” domain names by January 1, 2029, which is a new state-mandated program.¹⁰² Compliance is a complex and costly endeavor for the claimant, as at the time the test claim statute took effect, the claimant had approximately 79 websites with over 10,000 individual web pages that cumulatively

⁹⁵ Exhibit K (14), Senate Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 2.

⁹⁶ Exhibit K (14), Senate Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 1.

⁹⁷ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 6.

⁹⁸ Exhibit K (15), Senate Committee on Governance and Finance, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended May 18, 2023, page 2.

⁹⁹ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

¹⁰⁰ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

¹⁰¹ Exhibit K (14), Senate Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 2.

¹⁰² Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 1.

receive an average of approximately 59,000 views per day, as well as 40 public facing web applications that provide essential services to the public and 32,690 public email addresses, all of which were located on the claimant's "sccgov.org" domain name, which the claimant had been using since 2002.¹⁰³

The claimant identifies the following activities it alleges it must undertake to comply with the test claim statute. To migrate 79 websites to its new "santaclaracounty.gov" domain name, staff and third-party professionals must do the following:

- Complete the application process to obtain permission to use a .gov domain name.
- Establish teams with expertise to undertake the tasks needed for the domain transition and develop change management processes and oversight.
- Configure the entry-point of the County's web system infrastructure that allows the public to access the County's websites to work with the .gov domain.
- Register the County's new websites in the Domain Name System, the system that translates web addresses (domain names) into the numerical strings (IP addresses) that allow computers to connect to each other. This ensures that users are directed to the County's websites from their web browsers and includes reconfiguring the County's web security layer and cloud software.
- Enable single sign-on -a security process that allows the County's web infrastructure to authenticate valid internal users attempting to log into the system- to accept employees' new .gov email usernames.
- Redesign and replace the logo showing the County's legacy .org address that appears on many County websites.
- Configure the County's cloud computing systems with domain name aliases -the likely variants of the new .gov domains that users might enter into browsers when attempting to access County services- to ensure that users are directed to the County's websites when typing in the legacy .org domains.
- Conduct comprehensive testing of the website system to ensure the functionality of all newly implemented processes.
- Update the County's website analytics and auditing software -the program used to analyze users' interactions with County web pages and check for potential security, accessibility, and other vulnerabilities- to work with the new websites.
- Undertake search engine optimization, the processes that ensure that common internet search engines and web browsers direct users to the new .gov websites.
- Conduct security audits of the websites to locate and shore up potential vulnerabilities before they become publicly accessible.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 30 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

¹⁰⁴ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 31-32 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

The claimant also asserts it is required to do the following activities to redirect its 40 public-facing web applications in compliance with the test claim statute:

- Reconfigure web applications hosted on-premises and on the cloud to work with the County's new .gov domain.
- Revise the source code underlying all on-premises and cloud-based web applications to use the new domain and conduct subsequent quality assurance and testing.
- Configure the Domain Name System to direct users attempting to access County services using web browsers to on-premises and cloud-based web applications using the new .gov domain.
- Conduct comprehensive testing of all on-premises and cloud-based applications to ensure they are operable and secure.
- Reconfigure the infrastructure entry-point allowing the public to access the County's web applications to use the new .gov domain.
- Update all email notification services built into the web applications to ensure emails sent automatically to users by the web applications are delivered from addresses using .gov.
- Redesign and replace the logo showing the County's legacy .org address that appears on many County web applications.¹⁰⁵

Migrating the claimant's email addresses also requires the following:

- Assemble teams to undertake discovery and assess requirements, risks, and workflows, with consultation of third-party specialists.
- Review workflows, dependencies, and risks in the County's identity management software that stores identifying details about individuals who are provided access to the County's IT systems.
- Add mail exchange records to ensure emails sent to the new email addresses are delivered properly using the County's Domain Name System.
- Update the messaging hygiene infrastructure that scrubs external and internal emails for spam, malware, and other risks to accept the new .gov domain.
- Add the new email domain to the County's software to ensure emails sent from County and external users can be successfully received by County employees.
- Update the Domain Name System to enable it to process County and external emails using the new .gov domain.
- Update the County employee computing authentication system to permit employees to log into County computers and software systems using the new .gov addresses.

¹⁰⁵ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 32-33 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

- Establish system processes to ensure that outgoing emails sent by County employees show the new .gov domain.
- Develop, test, and deploy new systems of identity management to ensure that existing employees' legacy email addresses are replaced with addresses using .gov and future employees are issued addresses using .gov.
- Conduct final testing of the County's IT infrastructure and applications to ensure they properly accept and process new email addresses using the .gov domain.¹⁰⁶

Additionally, the claimant says that it is required to communicate the changes it made to its websites, web applications, and email systems internally to county employees and vendors and to the public, to ensure users know where to find essential services, how to communicate with county employees, and how to identify fraudulent information on other domains purporting to come from the county. It asserts this requires: internal communications informing county employees about the transition to the new email, website, and web application addresses; training employees on how to communicate these changes to the public and access web editing and management services to update and modify content; designing and initiating a public relations campaign; replacing references and links to legacy websites, web applications, and email addresses in the County's internet resources; and reprinting all paper documents containing the legacy websites and email addresses, including election materials, brochures, public signage, billing statements, business cards, and letterheads.¹⁰⁷

The claimant estimates it will cost approximately \$918,868 in total for it to complete all of the required activities.¹⁰⁸ Thus far, it has incurred \$20,017 in fiscal year 2023-2024 to begin the transition of its websites to the new domain name, consisting of 199 hours of employee and third-party professional labor.¹⁰⁹ It estimates it will take an additional \$24,641 in fiscal year 2024-2025 to finish migrating its websites, taking approximately 245 hours of employee and third-party professional labor.¹¹⁰ Migrating the claimants web applications will take 2,080 hours of labor from employees and third-party

¹⁰⁶ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 33 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

¹⁰⁷ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

¹⁰⁸ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

¹⁰⁹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 37-38 (Exhibit 1, Estimated Actual and Anticipated Costs of New Activities to Migrate County Websites to the .gov Domain Name in Compliance with Sections 50034(a)(1) and (2)).

¹¹⁰ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 37-38 (Exhibit 1, Estimated Actual and Anticipated Costs of New Activities to Migrate County Websites to the .gov Domain Name in Compliance with Sections 50034(a)(1) and (2)).

professionals, costing \$27,890.¹¹¹ Lastly it will take 2,772 hours of labor to migrate email addresses to the new domain name, costing \$656,320.¹¹²

The claimant's statewide cost estimate asserts the aggregate cost of implementing this test claim statute is \$90,900,000 in the 2024-2025 fiscal year.¹¹³ This is based on taking the estimated average cost for a city or county to migrate to a new domain name that was given in the test claim statute's legislative analysis (\$900,000), multiplying it by the number of cities and counties believed to have noncompliant websites and email addresses that would need to perform new activities to comply with the test claim statute (49 counties and 456 cities), and dividing that by the number of years between when the test claim statute went into effect on January 1, 2024 and the deadline for compliance of January 1, 2029 (five years).¹¹⁴

In its response to comments on the test claim, the claimant agreed with Finance's comment that migrating websites and email addresses to a new domain name is a one-time activity that does not include ongoing costs, and asserted that all incurred costs found in the test claim narrative and supporting Declaration of Matt Woo are for one-time activities the claimant must undertake to comply with the test claim statute, and "[t]hese activities are not intended to incur ongoing costs for compliance after they have been completed."¹¹⁵

On October 9, 2025, the claimant filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.¹¹⁶ While not disputing the Draft Proposed Decision's finding that many of the specific activities identified in the Test Claim are not mandated by the plain language of the test claim statute, and would be more appropriately addressed as reasonably necessary activities during the Parameters and Guidelines stage, it requests the Commission make a specific finding that the state's mandate that public websites use a ".gov" or ".ca.gov" domain name applies equally to public-facing web applications.¹¹⁷ "It is both reasonable and necessary to infer from the plain language and statutory history of Section 50034 that the Legislature intended to mandate that cities and counties ensure

¹¹¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 39-40 (Exhibit 2, Estimated Anticipated Costs of New Activities to Migrate County Web Applications to the .gov Domain Name in Compliance with Sections 50034(a)(1) and (2)).

¹¹² Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 41-42 (Exhibit 3, Estimated Anticipated Costs of New Activities to Migrate County Email Systems to the .gov Domain Name in Compliance with Section 50034(b)).

¹¹³ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 35 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

¹¹⁴ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 35 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

¹¹⁵ Exhibit G, Claimant's Rebuttal Comments, page 3.

¹¹⁶ Exhibit I, Claimant's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

¹¹⁷ Exhibit I, Claimant's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, pages 1-2, footnote 1.

that the web applications they make available to the public use either a .gov top-level domain name or a .ca.gov second-level domain name by January 1, 2029.”¹¹⁸

In addition to citing an analysis by the Department of Finance (Finance) that found the test claim statute likely creates “a significant state-reimbursable mandate for cities and counties to change their websites, *web applications*, email addresses, and active directory accounts,” the claimant presents four arguments for why the test claim statute applies to web applications.¹¹⁹ First, web applications appear to the public the same as websites, as both are accessed via a web browser on a computing device with an internet connection by entering a URL into the browser.¹²⁰ Second, Encyclopedia Britannica’s definition of “web application,” is not meaningfully distinct from the definition of “website” used in the Draft Proposed Decision, as “websites and web applications are both digital resources that are stored remotely and made accessible to users online via a web browser connected to the internet.”¹²¹ Third, many of the essential services the Draft Proposed Decision found supported that the claimant is practically compelled to comply with the test claim statute for websites it is not legally compelled to maintain are provided via web applications, not static websites.¹²² The claimant listed several of these services and the respective web applications they provide the services through.¹²³ Lastly, many of the Legislature’s reasons for enacting the test claim statute — the concerns about fake websites and the security benefits provided by “.gov” domain names — apply equally to websites as to web applications.¹²⁴ Arguably the heightened security benefits that come with “.gov” domain names are even more important for web applications, as the services they provide can involve the user inputting personal identifying information, or provide individualized tax or voter data, and so there would be greater concern to ensure this information is secure.¹²⁵ “It seems inconceivable that the Legislature would have intended local jurisdictions not to apply the mandates Section

¹¹⁸ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 2.

¹¹⁹ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 2, footnote 2 (emphasis added by claimant).

¹²⁰ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, 2-3.

¹²¹ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, pages 3-4. See also Exhibit K (16), Encyclopedia Britannica, *Website Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/website> (accessed on October 30, 2025), pages 4-5.

¹²² Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 4.

¹²³ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, pages 13-15 (Declaration of Nhan La).

¹²⁴ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, pages 8-10.

¹²⁵ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 10.

50034(a)(1) and (2) imposes on public-facing websites to public-facing web applications.”¹²⁶

B. Department of Finance

Finance filed comments on the Test Claim on May 23, 2025.¹²⁷ In its comments, Finance acknowledged that the test claim statute “requires local agencies to complete a migration of their websites and email addresses to “.gov” or “.ca.gov” by January 1, 2029,” which was not required prior to passing the test claim statute, and that the claimant has alleged increased costs to comply with this requirement.¹²⁸ Finance’s only critique of the Test Claim was that the act of migrating to the new websites and email addresses is a one-time activity, and therefore there should be no ongoing costs once migration is complete. Finance advised that should the Commission find the test claim statute imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program on local agencies, the Commission should examine the estimated costs the claimant alleged to ensure they only include one-time costs related to migrating websites and email addresses to “.gov” or “.ca.gov.”¹²⁹ Finance did not file comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

C. Interested Parties

Several cities and counties (“interested parties” according to the Commission’s regulations¹³⁰) filed comments on the Test Claim, expressing their support and making statements on the costs they have either incurred or anticipate will incur while complying with the test claim statute.

The County of Inyo reports spending \$2,794 so far for 40 hours of staff time and to purchase SSL certificates and DNS management for its new website, and anticipates an additional \$13,900 for staff time to migrate the current website and all email addresses and for additional SSL certificates.¹³¹ The County of Monterey asserts it needs to reprint public materials, signage, brochures, and letterheads, and that it will experience increased costs for staff time and labor for implementing, testing, and maintaining a new domain, a public awareness campaign, and email migration and IT system updates; but could not estimate experienced or anticipated costs.¹³² The County of Santa Barbara anticipates costs somewhere between \$750,000 and \$1,000,000 for changing official domain names, redesigning and reconfiguring county websites, obtaining new security certificates, and transferring its Microsoft 365 environment to align with the new email

¹²⁶ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 9.

¹²⁷ Exhibit F, Finance’s Comments on the Test Claim.

¹²⁸ Exhibit F, Finance’s Comments on the Test Claim, page 1.

¹²⁹ Exhibit F, Finance’s Comments on the Test Claim, page 2.

¹³⁰ See California Code of Regulations, Title 2, section 1181.2(i).

¹³¹ Exhibit B, County of Inyo’s Comments on the Test Claim, page 1.

¹³² Exhibit C, County of Monterey’s Comments on the Test Claim, page 1.

addresses.¹³³ Lastly, the Town of Truckee reported estimated costs of \$20,673.15, for several hundred hours of staff time, both that of IT staff and time spent by other members of its staff adjusting to the new website and email accounts.¹³⁴

D. Interested Persons

On October 10, 2025, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.¹³⁵ CSAC supports the Draft Proposed Decision but objects to characterizing the broad diversity in local agencies' costs found in the Background section's discussion of the test claim statute's legislative history as "discrepancies."¹³⁶ "The variables that cause wide differences in the most efficient means of compliance are copious, including the size of population that the local agency serves, their budgetary constraints, the infrastructure and complexity of their existing information technology systems, the size and skill level of existing information technology staff, and more."¹³⁷

CSAC also requests an amendment to the Proposed Decision acknowledging that web applications share the same ubiquity as websites and email addresses. Web applications allow local agencies to provide a modern and efficient level of service, and from the perspective of a typical user, appear to be a sophisticated website.¹³⁸ The CDT provides standard templates for web applications, and describe their need and importance because "digitally connecting Californians to government services they need has become increasingly more critical."¹³⁹ Some of the critical government services referenced in the Draft Proposed Decision are better deployed as web applications.¹⁴⁰ Lastly, CSAC argues it is inconsistent to find that the test claim statute's plain language makes no mention of web applications, but accept webpages — which are also not in the plain language — as subcomponents to a website that are similarly affected by the test claim statute.¹⁴¹ Web applications are indistinguishable from websites to the average user, and they exist to provide modern and efficient delivery of government services, just like websites, and should therefore be considered similar to the websites

¹³³ Exhibit D, County of Santa Barbara's Comments on the Test Claim, page 1.

¹³⁴ Exhibit E, Town of Truckee's Comments on the Test Claim, pages 1-2.

¹³⁵ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision.

¹³⁶ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, pages 1-2. This comes from the legislative analysis, stating that "local governments report vast discrepancies as to the time, effort, and expense required to transition to using '.gov' and '.ca.gov' domains." See Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 5.

¹³⁷ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 1.

¹³⁸ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 2.

¹³⁹ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 2.

¹⁴⁰ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 2.

¹⁴¹ Exhibit J, CSAC's Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 3.

local agencies are not legally required to maintain, but the Draft Proposed Decision found practically compelled local agencies to comply with the test claim statute.¹⁴²

IV. Discussion

Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution provides in relevant part the following:

Whenever the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the state shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse such local government for the costs of such programs or increased level of service...

The purpose of article XIII B, section 6 is to “preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local agencies, which are ‘ill equipped’ to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose.”¹⁴³ Thus, the subvention requirement of section 6 is “directed to state-mandated increases in the services provided by [local government] ...”¹⁴⁴

Reimbursement under article XIII B, section 6 is required when the following elements are met:

1. A state statute or executive order requires or “mandates” local agencies or school districts to perform an activity.¹⁴⁵
2. The mandated activity constitutes a “program” that either:
 - a. Carries out the governmental function of providing a service to the public; or
 - b. Imposes unique requirements on local agencies or school districts and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.¹⁴⁶
3. The mandated activity is new when compared with the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim statute or executive order and it increases the level of service provided to the public.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴² Exhibit J, CSAC’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 3.

¹⁴³ *County of San Diego v. State of California* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

¹⁴⁴ *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.

¹⁴⁵ *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 874.

¹⁴⁶ *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 874-875 (reaffirming the test set out in *County of Los Angeles* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56).

¹⁴⁷ *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 874-875, 878; *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal3d 830, 835.

4. The mandated activity results in the local agency or school district incurring increased costs, within the meaning of section 17514. Increased costs, however, are not reimbursable if an exception identified in Government Code section 17556 applies to the activity.¹⁴⁸

The Commission is vested with the exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution.¹⁴⁹ The determination whether a statute or executive order imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program is a question of law.¹⁵⁰ In making its decisions, the Commission must strictly construe article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, and not apply it as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”¹⁵¹

A. The Test Claim Was Timely Filed, with a Period of Reimbursement Beginning January 1, 2024.

Government Code section 17551(c) provides that test claims “shall be filed not later than 12 months following the effective date of a statute or executive order, or within 12 months of incurring increased costs as a result of a statute or executive order, whichever is later.”¹⁵² Section 1183.1(c) of the Commission’s regulations, in turn, defines “12 months” as 365 days.¹⁵³ The test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, and the test claim was filed on December 16, 2024, within 365 days following the effective date of the test claim statute.¹⁵⁴ The test claim was therefore timely filed.

Government Code section 17557(e) requires a test claim to be submitted on or before June 30 following a given fiscal year to establish eligibility for that fiscal year.¹⁵⁵ The December 16, 2024 filing date establishes reimbursement eligibility for the 2023-2024 fiscal year, but because the test claim statute became effective on January 1, 2024, the potential period of reimbursement begins on January 1, 2024.

¹⁴⁸ *County of Fresno v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1284; Government Code sections 17514 and 17556.

¹⁴⁹ *Kinlaw v. State of California* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 326, 335.

¹⁵⁰ *County of San Diego v. State of California* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 109.

¹⁵¹ *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1280 citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

¹⁵² Government Code section 17551(c).

¹⁵³ California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1(c).

¹⁵⁴ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 1.

¹⁵⁵ Government Code section 17557(e)

B. The Test Claim Statute Imposes a Reimbursable State-Mandated Program on Cities, Counties, and Cities and Counties.

As described below, the Commission finds that sections (a)(1), (a)(2), and (b) of Government Code section 50034, added by the test claim statute (Stats. 2023, ch. 586) imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution.

1. The Test Claim Statute Imposes State-Mandated Requirements That a City, County, or City and County's Public Websites and Employee Email Addresses Use Either a ".gov" Top-Level Domain Name or ".ca.gov" Second-Level Domain Name.

The plain language of Government Code section 50034 requires a local agency, meaning a "city, county, or city and county," that maintains an internet website for use by the public or public email addresses for its employees, ensure that its internet website and each email address utilizes either a ".gov" top-level domain name or ".ca.gov" second-level domain name by January 1, 2029. In addition, the statute requires that if the city or county continues to maintain a noncompliant website for use by the public after the January 1, 2029 deadline, the noncompliant website shall redirect users to a website using a ".gov" or ".ca.gov" domain name. Section 50034 states the following:

- (a) (1) No later than January 1, 2029, a local agency that maintains an internet website for use by the public *shall ensure that the internet website utilizes a ".gov" top-level domain name or a ".ca.gov" second-level domain.*
- (2) If a local agency that is subject to paragraph (1) maintains an internet website for use by the public that is noncompliant with paragraph (1) by January 1, 2029, that local agency *shall redirect that internet website to a website that does comply with paragraph (1).*
- (b) No later than January 1, 2029, a local agency that maintains public email addresses for its employees *shall ensure that each email address provided to its employees utilizes a ".gov" domain name or a ".ca.gov" domain name.*
- (c) For purposes of this section, "local agency" means a city, county, or city and county.
 - a. The test claim statute requires a city, county, or city and county, that maintains an internet website for use by the public or public email addresses for its employees to ensure the website and email addresses utilize either a ".gov" or ".ca.gov" domain name by January 1, 2029, and based on the rules of statutory construction, the Legislature's use of the word "website" includes all webpages, web applications, or related resources within the website.

Based on the plain language of the test claim statute, the activities of ensuring internet websites and email addresses utilize a ".gov" top-level domain name or ".ca.gov" second-level domain name, and ensuring that any noncompliant websites redirect to a website with a compliant domain name, by January 1, 2029, are required for a city,

county, or city and county that maintains a public facing website or public email addresses for its employees.

State law does not have any codified definitions for “website,” “email address,” or “domain name;” as used in the test claim statute and, thus we must follow the definitions generally accepted by the public.¹⁵⁶

Merriam-Webster’s definition of “website” is “a group of World Wide Web pages, usually containing hyperlinks to each other and made available online by an individual, company, educational institution, government, or organization.”¹⁵⁷ Encyclopedia Britannica similarly defines a website as “a collection of files and related resources accessible through the World Wide Web and the Internet via a domain name,” and notes that “typical files found at a website are HTML documents with their associated graphic image files (GIF, JPEG, etc.), scripted programs (in Perl, PHP, Java, etc.), and similar resources.”¹⁵⁸ Combining those two definitions, a website is a group or collection of files, such as webpages, scripted programs, and related resources, that have been made accessible online through the World Wide Web and the Internet via a domain name by an individual, company, educational institution, government, or organization.

“Email” is “a communication exchanged between people by computer, through either a local area network or the internet,” and “address” is “the place where mail or other communication is sent;” the combination of the two for “email address” means the place to send email to communicate with a person.¹⁵⁹

The Domain Name System allows users to navigate the Internet by associating complex IP addresses with easier to remember domain names.¹⁶⁰ According to ICANN, the organization responsible for managing the Domain Name System, a domain name is:

A unique name that forms the basis of the uniform resource locators (URLs) that people use to find resources on the Internet (e.g., web pages, email servers, images, and videos). The domain name itself identifies a specific address on the Internet that belongs to an entity such as a company, organization, institution, or individual. For example, in the URL

¹⁵⁶ See *Turo Inc. v. City of San Francisco* (2022) 80 Cal.App.5th 517, 521 (Words in a statute are construed to give them “a plain and commonsense meaning,” unless a statute specifically defines the word to give it a special meaning).

¹⁵⁷ Merriam-Webster, *Website* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/website> (accessed on July 10, 2025).

¹⁵⁸ Exhibit K (16), Encyclopedia Britannica, *Website Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/website> (accessed on October 30, 2025), pages 1-2.

¹⁵⁹ See Black’s Law Dictionary (12th ed. 2024).

¹⁶⁰ Exhibit K (4), ICANN, *The Domain Name System*, <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dns-2022-09-13-en> (accessed on July 22, 2025) page 1.

<https://www.icann.org/public-comments>, the domain name [icann.org](https://www.icann.org) directs a browser to the ICANN organization's domain. The rest of the URL directs the browser to a specific resource on the www server within ICANN's domain (in this case, the Public Comments page on the ICANN org website).¹⁶¹

A domain name is thus the address used to locate a group of Internet resources, such as a website, while a URL directs users to a specific resource within that group, such as a webpage or email address. Domain names are structured by breaking the domain name down into sections, arranged in hierarchal order from lowest to highest level, with dots separating the sections. Domain names contain at least two sections: a top-level domain and second-level domain.¹⁶² Some domain names also include optional subdomains.¹⁶³ Each top-level domain maintains a database of all second-level domains registered under it, and the owner of a second-level domain can in turn maintain a database of subdomains registered under it. CISA maintains the ".gov" top-level domain, while CDT maintains the ".ca.gov" second-level domain.¹⁶⁴

The test claim statute therefore requires cities' and counties' websites and email addresses to use a domain name registered under the ".gov" top-level domain, with the explicit option this can be as subdomain under the ".ca.gov" second-level domain.

The claimant and CSAC argue that the test claim statute also applies to web applications and web pages and is not limited to "websites." The Commission agrees. The rules of statutory construction support the conclusion that the Legislature's use of the word "website" includes "web applications" and "web pages" within it. A recent mandates case explained the basic rules of statutory construction as follows:

[O]ur fundamental task ... is to determine the Legislature's intent so as to effectuate the law's purpose. We first examine the statutory language, giving it a plain and commonsense meaning. We do not examine that language in isolation, but in the context of the statutory framework as a whole in order to determine its scope and purpose and to harmonize the various parts of the enactment. If the language is clear, courts must generally follow its plain meaning unless a literal interpretation would result in absurd consequences the Legislature did not intend. If the statutory language permits more than one reasonable interpretation, courts may consider other aids, such as the statute's purpose, legislative

¹⁶¹ Exhibit K (5), ICANN, *Acronyms and Terms – D*, <https://www.icann.org/en/icann-acronyms-and-terms?nav-letter=d&page=1> (accessed on July 22, 2025), page 8.

¹⁶² Exhibit K (5), ICANN, *Acronyms and Terms – D*, <https://www.icann.org/en/icann-acronyms-and-terms?nav-letter=d&page=1> (accessed on July 22, 2025), page 8.

¹⁶³ Exhibit K (5), ICANN, *Acronyms and Terms – D*, <https://www.icann.org/en/icann-acronyms-and-terms?nav-letter=d&page=1> (accessed on July 22, 2025), page 8.

¹⁶⁴ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, pages 3-4.

history, and public policy.” [Citation.] “Furthermore, we consider portions of a statute in the context of the entire statute and the statutory scheme of which it is a part, giving significance to every word, phrase, sentence, and part of an act in pursuance of the legislative purpose.”¹⁶⁵

Absent ‘a specific statutory definition of a term, the courts look to the plain meaning as understood by the ordinary person, which would typically be a dictionary definition.’¹⁶⁶

“[W]hen the statutory language is ambiguous a court’s primary goal is to adopt the interpretation that best effectuates the legislative intent or purpose. To identify a statute’s purpose and underlying legislative intent, courts may look to such aids as legislative history, maxims of statutory construction, and consequences of particular interpretation, including its impact on public policy.”¹⁶⁷

Here, the dictionary definition of “website” and the Legislature’s use of the word “website,” both in its analysis of the test claim statute and how it is frequently used in other statutes, supports a conclusion that the Legislature intended its use of the word “website” broadly to include programs such as “web applications” and “web pages,” which are part of the website.

As indicated above, “website” is defined as a group or collection of files accessed via the Internet. Encyclopedia Britannica’s definition specifically notes that the types of files that can make up a website include “HTML documents with their associated graphic image files (GIF, JPEG, etc.), scripted programs (in Perl, PHP, Java, etc.), and similar resources.”¹⁶⁸ This collection of files can include HTML documents like web pages, computer programs like web applications, or any other related resources. Merriam-Webster provides “the block of information found at a single World Wide Web Address,” as a variant definition of the word “page.”¹⁶⁹ Encyclopedia Britannica’s entry for HTML, which it defines as “a formatting system for displaying material retrieved over the Internet,” notes that each “retrieval unit” is known as a webpage, and HTML is the markup language used to encode webpages.¹⁷⁰ Encyclopedia Britannica’s definition for “web application” says it is a “computer program stored on a remote server and run by its users via a web browser,” and “[a]ny service offered over the Internet, by definition, is

¹⁶⁵ *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 566. See also, *Merced Irrigation Dist. v. Superior Court* (2017) 7 Cal.App.5th 916, 924.

¹⁶⁶ *People v. Ruiz* (2024) 104 Cal.App.5th 1027, 1032.

¹⁶⁷ *Martinez v. City of Clovis* (2023) 90 Cal.App.5th 193, 239.

¹⁶⁸ Exhibit K (16), Encyclopedia Britannica, *Website Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/website> (accessed on October 30, 2025), pages 1-2.

¹⁶⁹ Merriam-Webster, *Page*, entry 1 sense 2a <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/page#h1> (accessed on October 15, 2025).

¹⁷⁰ Exhibit K (17), Encyclopedia Britannica, *HTML Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/HTML> (accessed on October 15, 2025).

a form of web application.”¹⁷¹ Thus, any files that are part of a website would be subject to the legal requirements imposed on the website itself.

In addition, interpreting the test claim statute’s use of the word “website” to not include “web applications” or “web pages” creates a glaring omission that undermines the statute’s intended purpose. The test claim statute’s plain language only specifically requires cities and counties to ensure their websites and email addresses use a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name, despite oft-repeated evidence in the legislative history that migrating to a new domain name involved “changing all websites, web applications, emails and active directory accounts.”¹⁷² The legislative purpose behind the test claim statute is to ensure the public can discern real government websites from fake, because only legitimate government entities may use “.gov” and “.ca.gov” domain names. As the claimant pointed out, if cities and counties were required to migrate their websites to a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name but could continue to use their old domain name for web applications, it creates confusion, and risks not only sustaining, but exacerbating the risks of the public falling for fraudulent imitators or losing trust in government services.¹⁷³ Thus, it can be reasonably concluded that the Legislature intended “web application” and “web pages” to be covered by and included within the definition of “website”.

Interpreting web applications and web pages to be part of websites is also consistent with how the Legislature talks about how websites are used in the test claim statute’s legislative history. “A fake website that lures in real users who believe they are visiting a legitimate government website could then lure those users into sharing personal information, making payments, and conducting other compromising activities.”¹⁷⁴ These examples of compromising activities users can perform on websites depend on interactivity; on users inputting personal information into the website, which, as the claimant suggests, is a typical feature of web applications.¹⁷⁵

Furthermore, the Legislature’s use of “website” in other statutes supports that it interprets website to mean a broader, general term that includes web applications. There are only a handful of statutes that discuss “web applications.” The few examples that do are either talking about the use of a specific web application,¹⁷⁶ or use it as part

¹⁷¹ Exhibit K (16), Encyclopedia Britannica, *Website Definition & Facts* <https://www.britannica.com/technology/website> (accessed on October 30, 2025), pages 4-5.

¹⁷² Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis on AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 6.

¹⁷³ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 9.

¹⁷⁴ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis on AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 1.

¹⁷⁵ Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, pages 3-4.

¹⁷⁶ See Welfare and Institutions Code section 4641.5(b) and Government Code section 95020.5(b) (requiring regional centers for persons with developmental disabilities to use

of a standard definition of online platforms as “any public-facing Internet website, web application, or digital application.”¹⁷⁷ “Website,” on the other hand, is much more commonly used, and comes up in hundreds of statutes. Often, these statutes require a state or local agency to post certain information on their websites.¹⁷⁸ An interpretation of “website” that does not include “web applications” would mean that this information can only be published as a static document on a website, not an interactive web application. Yet frequently, government agencies will use web applications to publish legally required information.¹⁷⁹ Thus, the Legislature considers web applications to be an acceptable method of performing this legal obligation, because it understands web applications to be part of the government agency’s website.

Thus, the Legislature’s use of “website” is meant to include interactive components provided via web applications.

Accordingly, the plain language of the test claim statute requires a city, county, or city and county, that maintains an internet website for use by the public or public email addresses for its employees, to ensure their websites and email addresses utilize either a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name by January 1, 2029. The rules of statutory construction support the Legislature’s use of “website” is meant to be as a collection of remotely-accessible files such as web pages, web applications, and other related resources within the website.

a specific web application created by the state for their billing); Penal Code section 13370(b)(2)(F) (requiring the Department of Justice make prosecutorial data accessible using modern web application program interfaces).

¹⁷⁷ See Business and Professions Code section 17940(c); Family Code sections 6650(e) and 6750(c)(2); Elections Code section 20512(h); and Government Code sections 84504.6(a)(1) and 84513(a)(1).

¹⁷⁸ See Government Code section 8548.9 (State Auditor’s website shall display the status of recommendations the State Auditor made in its audits and investigations); Government Code section 100502 (California Health Exchange Board’s website provides standardized comparative information about health plans for health care plan enrollees and prospective enrollees); Government Code section 6270.5(a), as amended by Statute 2015, Chapter 795, section 2 (Local agencies shall post their catalog of enterprise systems on their internet website, if they have a website).

¹⁷⁹ For example, the claimant provided evidence that it publishes the catalog of enterprise systems required by Government Code section 6270.5(a) (as added by Statutes 2015, chapter 795, later moved to Government Code section 7922.715 by the California Public Records Act, Statutes 2021, chapter 614), on its Open Data Portal web application. Exhibit I, Claimant’s Comments on the Draft Proposed Decision, page 15 (Declaration of Nhan La).

- b. Cities and Counties are mandated by the state to comply with the requirements in Government Code section 50034(a)(1), (2), and (b), based on both legal and practical compulsion theories.

For the required activities in a statute or executive order to be mandated by the state, the claimant must be either legally or practically compelled to perform the activity.

Legal compulsion occurs when a statute or executive action uses mandatory language that “‘require[s]’ or ‘command[s]’” a local entity to participate in a program or service. [citations omitted] [construing the term “mandates” in art. XIII B, § 6 to mean “‘orders’ or ‘commands’”].) Stated differently, legal compulsion is present when the local entity has a mandatory, legally enforceable duty to obey.¹⁸⁰

In *Coast Community College District v. Commission on State Mandates*, claimants alleged that several regulations imposed state mandated costs on community college districts. Although complying with the regulations entitled districts to state funding, the Commission found they were not legally compelled to comply with the regulations, as they had the option of not complying with the regulations, and not complying only resulted in the Chancellor having the option to take several possible actions in response to encourage compliance, including withholding funding.¹⁸¹ The Appellate Court found that these funding regulations were legally compelled because the regulations related to community colleges’ core functions, however the State Supreme Court reversed this decision, finding that something is only legally compelled if there is a mandatory legal obligation that they obey, and the proper focus in a legal compulsion inquiry is upon the nature of the claimants’ participation in the underlying programs themselves.¹⁸² “If a community college district is willing to risk the possibility of losing some or all of its state aid, there does not appear to be any mechanism (or at least none the parties have identified) that would allow the Chancellor or any other state entity to compel compliance as a matter of law.”¹⁸³

The court also recognized there may be a state-mandated program with practical compulsion. Practical compulsion occurs when the consequences for not complying with a technically optional requirement are so onerous they result in “certain and severe penalties such as double taxation and other draconian consequences,” such that a local

¹⁸⁰ *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th. 800, 815. See also *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 874.

¹⁸¹ *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th. 800, 811.

¹⁸² *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th. 800, 815.

¹⁸³ *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th. 800, 817.

government has no reasonable alternative but to comply.¹⁸⁴ For there to be no reasonable alternative, any alternative options that may exist must be “so far beyond the realm of practical reality” that it leaves the local government “without discretion” not to comply with the state’s conditions, such that the alternative amounts to “no alternative at all.”¹⁸⁵ In such cases, the state “does not command a local entity to engage in conduct, but rather induces compliance through the imposition of severe consequences that leave the local entity no reasonable alternative but to comply.”¹⁸⁶

The claimant argues that it is legally compelled to comply with the test claim statute because of the statute’s use of the mandatory language “shall.”¹⁸⁷ In the alternative, it also argues it is practically compelled because the only alternative available is not to have a public website, which amounts to “no alternative at all,” as use of the web is integral to local governments’ functioning.¹⁸⁸ The claimant contends cities and counties use their websites to disseminate important information and allow citizens to request public records, file essential paperwork, register to vote, and access public hearings. Providing these services via the internet is especially important for people with disabilities, or those who live far from their local government buildings or are reliant on public benefits. City and county websites provide all residents with a key tool for engaging with their elected government, by allowing them to access the agendas of the meetings of the Board of Supervisors, watch streaming or archived videos of these meetings, and participate by video conference to exercise their right to provide public comment.¹⁸⁹ Additionally, the claimant alleges there are multiple other State laws that mandate local governments create websites or dictate how they are used, specifically noting the requirements that special districts maintain a website (Government Code section 53087.8); that local governments post certain types of at-risk contracts on their websites for public inspection (Public Contracts Code section 20146(e)); that public agencies post notices on their websites under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code sections 21092(b)(3), 21092.3, and 21152(c)); that health care districts and hospital districts maintain a website containing information about their budget, membership, and public meetings (Government Code section 7926.500 and Health and Safety Code section 32139(b)); and that local governments disclose all

¹⁸⁴ *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 1355, 1360, 1364.

¹⁸⁵ *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 558 (finding that urbanized cities and counties were practically compelled to obtain a permit for their stormwater drainage systems).

¹⁸⁶ *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th 800, 816.

¹⁸⁷ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 22-23 (Written Narrative).

¹⁸⁸ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 23 (Written Narrative).

¹⁸⁹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 24 (Written Narrative).

offers and counteroffers for certain high cost contracts on their websites (Public Contracts Code section 22178).¹⁹⁰

As explained below, the Commission finds that the required activities in the test claim statute are mandated by the state, based on both legal and practical compulsion theories.

- i. Cities and counties are legally required to publish certain notices and documents on their websites, which requires maintaining a public internet website to publish this information; thus cities and counties are legally compelled to maintain a public internet website, which makes the test claim statute's requirements mandated by the state.*

The claimant asserts the test claim statute's use of the word "shall" makes the activities in the test claim statute mandatory requirements, and thus legally compelled state mandates. It is true that the use of the word "shall" in the Government Code means something is mandatory, while "may" is merely permissive.¹⁹¹ However, as a general matter, a local entity's voluntary or discretionary decision to undertake an activity cannot be said to be legally compelled, even if that decision results in certain mandatory actions.¹⁹² The proper focus in a legal compulsion inquiry is upon the nature of the claimants' participation in the underlying programs themselves.¹⁹³ In other words, mandatory language like "shall" does not automatically mean something is a legally compelled state mandate, if it is in the context of imposing requirements on an activity the local agency chose to undertake voluntarily. In context, the requirement that cities and counties shall ensure their public websites use either a ".gov" top-level domain or a ".ca.gov" second-level domain is imposed on "a local agency that maintains an internet website for use by the public."¹⁹⁴ Thus, the question of whether this requirement is a legally compelled mandate depends on whether cities and counties are legally compelled to have a public website in the first place.

There are no statutes that explicitly say all cities and counties shall maintain a public internet website. The Legislature can and has in the past used its authority to legally compel government agencies to maintain a website. Government Code section 8548.9 says that the State Auditor shall "maintain a publicly accessible internet website that displays the status of recommendations the State Auditor made in its audits and investigations." The California Health Benefit Exchange Board shall "maintain an internet website through which enrollees and prospective enrollees of qualified health

¹⁹⁰ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 24 (Written Narrative).

¹⁹¹ Government Code section 14.

¹⁹² *Coast Community College District v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th 800, 815.

¹⁹³ *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th. 800, 815.

¹⁹⁴ Government Code section 50034(a)(1).

plans may obtain standardized comparative information on those plans.”¹⁹⁵ State law requires independent special districts, health care districts, and hospital districts to each maintain a website.¹⁹⁶ However the test claim statute explicitly says that “local agency” as used here only means a “city, county, or city and county,” purposefully limiting it from the definition used in earlier drafts which included a “county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency.”¹⁹⁷ These are examples of the Legislature creating a clear legal compulsion for other state or local agencies to maintain a public website. Because there is no statute that imposes a similar legal compulsion for cities and counties, we’ll instead consider whether there are any instances of legal compulsion caused by the Legislature legally compelling cities and counties to make certain information available on a public website they maintain, thereby requiring them to maintain a website.

The claimant cited several State laws it alleges require local governments to post certain information on their public websites, and therefore to have a public website.¹⁹⁸ Many of the cited examples are themselves dependent on a local agency first choosing to take a discretionary action. The Public Contract Code requires that a county or public entity that “elects to...[use] a construction manager at-risk contract for a building project shall make a copy of the contract available for public inspection on its internet website,” and that any city, county, city and county, or special district that chooses to enter into a contract valued at \$250,000 or more disclose all offers and counteroffers to the public on its internet website.¹⁹⁹ It is a discretionary decision for a local agency to enter into these types of contracts, thus the state does not mandate them to have an internet website in order to perform the resulting mandatory actions.²⁰⁰ Legislative analysis for the test claim statute also acknowledged several prior laws that require local agencies to post certain information on their internet websites *if they have one*.²⁰¹ This condition

¹⁹⁵ Government Code section 100502(c).

¹⁹⁶ Government Code sections 7926.500 and 53087.8; Health and Safety Code section 32139(b).

¹⁹⁷ Government Code section 50034(c); see also Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 2.

¹⁹⁸ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 24 (Written Narrative).

¹⁹⁹ Public Contract Code sections 20146(e) and 22178(c)

²⁰⁰ See *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 727, 743 (School districts’ choice to participate in voluntary state-funded programs did not create a legally compelled state mandate to comply with the programs’ requirements).

²⁰¹ Exhibit K (13) Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 2. See also Government Code sections 6270.5(a), as amended by Statute 2015, Chapter 795, section 2 (Local agencies shall post their catalog of enterprise systems on their internet website, if they have a website); 53908(a), as amended by Statutes 2014,

excuses any local agencies that do not have a website from performing the mandatory actions, thus the Legislature is not legally compelling local agencies to have a website here either. None of these examples establish a legal obligation or duty for a city or county to have a public website.

However, there are at least some laws that do impose a legal obligation to post certain information on a local agency's website, thus requiring cities and counties to have a website. The California Environmental Quality Act requires lead agencies to provide notices during the process of preparing an environmental impact report or negative declaration for a project and after approving a project subject to these provisions.²⁰² These notices shall be posted on the lead agency's website as well as the website of the county clerk.²⁰³ A "lead agency" is the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant impact on the environment.²⁰⁴ Projects under the California Environmental Quality Act do not just mean those undertaken by or on behalf of a public agency, but also any other activities that require a public agency to issue a person a lease, permit, license, certificate or other entitlement for use.²⁰⁵ A city or county that serves as the lead agency for a project often did not make a choice to take on that role, as many projects are instigated by members of the public seeking approval from the city or county. Regardless of whether the project is ultimately approved, the public agency with principal responsibility for approving a project is the project's lead agency, and is legally required to post notices on its website as part of its responsibilities as lead agency.

For another example, Government Code section 84616 requires local government agencies to post on their websites a copy of any statement, report or other documents candidates file with them that is required by campaign finance disclosure law.²⁰⁶ Candidates are legally required to file these documents to be allowed to run for office, and local governments are obligated to hold elections for these positions as part of the democratic process. Unlike other disclosures required by the Government Code, the phrasing used to impose this requirement to post candidates' financial disclosure documents does not condition it as only being required if the local government has a

Chapter 894, section 3 (If a local agency that is required to make certain annual reports to the Controller maintains an internet website, it shall post information about the annual compensation of it elected officials, officers, and employees in a conspicuous location on its website); 54954(a)(1), as amended by Statutes 2011, Chapter 692, section 8 (Meeting agendas for the legislative body of a local agency or its designee shall be posted at least 72 hours before the meeting on the local agency's internet website, if it has one).

²⁰² Public Resources Code sections 21092, 21152.

²⁰³ Public Resources Code sections 21092(b)(3), 21092.3, and 21152(c)(1).

²⁰⁴ Public Resources Code section 21067.

²⁰⁵ Public Resources Code section 21065.

²⁰⁶ Government Code section 84616.

website in the first place. Thus, cities and counties are legally required to post these documents on their websites, and in turn, have a public website.

Cities and counties are legally required to publish certain notices and documents on their public internet website, which necessarily requires them to maintain a public internet website. Because they are legally required to maintain a public internet website, they are in turn legally compelled to ensure that that website complies with the requirements in the test claim statute that their websites use a domain name with either a “.gov” top-level domain or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain.

Additionally, Government Code section 50034(a)(2) requires cities and counties to ensure that any websites they continue to maintain after the January 1, 2029 deadline with domain names that do not comply with the above requirement to use either the “.gov” top-level domain or “.ca.gov” second-level domain redirect users to a compliant website. It would be irrational to claim cities and counties are legally compelled to maintain a website that does not comply with the law. However, the state mandate compelling compliance with Government Code section 50034(a)(1) itself creates a legal obligation to comply with Government Code section 50034(a)(2) for all noncompliant websites. Cities and counties are mandated by the state to maintain public websites, and thus they have a legal obligation to ensure their websites are compliant with all laws applicable to their websites, including this requirement that non-compliant websites redirect users to a website with a compliant domain. Cities and counties are therefore legally compelled to also ensure that any website with a non-compliant domain name they continue to maintain after January 1, 2029 redirects users to a website with a compliant domain name.

- ii. *For websites and webpages cities and counties are not legally compelled to maintain, there is substantial evidence that cities and counties are practically compelled to comply with the test claim statute by migrating their websites to compliant domain names.*

Though cities and counties may be legally compelled to have a public internet website, that finding does not account for all of the websites and webpages a city or county may have elected to create voluntarily before the test claim statute went into effect. For example, the claimant certifies it has 79 websites with over 10,000 individual webpages, many of which presumably serve functions other than being the place where it publishes legally required information. However, there is substantial evidence that local agencies are practically compelled to comply with the test claim statute by migrating their websites to a domain name using either “.gov” or “.ca.gov” by January 1, 2029, even for websites they are not legally compelled to maintain.

As indicated earlier, practical compulsion occurs when the consequences for not complying with a technically optional requirement are so onerous they result in “certain and severe penalties such as double taxation and other draconian consequences,” such that a local government has no reasonable alternative but to comply.²⁰⁷ For there to be

²⁰⁷ *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2009) 170 Cal.App.4th 1355, 1360, 1364.

no reasonable alternative, any alternative options that may exist must be “so far beyond the realm of practical reality” that it leaves the local government “without discretion” not to comply with the state’s conditions, such that the alternative amounts to “no alternative at all.”²⁰⁸ In such cases, the state “does not command a local entity to engage in conduct, but rather induces compliance through the imposition of severe consequences that leave the local entity no reasonable alternative but to comply.”²⁰⁹

Prior law did not dictate what types of domain names cities and counties may use for their public websites, and many cities and counties chose to create websites with top-level domains such as “.com,” “.net,” or “.org.”²¹⁰ Now, the only options available to cities and counties whose public website domain names use one of these top-level domains that do not comply with the test claim statute is to either migrate their websites to a new compliant domain name in accordance with the test claim statute or stop having the website altogether. As the claimant points out, this would have severe consequences for the people who utilize the services provided through these websites. Cities and counties use their public websites to easily disseminate information and provide other government services, and members of the public have become reliant on using these websites. Examples of such services include accessing public information, corresponding with local officials, paying fines, registering to vote, filing taxes, obtaining up-to-date health and safety resources, requesting copies of vital records, accessing mass transit schedules, and many other tasks.²¹¹ These are some of the most common and important ways in which members of the public interact with their local government. Having easy access to these services via the internet is especially important for people with disabilities.²¹² Removing a city or county’s public website, and with it, denying access to these services to anyone that detrimentally relied on these websites as a reliable means of accessing these services, would disenfranchise members of the

²⁰⁸ *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 558 (finding that urbanized cities and counties were practically compelled to obtain a permit for their stormwater drainage systems).

²⁰⁹ *Coast Community College Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 13 Cal.5th 800, 816.

²¹⁰ In the claimant’s case, it created its “sccgov.org” domain name in 2002, before local governments were allowed to use the “.gov” top-level domain. See Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 30 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²¹¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 325 (Federal Register, Volume 89, Number 80, page 31320, April 24, 2024) (Citing these examples of government services provided via the internet while explaining the need for regulations requiring public entities’ websites and mobile applications to be accessible).

²¹² See generally, 28 CFR section 35.200 (requiring public entities ensure their web content and mobile applications are readily accessible and usable to people with disabilities, complying with WCAG 2.1 levels A and AA beginning April 24, 2026 for entities with populations greater than 50,000, and by April 26, 2026, for entities with populations less than 50,000).

public from their local government, a severe consequence cities and counties would feel practically compelled to avoid. The Legislature also understood the public benefit of allowing people to access this important information through a city or county's websites, as noted in its discussion of several laws which require local agencies to post certain information on their websites:

As technology advances, the Legislature often amends statutes to capture these advancements and take advantage of any potential public benefits. For example, the Brown Act requires all local agencies to post the agenda for any regular meeting 72 hours in advance in a location that is freely accessible to the public. The agenda must clearly specify the meeting's time, location, and the topics that will be deliberated. Despite this requirement, a local agency's constituents still have to know when the agency plans to meet, where the agenda is posted, and physically travel to the location where the agenda is posted or contact the agency directly to discover what topics the agency is planning to discuss. With the proliferation of Internet access and local agencies utilizing this tool to communicate with their constituents, AB 1344 (Feuer), Chapter 692, Statutes of 2011, required all local agencies that have a website to post their meeting agendas on the website 72 hours in advance, effectively making the agenda more accessible to the public by taking advantage of advancements in technology. Additionally, SB 272 (Hertzberg), Chapter 795, Statutes of 2015, and AB 2040 (Garcia), Chapter 894, Statutes of 2014, required local agencies to post on their websites a list of the agency's enterprise systems and the agency's employee compensation report, respectively.²¹³

This discussion demonstrates how important it is to the Legislature that local agencies are able to use the Internet to provide information to their constituents. At this point, expecting a city or county to stop providing a public website through which the public can access government services to avoid the costs of complying with the test claim statute is an unreasonable alternative, and is similar to an expectation that an urban city or county stop providing its citizens with a stormwater drainage system to avoid complying with a stormwater discharge permit.²¹⁴

It is worth noting the Legislature certainly seemed to intend compliance with the test claim statute to be the only option available to cities and counties and did not consider the possibility of a city or county removing its public website to be a reasonable alternative. The Legislature lamented this was something that all public agencies should have been legally required to do decades ago, implying it believed the test claim

²¹³ Exhibit K (13) Assembly Floor Analysis of AB 1637, as amended June 29, 2023, page 2.

²¹⁴ See *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 558

statute created a legally required mandate.²¹⁵ A city or county choosing the alternative of not having a public website may also result in the exact harm the Legislature was trying to prevent with the test claim statute; to prevent the public from falling for fake government websites, and ensure confidence in legitimate government sources.²¹⁶ The widespread usage of top-level domains other than “.gov” among local government agencies made it easy for malicious actors to create domain names for fake government websites that could be used to spread misinformation or trick members of the public into making payments or revealing personal information.²¹⁷ By requiring all cities and counties to use either the “.gov” top-level domain or “.ca.gov” second-level domain, which are only available to verified government agencies, it makes it easier on the public to discern a real domain name from a fake one and ensures confidence in a real government website’s legitimacy. The idea of a city or county having no online presence whatsoever is so unthinkable to modern society that members of the public may conclude a fake website to be real, despite not using a “.gov” top-level domain. This is the exact harm the Legislature was trying to prevent, further demonstrating that choosing to stop having a public website to avoid complying with the test claim statute is an unreasonable alternative.

Cities and counties are thus practically compelled to comply with the test claim statute’s requirement that their public websites use either the “.gov” top-level domain, or “.ca.gov” second level domain, as the only alternative would be to simply not have a website at all, which would result in denying citizens access to important government services and may cause people to be more likely to fall for fake websites pretending to belong to that city or county. The harm to citizens caused by these consequences is so severe that cities and counties have no reasonable alternative but to comply.

- iii. *Cities and counties are both legally and practically compelled to ensure their employees public email addresses utilize a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name.*

Although the claimant alleges that both section (a) of Government Code section 50034 (regarding public websites) and section (b) (regarding employee email addresses) impose state mandates through both legal and practical compulsion theories, the claimant’s arguments only address Government Code section 50034(a). The claimant does not explain how they are legally or practically compelled to comply with the requirement to ensure the public email addresses provided to a city’s or county’s employees utilize a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name by January 1, 2029. Nevertheless, the Commission finds that there is both legal and practical compulsion to comply with this requirement.

²¹⁵ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 1.

²¹⁶ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 1.

²¹⁷ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

The reasoning for why cities and counties are compelled to have email addresses for their employees is fairly similar to the reasoning for public websites. Many laws require local agencies to communicate with the public via email, whether when sending out notices or other information to members of the public that request to be contacted that way or by allowing members of the public to file documents via email.²¹⁸ Under these circumstances, the requirement to ensure public email addresses utilize a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name is legally compelled by state law.

Moreover, counties and cities are practically compelled to maintain email addresses. Email, text messaging, and other electronic platforms, permit writings to be prepared, exchanged, and stored more quickly and easily.²¹⁹ Email is an essential means of communication in our modern society, and most, if not all, employees would need a public facing email address in order to do business on behalf of the city or county. Under the California Public Records Act, the public has a right to access written public records regarding government business, including employee emails.²²⁰ As discussed, the purpose of the test claim statute requiring cities and counties to transition to using a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name for their employee email addresses is to instill confidence in the public that when they email government employees, they are conversing with a real government employee and not falling victim to a scam or hacker.²²¹ This supports that public employee email addresses serve as an official means for accessing public records. And like the issue with fake websites, a malicious actor could easily create a fake email address to pose as a city’s or county’s employees if there isn’t a real public address by which to contact them. The alternative of cities and

²¹⁸ See Government Code sections 6103.3(a)(1) (abuse victims can request to be notified via email when an order or injunction has been served on their abuser), 26666.5(a) (marshals and sheriffs shall accept a standardized form used in civil actions or proceedings than can be served via email, fax, or in-person delivery), 65585(b)(1)(A) (a city or county shall email a link to any draft revisions of the housing element to all individuals and organizations that previously requested notifications regarding the housing element); 84616(a) (documents that must be filed for the creation of an organization can be submitted in paper format or by fax or email and shall be posted on the local government’s website); Public Resources Code section 21091(d)(3)(A) (lead agencies shall accept comments on a draft environmental impact report, proposed negative declaration, proposed mitigated negative declaration, or notice under Section 21080.4 via email and treat email comments as equivalent to written comments).

²¹⁹ *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 618.

²²⁰ Government Code section 7920 et seq. See also *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 608, 625 (finding that the CPRA’s definition of “public record” as “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics,” includes emails and text messages, regardless of whether it was sent or received on an employee’s personal account).

²²¹ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 4.

counties not providing public email addresses for their employees is so far beyond the realm of practical reality that it amounts to no alternative at all, and they are left without discretion not to comply with the test claim statute. The claimant and other cities and counties are therefore both legally compelled to have public email addresses for their employees in order to make legally required communications, and practically compelled because employees need public email addresses in order to do business on behalf of the city or county.

As Finance pointed out, the act of migrating an existing website or email address to a new domain name is a one-time requirement and should not include ongoing costs once migration is complete.²²² The claimant agrees with this, asserting that all claimed costs were for one-time activities and it does not anticipate any ongoing costs after compliance is completed.²²³

Accordingly, the test claim statute imposes a state-mandated program requiring a city, county, or city and county that maintains an Internet website for use by the public, or public email addresses for its employees, to do the following one-time activities:

- Ensure that the Internet website used by the public (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) utilizes either a “.gov” top-level domain name or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain name by January 1, 2029.²²⁴
- Ensure any websites (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) with a non-compliant domain name the city or county continues to maintain after January 1, 2029 redirects users to a website with a compliant domain name.²²⁵
- Ensure that each public email address provided for the city’s or county’s employees utilizes a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name by January 1, 2029.²²⁶
 - c. The claimant requests reimbursement for several activities that are not required or mandated by the plain language of the test claim statute. These activities and costs may be proposed for inclusion in the Parameters and Guidelines if they are supported by evidence in the record showing they are “reasonably necessary for the performance of the state-mandated program” in accordance with the Government Code and Commission regulations.

The claimant identifies a long list of tasks it alleges are required for its process to migrate its websites, web applications, and email addresses to the new domain name, such as search engine optimization or organizing the teams that will be assigned to the

²²² Exhibit F, Finance’s Comments on the Test Claim, page 2.

²²³ Exhibit G, Claimant’s Rebuttal Comments, page 3.

²²⁴ Government Code section 50034(a)(1)

²²⁵ Government Code section 50034(a)(2)

²²⁶ Government Code section 50034(b).

different tasks allegedly needed in the transition, which were not specifically identified in the plain language of the test claim statute.²²⁷ The claimant also asserts it is required to communicate the changes it made to its websites, web applications, and email systems internally to county employees and vendors and to the public, which requires internal communications and training for employees, a public relations campaign, replacing all references and links to legacy websites, web applications, and email addresses on online resources, and reprinting all paper documents that include the legacy websites and email addresses.²²⁸ The Assembly Committee on Appropriations noted that the costs to migrate a local agency's systems included "indirect costs, such as changes to outreach and promotional materials, business cards, letter heads, and election materials. Some agencies may also have costs for media campaigns to alert the public to the change."²²⁹ Although the legislative history of the test claim statute acknowledged that the mandate would result in some local agencies incurring costs for printing new materials and for a public relations campaign, these activities are not required or mandated by the plain language of the test claim statute. Nevertheless, all of these activities and costs may be proposed for inclusion in the Parameters and Guidelines if they are supported by evidence in the record showing they are "reasonably necessary for the performance of the state-mandated program" in accordance with Government Code section 17557(a), and California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 1183.7(d) and 1187.5.

2. The State-Mandated Requirements Are New and Impose a New Program or Higher Level of Service, Which Is Both Uniquely Imposed on Local Governments and Provides a Governmental Service to the Public.

Article XIII B, section 6 requires reimbursement when "the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government." A new program or higher level of service has been defined as those "that carry out the governmental function of providing services to the public, or laws which, to implement a state policy, impose unique requirements on local governments and do not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state."²³⁰ Just one of these conditions need be met.²³¹ The purpose of article XIII B, section 6 is to prevent the state from forcing extra programs on local government each year in a manner that negates their careful budgeting of increased expenditures counted against the local government's annual

²²⁷ Exhibit A, Test Claim, pages 31-33 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²²⁸ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²²⁹ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 3.

²³⁰ *Carmel Valley Fire Protection District v. State of California* (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 521, 537, citing *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 46, 56, emphasis in original.

²³¹ *Carmel Valley Fire Protection District v. State of California* (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 521, 537; *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2021) 59 Cal. App. 5th 546, 557.

spending limit and thus, article XIII B, section 6 requires a showing that the test claim statute mandates new activities compared to prior law.²³²

The Commission finds that the activities mandated by the test claim statute are new compared to prior law. Prior law did not impose any requirements that cities and counties use the “.gov” top-level domain or “.ca.gov” second-level domain, or any other restrictions on the domain names available to them. The Legislature lamented this fact in its analysis of the test claim statute, noting that “[i]t would have been helpful for internet cybersecurity if government entities had been legally required to take this step decades ago.”²³³ Government Code section 50034 is a new law added by the test claim statute, imposing what the Legislature acknowledged to be completely new requirements. Thus the requirements that cities and counties use either the “.gov” top-level domain or “.ca.gov” second-level domain in the domain name for their public facing internet websites and employee email addresses, and that any non-compliant website they continue to maintain after the January 1, 2029 deadline redirect users to a compliant website, are new compared to prior law.

The Commission also finds that the requirements are uniquely imposed on cities and counties and provide a service to the public.²³⁴ The test claim statute provides a beneficial public service by providing assurance to the public that when they access a website or other internet resource that uses a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name, it belongs to a legitimate government agency. The test claim statute was created to ensure that “when Californians look for government information or services, they can know with confidence they are receiving official information.”²³⁵ “The main benefit of this measure will be to ensure that members of the public know that when they access a California local governmental website with an internet address ending with “.gov” or

²³² California Constitution, articles XIII B, sections 1, 8(a) and (b); *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56; *Lucia Mar Unified School Dist. v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835; *Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates* (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 1564, 1595; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1283; *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 749, 763.

²³³ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 1.

²³⁴ See *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2022) 85 Cal.App.5th 535, 555 (a stormwater permit requiring local governments to perform pollution abatement services in addition to stormwater drainage services); *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835 (“the education of handicapped children is clearly a governmental function providing a service to the public”); *San Diego Unified School District v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 879 (Providing public school constitutes a governmental function and enhancing the safety of public schools constitutes a service to the public).

²³⁵ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 3.

“.ca.gov,” or email a government employee at such an address, that they are not going to be the victim of a hacker’s fake website.”²³⁶ Providing information and access to governmental services are key governmental functions, and ensuring members of the public can feel confident in the safety and reliability of the method in which they access these services and information provides a service to the public. The test claim statute therefore meets the first definition for a new program or higher level of service.

The test claim statute also implements state policy by imposing unique requirements on local governments that do not apply generally to all residents in the state. The test claim statute imposes its requirements on “a city, county, or city and county.”²³⁷ This is a specific subset of local government, and it does not apply to all residents of the state. The “.gov” top-level domain is only available for government agencies within the United States at either the federal, state, county, city, tribal, territorial, special district, or school district levels.²³⁸ Likewise, the “.ca.gov” second-level domain is only available to state entities, counties, cities, State recognized tribal governments, Joint Power Authorities, and independent special districts within the state of California.²³⁹ An individual who is not authorized to request a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain on behalf of one of these government agencies would be denied if they tried to obtain a domain name that complies with the test claim statute, and would thus be unable to ensure their public websites or email addresses comply with the test claim statute. The test claim statute therefore imposes unique requirements on local governments that do not apply to all residents of the state, further demonstrating the test claim statute’s requirements to be a new program or higher level of service.

3. The Test Claim Statute Results in Costs Mandated by the State Within the Meaning of Government Code Section 17514 and Exceptions in Government Code 17556 Do Not Apply.

Finally, Government Code section 17514 defines “costs mandated by the state” as any increased costs which a local agency or school district is required to incur as a result of any statute or executive order that mandates a new program or higher level of service. Government Code section 17564(a) specifically requires that no claim or payment shall be made unless the claim exceeds \$1,000. A finding of such costs mandated by the state also means that no exception in Government Code section 17556 applies.

The claimant has filed declarations signed under penalty of perjury identifying the following increased costs exceeding \$1,000 to comply with the test claim statute:

²³⁶ Exhibit K (1), Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended March 16, 2023, page 4.

²³⁷ Government Code section 50034(c).

²³⁸ Exhibit K (2), CISA, *Eligibility for .gov Domains*, <https://get.gov/domains/eligibility/> (accessed on July 23, 2025) page 2.

²³⁹ Exhibit K (3), CDT, *Domain Name Requirements*, <https://domainnamerequest.cdt.ca.gov/Home/Requirements> (accessed on July 23, 2025), page 2.

- \$20,017 in FY 2023-2024 to begin migrating its existing websites to a new “.gov” domain name in accordance with Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2), consisting of 199 hours of staff and third-party professional labor.²⁴⁰
- The claimant estimates it will require an additional \$24,641 to finish the activities required to migrate its websites in accordance with Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2), consisting of an additional 245 hours of staff and third-party professional labor.²⁴¹
- Estimated anticipated costs of \$217,890 in some future fiscal year to migrate its web applications in accordance with Government Code section 50034(a)(1)-(2), consisting of 2040 hours of staff and third-party professional labor.²⁴²
- Estimated anticipated costs of \$656,320 in some future fiscal year to migrate employee email addresses in accordance with Government Code section 50034(b) consisting of approximately 2,772 hours of staff and third-party professional labor.²⁴³
- Estimated statewide costs consisting of \$90,900,000 in FY 2024-2025 and for each year until the compliance deadline of January 1, 2029.²⁴⁴

No evidence rebuts these declarations.

Furthermore, none of the exceptions to costs mandated by the state in Government Code section 17556 apply to this test claim statute. As noted, the original draft of the test claim statute included a declaration that claimants had fee authority sufficient as a matter of law, however the Assembly Committee on Appropriations dismissed this as incorrect, stating that “it is unclear on what basis a local agency may charge a fee or other assessment to recover the costs of migrating to a .gov or .ca.gov domain,” and that charging a fee for access to a local agency’s website would likely conflict with Proposition 26.²⁴⁵ There are no statutes that grant cities and counties authority to charge a fee that could be used to cover the costs of the mandated activities. Government Code section 17556(d) therefore does not apply.

Although the legislative analysis identifies a federal grant that could potentially be used to fund the test claim statute’s required activities, there is no law declaring that this grant shall first be used to offset the costs this test claim statute, or evidence that the grant is sufficient to completely offset the costs. Government Code section 17556(e) thus also does not apply. No other exceptions under Government Code section 17556 are

²⁴⁰ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²⁴¹ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 35 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²⁴² Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²⁴³ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 34 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²⁴⁴ Exhibit A, Test Claim, page 35 (Declaration of Matt Woo).

²⁴⁵ Exhibit K (12), Assembly Committee on Appropriations, Analysis of AB 1637, as amended April 27, 2023, page 1.

applicable, as the test claim statute is not the result of the claimant requesting authority to implement this program; was not declared existing law by the courts; was not imposed by federal law; is not the result of a ballot measure approved by voters; and does not create, eliminate, or change the definition of a crime.

Therefore, the Commission finds that the test claim statute imposes increased costs mandated by the state under article XIII B, section 6 and Government Code section 17514.

V. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing analysis, the Commission approves this Test Claim and finds that Government Code section 50034, as added by Statutes 2023, chapter 586 imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution on a city, county, or city and county to comply with following one-time activities beginning January 1, 2024:

1. Ensure that the Internet website used by the public (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) utilizes either a “.gov” top-level domain name or a “.ca.gov” second-level domain name by January 1, 2029.²⁴⁶
2. Ensure that any public internet websites (including any webpages, web applications, or other related resources within the website) with a non-compliant domain name that the city or county continues to maintain after January 1, 2029 redirects users to a compliant website.²⁴⁷
3. Ensure that each public email address provided for the city’s or county’s employees utilizes a “.gov” or “.ca.gov” domain name by January 1, 2029.²⁴⁸

All other activities or costs requested in the Test Claim are not mandated by the state, but may be proposed for inclusion in the Parameters and Guidelines if they are supported by evidence in the record showing they are “reasonably necessary for the performance of the state-mandated program” in accordance with Government Code section 17557(a), and California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 1183.7(d) and 1187.5.

²⁴⁶ Government Code section 50034(a)(1).

²⁴⁷ Government Code section 50034(a)(2).

²⁴⁸ Government Code section 50034(b).

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Sacramento and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On November 18, 2025, I served the:

- **Current Mailing List dated November 7, 2025**
- **Proposed Decision issued November 18, 2025**

Internet Websites and Email Addresses, 24-TC-04

Statutes 2023, Chapter 586 (AB 1637); Government Code Section 50034(a)(1)-(2) and (b)

County of Santa Clara, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on November 18, 2025 at Sacramento, California.



Jill Magee
Commission on State Mandates
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 11/7/25

Claim Number: 24-TC-04

Matter: Internet Websites and Email Addresses

Claimant: County of Santa Clara

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.3.)

, Finance Director, *City of Citrus Heights*
Finance Department, 6237 Fountain Square Dr, Citrus Heights , CA 95621
Phone: (916) 725-2448
Finance@citrusheights.net

Heather Abrams, Town Manager, *Town of Fairfax*
142 Bolinas Road, Fairfax, CA 94930
Phone: (415) 453-1584
habrams@townoffairfax.org

Jose Acosta, Utility Director, *City of Solvang*
1644 Oak Street, Solvang, CA 93463
Phone: (805) 688-5575
jacosta@cityofsolvang.com

Jackie Acosta, Finance Director, *City of Union City*
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road, Union City, CA 94587
Phone: (510) 675-5338
JackieA@unioncity.org

Aaron Adams, City Manager, *City of Temecula*
41000 Main Street, Temecula, CA 92590
Phone: (951) 506-5100
aaron.adams@temeculaca.gov

Steven Adams, City Manager, *City of King City*
212 South Vanderhurst Avenue, King City, CA 93930
Phone: (831) 386-5925
sadams@kingcity.com

Gabe Adams, Acting City Manager, *City of Trinidad*
409 Trinity Street, PO Box 390, Trinidad, CA 95570
Phone: (707) 677-3876
cityclerk@trinidad.ca.gov

Trevor Agrelius, Finance Director, *City of Laguna Niguel*
30111 Crown Valley Parkway, Laguna Niguel, CA 92677
Phone: (949) 362-4358
TAgrelius@cityoflagunaniguel.org

Adaoha Agu, *County of San Diego Auditor & Controller Department*
Projects, Revenue and Grants Accounting, 5530 Overland Avenue, Ste. 410 , MS:O-53, San Diego, CA 92123
Phone: (858) 694-2129
Adaoha.Agu@sdcounty.ca.gov

Ron Ahlers, Chief Financial Officer, *City of Calabasas*
Finance Department, 100 Civic Center Way, Calabasas, CA 91302
Phone: (805) 517-6249
RAhlers@cityofcalabasas.com

Jason Al-Imam, Director of Finance, *City of Newport Beach*
3300 Newport Blvd, Newport Beach, CA 92663
Phone: (949) 644-3123
jalimam@newportbeachca.gov

Emily Aldrich, Finance Director, *City of Yreka*
701 Fourth Street, Yreka, CA 96097
Phone: (530) 842-4836
ealdrich@yrekaca.gov

Douglas Alessio, Administrative Services Director, *City of Livermore*
Finance Department, 1052 South Livermore Avenue, Livermore, CA 94550
Phone: (925) 960-4300
finance@cityoflivermore.net

Mark Alvarado, *City of Monrovia*
415 S. Ivy Avenue, Monrovia, CA 91016
Phone: N/A
malvarado@ci.monrovia.ca.us

Karina Alvarez, Auditor-Controller, *County of Imperial*
940 W. Main Street, Suite 108, El Centro, CA 92243
Phone: (442) 265-1299
karinabalvarez@co.imperial.ca.us

Josefina Alvarez, Interim Finance Director, *City of Kerman*
850 South Madera Avenue, Kerman, CA 93630
Phone: (559) 846-4682
jalvarez@cityofkerman.org

Rachelle Anema, Assistant Auditor-Controller, *County of Los Angeles*
Accounting Division, 500 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 974-8321
RANEMA@auditor.lacounty.gov

Michael Antwine II, City Manager, *City of Bell*
6330 Pine Avenue, Bell, CA 90201

Phone: (323) 588-6211
mantwine@cityofbell.org

Donna Apar, Finance Director, *City of San Marcos*
1 Civic Center Drive, San Marcos, CA 92069
Phone: (760) 744-1050
dapar@san-marcos.net

Lili Apgar, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*
Local Reimbursements Section, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0254
lapgar@sco.ca.gov

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*
Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-7522
SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Samantha Argabrite, City Manager, *City of Simi Valley*
2929 Tapo Canyon Road, Simi Valley, CA 93063
Phone: (805) 583-6701
citymgr@simivalley.org

Damien Arrula, City Administrator, *City of Placentia*
401 E. Chapman Avenue, Placentia, CA 92870
Phone: (714) 993-8171
darrula@placentia.org

Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator, *City of Gridley*
685 Kentucky Street, Gridley, CA 95948
Phone: (530) 846-3631
earteaga@gridley.ca.us

Louis Atwell, City Manager, *City of Inglewood*
1 Manchester Boulevard, Inglewood, CA 90301
Phone: (310) 412-5301
latwell@cityofinglewood.org

Carol Augustine, *City of Burlingame*
501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA 94010
Phone: (650) 558-7210
caugustine@burlingame.org

Abel Avalos, City Manager, *City of Artesia*
18747 Clarkdale Avenue, Artesia, CA 90701
Phone: (562) 865-6262
aavalos@cityofartesia.us

Aaron Avery, Legislative Representative, *California Special Districts Association*
1112 I Street Bridge, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 442-7887
Aarona@csda.net

Ana Aviles Avila, City Manager, *City of Pinole*
2131 Pear Street, Pinole, CA 94564
Phone: (510) 724-9837
aavilesavila@pinole.gov

Sahana Ayer, Chief Counsel, *California Department of Technology*
1325 J Street, #1600, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 767-2096
sahana.ayer@state.ca.gov

Bill Ayub, City Manager, *City of Ventura*
501 Poli Street, Ventura, CA 93001
Phone: (805) 654-7740
bayub@cityofventura.ca.gov

Karina Bañales, City Manager, *City of Rolling Hills*
2 Portuguese Bend Road, Rolling Hills, CA 90274
Phone: (310) 377-1521
KBanales@CityofRH.net

Van Bach, Accounting Manager, *City of San Rafael*
1400 Fifth Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94901
Phone: (415) 458-5001
van.bach@cityofsanrafael.org

Steve Bade, Interim City Manager, *City of Redding*
777 Cypress Avenue 3rd Floor, Redding, CA 96001
Phone: (530) 225-4060
sbade@cityofredding.org

Happy Bains, Interim Finance Director, *City of Livingston*
Administrative Services, 1416 C Street, City of Livingston , CA 95334
Phone: (209) 394-8041
hbains@livingstonca.gov

Anna Barich, Attorney, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
Anna.Barich@csm.ca.gov

Valerie Barone, City Manager, *City of Concord*
1950 Parkside Drive, Concord, CA 94519
Phone: (925) 671-3150
valerie.barone@cityofconcord.org

Robert Barron III, Finance Director, *City of Atherton*
Finance Department, 91 Ashfield Rd, Atherton, CA 94027
Phone: (650) 752-0552
rbarron@ci.atherton.ca.us

Dan Barros, City Manager, *City of Colma*
1198 El Camino Real, Colma, CA 94014
Phone: (650) 997-8300
dbarros@colma.ca.gov

David Bass, Vice Mayor, *City of Rocklin*
3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677
Phone: (916) 663-8504
David.Bass@rocklin.ca.us

Deborah Bautista, *County of Tuolumne*
El Dorado Hills Community Services District, 2 South Green St. , Sonora, CA 95370

Phone: (209) 533-5551
dbautista@co.tuolumne.ca.us

Gerry Beaudin, City Manager, *City of Pleasanton*
123 Main Street, PO Box 520, Pleasanton, CA 94566
Phone: (925) 931-5002
gbeaudin@cityofpleasantonca.gov

Jennifer Becker, Financial Services Director, *City of Burbank*
275 East Olive Avenue, Burbank, CA 91502
Phone: (818) 238-5500
jbecker@burbankca.gov

Mary Bedard, Auditor-Controller, *County of Kern*
1115 Truxtun Avenue, 2nd Floor, Bakersfield, CA 93301
Phone: (805) 868-3599
bedardm@co.kern.ca.us

Ray Beeman, Chief Fiscal Officer, *City of Gardena*
1700 West 162nd Street, Gardena, CA 90247
Phone: (310) 217-9516
rbeeman@cityofgardena.org

Cameron Begbie, Interim City Manager, *City of Plymouth*
P.O. Box 429, Plymouth, CA 95669
Phone: (209) 245-6941
CBegbie@cityofplymouth.org

Jason Behrmann, Interim City Manager, *City of Elk Grove*
8401 Laguna Palms Way, Elk Grove, CA 95758
Phone: (916) 478-2201
jbehrmann@elkgrovecity.org

Aimee Beleu, Finance Director/Town Treasurer, *Town of Paradise*
5555 Skyway, Paradise, CA 95969
Phone: (530) 872-6291
abeleu@townofparadise.com

Ginni Bella Navarre, Deputy Legislative Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8342
Ginni.Bella@lao.ca.gov

Ben Benoit, Auditor-Controller, *County of Riverside*
4080 Lemon Street, 11th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502
Phone: (951) 955-3800
bbenoit@rivco.org

Paul Benoit, City Administrator, *City of Piedmont*
120 Vista Avenue, Piedmont, CA 94611
Phone: (510) 420-3042
pbenoit@ci.piedmont.ca.us

Wendy Berry, Administrative Services Director, *City of Solvang*
Finance, 1644 Oak Street, Solvang, CA 93463
Phone: (805) 688-5575
wendyb@cityofsolvang.com

Angela Bickle, Interim Auditor-Controller, *County of Trinity*
11 Court Street, P.O. Box 1230, Weaverville, CA 96093
Phone: (530) 623-1317
abickle@trinitycounty.org

Kevin Biersack, Financial Services Director, *City of Cathedral City*
Administrative Services, 68700 Avenida Lalo Guerrero, Cathedral City , CA 92234
Phone: (760) 770-0378
kbiersack@cathedralcity.gov

Christy Billings, Interim Finance Director, *City of Ojai*
401 S. Ventura Street, Ojai, CA 93023
Phone: (805) 646-5581
christy.billings@ojai.ca.gov

Teresa Binkley, Director of Finance, *City of Taft*
Finance Department, 209 E. Kern St. , Taft, CA 93268
Phone: (661) 763-1350
tbinkley@cityoftaft.org

Benjamin Bitter, City Manager, *City of Maricopa*
400 California Street, Maricopa, CA 93252
Phone: (520) 316-6811
eziegler@bak.rr.com

Nathan Black, Auditor-Controller, *County of Sutter*
1160 Civic Center Blvd., Suite D, Yuba City, CA 95993
Phone: (530) 822-7127
nblack@co.sutter.ca.us

Lowell Black, Director of Finance, *County of Alpine*
P.O. Box 266, Markleeville, CA 96120
Phone: (530) 694-2284
nwilliamson@alpinecountyca.gov

Dalacie Blankenship, Finance Manager, *City of Jackson*
Administration / Finance, 33 Broadway, Jackson, CA 95642
Phone: (209) 223-1646
dblankenship@ci.jackson.ca.us

Michael Blay, City Manager, *City of Upland*
460 N. Euclid Avenue, Upland, CA 91786-4732
Phone: (909) 931-4106
CityManager@UplandCA.gov

Todd Bodem, City Administrator, *City of Guadalupe*
918 Obispo Street, P.O. Box 908, Guadalupe, CA 93434
Phone: (805) 356-3891
todd.bodem@cityofguadalupe.org

Lincoln Bogard, Administrative Services Director, *City of Banning*
99 East Ramsey Street, Banning, CA 92220
Phone: (951) 922-3118
lbogard@banningca.gov

Konrad Bolowich, City Manager, *City of Grand Terrace*
22795 Barton Road, Grand Terrace, CA 92313-5295

Phone: (909) 954-5175
kbolowich@grandterrace-ca.gov

Ryan Bonk, City Manager, *City Of Portola*
P.O. Box 1225, Portola, CA 96122
Phone: (530) 832-6800
citymanager@cityofportola.com

Jonathan Borrego, City Manager, *City of Oceanside*
300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054
Phone: (760) 435-3065
citymanager@oceansideca.org

Jaime Boscarino, Finance Director, *City of Thousand Oaks*
2100 Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Thousand Oaks, CA 91362
Phone: (805) 449-2220
jboscarino@toaks.gov

Laura Bowers, Interim Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Santa Cruz*
Auditor-Controller's Office, 701 Ocean Street, Room 100, Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4073
Phone: (831) 454-2500
laura.bowers@santacruzcounty.us

Jason Bradford, Finance Director, *City of Glendale*
141 N. Glendale Ave, Room 346, Glendale, CA 91206
Phone: (818) 548-2085
jbradford@glendaleca.gov

Roger Bradley, City Manager, *City of Downey*
11111 Brookshire, Downey, CA 90241-7016
Phone: (562) 904-7284
citymanager@downeyca.org

David Brandt, City Manager, *City of Cupertino*
10300 Torre Avenue, Cupertino, CA 95014-3202
Phone: 408.777.3212
manager@cupertino.org

Molly Brennan, Director of Finance, *City of National City*
1243 National City Blvd., National City, CA 91950
Phone: (619) 336-4330
finance@nationalcityca.gov

Sean Brewer, Interim City Manager, *City of Coalinga*
155 West Durian, Coalinga, CA 93210
Phone: (559) 935-1533
sbrewer@coalinga.com

Roel Briones, Interim Finance Director, *City of Farmersville*
909 W Visalia Road, Farmersville, CA 93223
Phone: (559) 747-0458
fdtemp@cityoffarmersville-ca.gov

Gary Brizzee, Interim City Manager, *City of Los Banos*
520 J Street, Los Banos, CA 93635
Phone: (209) 827-2440
gary.brizzee@losbanos.org

Matthew Bronson, City Manager, *City of Grover Beach*
154 South 8th Street, Grover Beach, CA 93433
Phone: (805) 473-4567
mbronson@groverbeach.org

Joshua Brooks, Deputy Director of Administrative Services, *City of Irvine*
1 Civic Center Plaza, Irvine, CA 92606
Phone: (949) 724-6263
JoBrooks@cityofirvine.org

Troy Brown, City Manager, *City of Moorpark*
323 Science Drive, Moorpark, CA 93021
Phone: (805) 517-6212
citymanager@moorparkca.gov

Jessica Brown, Chief Financial Officer, *City of Fontana*
8353 Sierra Avenue, Fontana, CA 92335
Phone: (909) 350-7679
jbrown@fontana.org

Dan Buckshi, City Manager, *City of Walnut Creek*
1666 North Main Street, Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Phone: (925) 943-5812
Buckshi@walnut-creek.org

Christa Buhagiar, Director of Finance/Treasurer, *City of Chino Hills*
14000 City Center Drive, Chino Hills, CA 91709
Phone: (909) 364-2460
cbuhagiar@chinohills.org

Dahle Bulosan, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Irvine*
One Civic Center Plaza, Irvine, CA 92606
Phone: (949) 724-6263
DBulosan@cityofirvine.org

Allan Burdick,
7525 Myrtle Vista Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95831
Phone: (916) 203-3608
allanburdick@gmail.com

Guy Burdick, Consultant, *MGT Consulting*
2251 Harvard Street, Suite 134, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 833-7775
gburdick@mgtconsulting.com

Jeffrey Burgh, Auditor Controller, *County of Ventura*
Ventura County Watershed Protection District, 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009-1540
Phone: (805) 654-3151
jeff.burgh@ventura.org

Rob Burns, *City of Chino*
13220 Central Avenue, Chino, CA 91710
Phone: N/A
rburns@cityofchino.org

Matt Burton, Interim City Manager, *City Of Cypress*
5275 Cypress Ave, Cypress, CA 90630

Phone: (714) 229-6700
mburton@yorbalindaca.gov

Rod Butler, City Manager, *City of Jurupa Valley*
8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509
Phone: (951) 332-6464
rbutler@jurupavalley.org

Stephanie Butters, Assistant Director of Finance, Auditor-Controller, *County of Mono*
25 Bryant Street, PO Box 556, Bridgeport, CA 93517
Phone: (760) 932-5496
sbutters@mono.ca.gov

Rica Mae Cabigas, Chief Accountant, *Auditor-Controller*
Accounting Division, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 974-8309
rcabigas@auditor.lacounty.gov

Elizabeth Cabrera, City Manager, *City of San Joaquin*
21900 Colorado Avenue, San Joaquin, CA 93660
Phone: (559) 693-4311
elizabethc@cityofsanjoaquin.org

Evelyn Calderon-Yee, Bureau Chief, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,
Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
ECalderonYee@sco.ca.gov

Daniel Calleros, Interim City Administrator, *City of Vernon*
4305 Santa Fe Avenue, Vernon, CA 90058
Phone: (323) 583-8811
Dcalleros@cityofvernonCA.gov

Rebecca Campbell, Finance Director, *City of Santa Maria*
110 E. Cook Street, Santa Maria, CA 93454
Phone: (805) 925-0951
rcampbell@cityofsantamaria.org

Lisa Cardella-Presto, *County of Merced*
2222 M Street, Merced, CA 95340
Phone: (209) 385-7511
LCardella-presto@co.merced.ca.us

Nancy Cardenas, Auditor-Controller, Treasurer, Tax Collector, *County of Lassen*
221 South Roop Street, Ste. 1, Susanville, CA 96130
Phone: (530) 251-8220
ncardenas@co.lassen.ca.us

Steve Carmona, City Manager, *City of Pico Rivera*
6615 Passons Boulevard, Pico Rivera, CA 90660
Phone: (562) 801-4371
scarmona@pico-rivera.org

Scott Carney, City Manager, *City of Lodi*
221 W Pine Street, Lodi, CA 95240
Phone: (209) 333-6700
citymanager@lodi.gov

Pamela Caronongan, City Administrator, *City of Angels Camp*
200 Monte Verda Street, Ste. B, PO Box 667 Angels Camp, Angels Camp, CA 95222
Phone: (209) 736-2181
pamelacaronongan@angelscamp.gov

Pete Carr, City Manager/Finance Director, *City of Orland*
PO Box 547, Orland, CA 95963
Phone: (530) 865-1602
CityManager@cityoforland.com

Manuel Carrillo, Director of Finance and Administrative Services, *City of Bell Gardens*
7100 Garfield Ave, Bell Gardens, CA 90201
Phone: (562) 806-7700
MCarrillo@bellgardens.org

Roger Carroll, Finance Director/Treasurer, *Town of Loomis*
Finance Department, 3665 Taylor Road, Loomis, CA 95650
Phone: (916) 652-1840
rcarroll@loomis.ca.gov

Nicole Casey, Administrative Services Director, *Town of Truckee*
10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161
Phone: (530) 582-2935
ncasey@townoftruckee.com

Arturo Castillo, Administrative Services Director, *City of San Pablo*
1000 Gateway Avenue, San Pablo, CA 94806
Phone: (510) 215-3021
AECastillo@sanpabloca.gov

Leslie Caviglia, City Manager, *City of Visalia*
707 West Acequia Avenue, Visalia, CA 93291
Phone: (559) 713-4332
leslie.caviglia@visalia.city

Julissa Ceja Cardenas, *California State Association of Counties*
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 327-7500
jcejacardenas@counties.org

Mitchell Celaya, Interim City Manager, *City of Calistoga*
1232 Washington Street, Calistoga, CA 94515
Phone: (707) 584-6201
mcelaya@calistogaca.gov

David Cerda, Acting City Manager, *City of Parlier*
1100 East Parlier Avenue, Parlier, CA 93648
Phone: (559) 646-3545
dcerda@parlier.ca.us

Javier Chagoyen-Lazaro, Chief Financial Officer, *City of Oxnard*
300 West Third Street, Third Floor, Oxnard, CA 93030
Phone: (805) 200-5400
javier.chagoyenlazaro@oxnard.org

Ellis Chang, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Mission Viejo*
200 Civic Center, Mission Viejo, CA 92691

Phone: (949) 470-3059
adminservices@cityofmissionviejo.org

Ashley Chaparro, Deputy Finance Director, *City of Port Hueneme*
250 North Ventura Road, Port Hueneme, CA 93041
Phone: (805) 986-6524
achaparro@ci.port-hueneme.ca.us

Sheri Chapman, General Counsel, *League of California Cities*
1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 658-8267
schapman@calcities.org

Stacie Charlebois, Senior Accountant, *Town of Corte Madera*
300 Tamalpais Drive, Corte Madera, CA 94925
Phone: (415) 927-5050
scharlebois@cortemadera.gov

Veronica Chavez, Director of Finance, *City of Palm Desert*
73510 Fred Waring Drive, Palm Desert, CA 92260
Phone: (760) 776-6320
vchavez@palmdesert.gov

Diego Chavez, Administrative Services Director, *City of Murrieta*
1 Town Square, Murrieta, CA 92562
Phone: (951) 461-6437
dchavez@murrietaca.gov

Henry Chen, Acting Financial Services Manager, *City of Arcadia*
240 West Huntington Drive, Arcadia, CA 91007
Phone: (626) 574-5427
hchen@ArcadiaCA.gov

Erick Cheung, Finance Manager, *City of Pleasant Hill*
100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
Phone: (925) 671-5231
echeung@pleasanthillca.org

Matthew Chidester, City Manager, *City of Half Moon Bay*
501 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Phone: (650) 726-8272
MChidester@hmbcity.com

Annette Chinn, *Cost Recovery Systems, Inc.*
705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 939-7901
achinnrcs@aol.com

David Chiu, City Attorney, *City and County of San Francisco*
Office of the City Attorney, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4700
cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

Lawrence Chiu, Finance Director, *City of Emeryville*
1333 Park Ave, Emeryville, CA 94608
Phone: (510) 596-4352
Lawrence.Chiu@emeryville.org

DeAnna Christensen, Director of Finance, *City of Modesto*

1010 10th Street, Suite 5200, Modesto, CA 95354

Phone: (209) 577-5371

dachristensen@modestogov.com

Carmen Chu, Assessor-Recorder, *City and County of San Francisco*

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 190, San Francisco, CA 94102-4698

Phone: (415) 554-5596

assessor@sfgov.org

Carolyn Chu, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*

925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 319-8326

Carolyn.Chu@lao.ca.gov

Paul Chung, Director of Finance, *City of El Segundo*

350 Main Street, El Segundo, CA 90245-3813

Phone: (310) 524-2315

pchung@elsegundo.org

City Clerk, City Clerk, *City of Amador City*

14531 East School Street, P.O. Box 200, Amador City, CA 95601

Phone: (209) 267-0682

city.clerk@amador-city.com

Justin Clifton, City Manager, *City of Murrieta*

1 Town Square, Murrieta, CA 92562

Phone: (951) 461-6010

jclifton@murrietaca.gov

Nicole Coburn, Assistant County Executive Officer, *City of Santa Cruz*

809 Center Street, Rm 101, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Phone: (831) 454-2100

nicole.coburn@santacruzcountyca.gov

Luv Cofresi, Finance Director, *City of Milpitas*

455 East Calaveras Boulevard, Milpitas, CA 95035

Phone: (408) 586-3111

lcofresi-howe@milpitas.gov

Steve Colangelo, Interim City Manager, *City of Stockton*

425 North El Dorado Street, Stockton, CA 95202

Phone: (209) 937-8212

city.manager@stocktonca.gov

Michael Coleman, *Coleman Advisory Services*

2217 Isle Royale Lane, Davis, CA 95616

Phone: (530) 758-3952

coleman@muni1.com

Ashley Collick, City Manager, *City of San Juan Bautista*

311 Second Street P.O. Box 1420, San Juan Bautista, CA 95045

Phone: (831) 623-4661

citymanager@san-juan-bautista.ca.us

Stephen Conway, *City of Los Gatos*

110 E. Main Street, Los Gatos, CA 95031

Phone: N/A
sconway@losgatosca.gov

Steve Conway, Interim Assistant City Manager/Admin Services Director, *City of Morro Bay*
595 Harbor Street, Morro Bay, CA 93442
Phone: (805) 772-6217
sconway@morrobayca.gov

Bryan Cook, City Manager, *City of Temple City*
9701 Las Tunas Drive , Temple City , CA 91780
Phone: (626) 285-2171
bcook@templecity.us

Cass Cook, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Tulare*
221 South Mooney Blvd, Room 101 E, Visalia, CA 93291
Phone: (559) 636-5200
tulareauditor@co.tulare.ca.us

Julia Cooper, *City of San Jose*
Finance, 200 East Santa Clara Street, San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 535-7000
Finance@sanjoseca.gov

Drew Corbett, Acting Finance Director, *City of South San Francisco*
400 Grand Ave, South San Francisco, CA 94080
Phone: (650) 877-8505
drew.corbett@ssfca.gov

Christine Cordon, City Manager, *City of Westminster*
8200 Westminster Blvd, Westminster, CA 92683
Phone: (714) 548-3178
CCordon@westminster-ca.gov

Erika Cortez, Administrative Services Director, *City of Imperial Beach*
825 Imperial Beach Boulevard, Imperial Beach, CA 91932
Phone: (619) 423-8303
ecortez@imperialbeachca.gov

Jennifer Crawford, Acting City Manager, *City of Yucaipa*
34272 Yucaipa Blvd., Yucaipa, CA 92399
Phone: (909) 797-2489
jcrawford@yucaipa.org

Mallory Crecelius, Interim City Manager, *City of Blythe*
235 N. Broadway, Blythe, CA 92225
Phone: (760) 922-6161
msutterfield@cityofblythe.ca.gov

Adam Cripps, Interim Finance Manager, *Town of Apple Valley*
14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, CA 92307
Phone: (760) 240-7000
acripps@applevalley.org

Kuyler Crocker, Interim City Manager, *City of Lindsay*
251 E. Honolulu St., Lindsay, CA 93247
Phone: (559) 562-7102
kcrocker@lindsay.ca.us

Robert Cross, Financial Services Manager, *City of Lompoc*
100 Civic Center Plaza, Lompoc, CA 93438-8001
Phone: (805) 736-1261
r_cross@ci.lompoc.ca.us

Sean Crumby, Interim City Manager, *City of Irvine*
One Civic Center Plaza, Irvine, CA 92623-9575
Phone: (949) 724-6246
scrumby@cityofirvine.org

Nate Cruz, Finance Director, *City of Foster City*
610 Foster City Blvd., Foster City, CA 94404
Phone: (650) 286-3204
ncruz@fostercity.org

Chamise Cubbison, Auditor-Controller-Tax Collector, *County of Mendocino*
501 Low Gap Road, Rm 1080, Ukiah, CA 95482
Phone: (707) 234-6860
cubbisonc@mendocinocounty.gov

Amy Cunningham, Administrative Services Director, *City of Novato*
922 Machin Avenue, Novato, CA 94945
Phone: (415) 899-8918
ACunningham@novato.org

Gavin Curran, Acting City Manager, *City of Laguna Beach*
505 Forest Avenue, Laguna Beach, CA 92651
Phone: (949) 497-0754
gcurran@lagunabeachcity.net

Cindy Czerwin, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Watsonville*
250 Main Street, Watsonville, CA 95076
Phone: (831) 768-3450
cindy.czerwin@cityofwatsonville.org

Santino Danisi, Finance Director / City Controller, *City of Fresno*
2600 Fresno St. Rm. 2157, Fresno, CA 93721
Phone: (559) 621-2489
Santino.Danisi@fresno.gov

Chuck Dantuono, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Highland*
Administrative Services, 27215 Base Line, Highland, CA 92346
Phone: (909) 864-6861
cdantuono@cityofhighland.org

Fran David, City Manager, *City of Hayward*
Finance Department, 777 B Street, Hayward, CA 94541
Phone: (510) 583-4000
citymanager@hayward-ca.gov

Doug Davis, City Manager, *Town of Hillsborough*
1600 Floribunda Ave, Hillsborough, CA 94010
Phone: (650) 375-7400
citymanager@hillsborough.net

Jon Davis, Town Manager, *Town of Windsor*
9291 Old Redwood Hwy, Bldg 400, Windsor, CA 95492

Phone: (707) 838-5335
jdavis@townofwindsor.ca.gov

Rob de Geus, City Manager, *City of Westlake Village*
31200 Oakcrest Drive, Westlake Village, CA 91361
Phone: (808) 706-1613
rob@wlv.org

Thomas Deak, Senior Deputy, *County of San Diego*
Office of County Counsel, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 355, San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 531-4810
Thomas.Deak@sdcounty.ca.gov

Dilu DeAlwis, *City of Colton*
650 North La Cadena Drive, Colton, CA 92324
Phone: (909) 370-5036
financedept@coltonca.gov

Gigi Decavalles-Hughes, Director of Finance, *City of Santa Monica*
Finance, 1717 4th Street, Suite 250, Santa Monica, CA 90401
Phone: (310) 458-8281
gigi.decavalles@smgov.net

Sharon Del Rosario, Finance Director, *City of Stanton*
7800 Katella Ave, Stanton, CA 90680
Phone: (714) 890-4226
sdelrosario@stantonca.gov

Shannon DeLong, Assistant City Manager, *City of Whittier*
13230 Penn Street, Whittier, CA 90602
Phone: (562) 567-9301
admin@cityofwhittier.org

Keith DeMartini, Director of Finance, *City of Santa Barbara*
P.O. Box 1990, Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990
Phone: (805) 564-5336
KDemartini@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Jeremy Dennis, City Manager, *City of Brisbane*
50 Park Place, Brisbane, CA 94005
Phone: (415) 508-2110
jdennis@brisbaneca.org

Finance Department, *City of Milpitas*
455 E. Calaveras Blvd., Milpitas, CA 95035
Phone: (408) 586-3111
finance@milpitas.gov

Mandip Dhillon, Auditor Controller, *County of Stanislaus*
1010 10th Street, Modesto, CA 95354
Phone: (209) 525-6398
auditor@stancounty.com

Leticia Dias, Finance Director, *City of Ceres*
2220 Magnolia Street, Ceres, CA 95307
Phone: (209) 538-5757
leticia.dias@ci.ceres.ca.us

Lana Dich, Director of Fiance and Administrative Services, *City of Santa Fe Springs*
11710 East Telegraph Road, Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670
Phone: (562) 409-7520
lanadich@santafesprings.org

Cheryl Dillingham, Auditor-Controller, *County of Humboldt*
825 Fifth Street, Room 126, Eureka, CA 95501
Phone: (707) 476-2452
ctyauditor@co.humboldt.ca.us

Deston Dishion, City Administrator, *City of Bishop*
377 West Line Street, Bishop, CA 93514
Phone: (760) 873-5863
ddishion@cityofbishop.ca.gov

Steven Dobrenen, Finance Director, *City of Cudahy*
5220 Santa Ana Street, Cudahy, CA 90201
Phone: (831) 386-5925
sdobrenen@cityofcudahyca.gov

Ken Domer, City Manager, *City of La Verne*
3660 "D" Street, La Verne, CA 91750
Phone: (909) 596-8726
kdomer@cityoflaverne.org

Dario Dominguez, Interim City Manager, *City of Orange Cove*
633 Sixth Street, Orange Cove, CA 93646
Phone: (559) 626-4488
ddominguez@cityoforangecove.com

Tracy Drager, Auditor and Controller, *County of San Diego*
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 166, San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 531-5413
tracy.drager@sdcounty.ca.gov

June Du, Finance Director, *City of Los Altos*
1 North San Antonio Road, Los Altos, CA 94022
Phone: (650) 947-2700
jdu@losaltosca.gov

Tom DuBois, City Manager, *City of Sutter Creek*
18 Main Street, Sutter Creek, CA 95685
Phone: (209) 215-4890
tdubois@cityofsuttercreek.org

Randall L. Dunn, City Manager, *City of Colusa*
Finance Department, 425 Webster St. , Colusa, CA 95932
Phone: (530) 458-4740
citymanager@cityofcolusa.com

David Dunn, City Administrator, *City of Montague*
230 South 13th Street, Montague, CA 96064
Phone: (530) 459-3030
clerk@cityofmontagueca.com

Jimmy Duran, Interim City Manager, *City of Brawley*
383 Main Street, Brawley, CA 92227

Phone: (760) 351-3048
jduran@brawley-ca.gov

Janet Dutcher, Finance Director, *County of Mono*
25 Bryant Street, PO Box 556, Bridgeport, CA 93517
Phone: (760) 932-5496
jdutcher@mono.ca.gov

Melissa Eads, City Administrator, *City of Sonora*
94 N. Washington Street, Sonora, CA 95370
Phone: (209) 532-4541
meads@sonoraca.com

Richard Eberle, Auditor-Controller, *County of Yuba*
915 8th Street, Suite 105, Marysville, CA 95901
Phone: (530) 749-7810
reberle@co.yuba.ca.us

Michael Egan, City Manager, *City of La Palma*
7822 Walker Street, La Palma, CA 90623
Phone: (714) 690-3300
citymanager@lapalmaca.gov

Pamela Ehler, *City of Brentwood*
150 City Park Way, Brentwood, CA 94513
Phone: N/A
pehler@brentwoodca.gov

Ann Eifert, Director of Financial Services/City Treasurer, *City of Aliso Viejo*
12 Journey, Suite 100, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656-5335
Phone: (949) 425-2520
aeifert@avcity.org

Adam Ennis, City Administrator, *City of Exeter*
100 North C Street, P.O. Box 237, Exeter, CA 93221
Phone: (559) 592-4539
adam@exetercityhall.com

Edward Enriquez, Interim Assistant City Manager/CFO Treasurer, *City of Riverside*
3900 Main Street, Riverside, CA 92501
Phone: N/A
EEnriquez@riversideca.gov

Kelly Ent, Director of Government Services, *City of Big Bear Lake*
Finance Department, 39707 Big Bear Blvd, Big Bear Lake, CA 92315
Phone: (909) 866-5831
kent@citybigbearlake.com

Tina Envia, Finance Manager, *City of Waterford*
Finance Department, 101 E Street, Waterford, CA 95386
Phone: (209) 874-2328
finance@cityofwaterford.org

Chris Eras, Interim City Manager, *City of Galt*
380 Civic Drive, Galt, CA 95632
Phone: (209) 366-7100
cerias@cityofgalt.org

Vic Erganian, Deputy Finance Director, *City of Pasadena*
Finance Department, 100 N. Garfield Ave, Room S348, Pasadena, CA 91109-7215
Phone: (626) 744-4355
verganian@cityofpasadena.net

Eric Erickson, Director of Finance and Human Resources , *City of Mill Valley*
Department of Finance and Human Resources , 26 Corte Madera Avenue , Mill Valley, CA 94941
Phone: (415) 388-4033
finance@cityofmillvalley.org

Paul Espinoza, Interim Finance Director, *City of Paramount*
16400 Colorado Avenue, Paramount, CA 90723
Phone: (562) 220-2200
pespinoza@paramountcity.com

Nadia Feeser, Administrative Services Director, *City of Pismo Beach*
Finance Department, 760 Mattie Road, Pismo Beach, CA 93449
Phone: (805) 773-7010
nfeeser@pismobeach.org

Matthew Fertal, City Manager, *City of Garden Grove*
Finance Department, 11222 Acacia Parkway, Garden Grove, CA 92840
Phone: (714) 741-5000
CityManager@ci.garden-grove.ca.us

Laura Fischer, City Manager , *City of Westmorland*
355 S.Center Street, Westmorland, CA 92281
Phone: (760) 344-3411
lfischer@cityofwestmorland.net

Kevin Fisher, Assistant City Attorney, *City of San Jose*
Environmental Services, 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor, San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 535-1987
kevin.fisher@sanjoseca.gov

Tim Flanagan, Office Coordinator, *Solano County*
Register of Voters, 678 Texas Street, Suite 2600, Fairfield, CA 94533
Phone: (707) 784-3359
Elections@solanocounty.com

Alan Flora, Finance Director, *City of Clearlake*
14050 Olympic Drive, Clearlake, CA 95422
Phone: (707) 994-8201
aflora@clearlake.ca.us

Sandy Fonseca, Interim Finance Director, *City of Calexico*
608 Heber Ave, Calexico, CA 92231
Phone: (760) 768-2123
sfonseca@calexico.ca.gov

Anthony Forestiere, Acting Finance Director, *City of Madera*
205 West Fourth Street, Madera, CA 93637
Phone: (559) 661-5454
aforestiere1@madera.gov

Dan Fox, City Manager, *City of Diamond Bar*
21810 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Phone: (909) 839-7010
dfox@diamondbarca.gov

Aaron France, City Manager, *City of Buena Park*
6650 Beach Boulevard, Second Floor, Buena Park, CA 90621
Phone: (714) 562-3550
afrance@buenapark.com

Steve Franks, City Manager, *City of Villa Park*
17855 Santiago Blvd, Villa Park, CA 92861
Phone: (714) 998-1500
sfranks@villapark.org

Cheri Freese, Finance Director, *City of Ridgecrest*
100 West California Avenue, Ridgecrest, CA 93555
Phone: (760) 499-5026
cfreese@ridgecrest-ca.gov

Jaylen French, Interim City Manager, *City of Escalon*
2060 McHenry Avenue, Escalon, CA 95320
Phone: (209) 691-7400
jfrench@cityofescalon.org

Nora Frimann, City Attorney, *City of San Jose*
200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor, San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 535-1900
nora.frimann@sanjoseca.gov

Elizabeth Fuchen, Interim Finance Director, *City of El Centro*
1275 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243
Phone: (760) 337-4573
efuchen@cityofelcentro.org

Melanie Gaboardi, Assistant Finance Director, *City of Tulare*
411 East Kern Ave., Tulare, CA 93274
Phone: (559) 685-2300
mgaboardi@tulare.ca.gov

Patrick Gallegos, Interim City Manager, *City of Seal Beach*
211 8th Street, Seal Beach, CA 90740
Phone: (562) 431-2527
pgallegos@sealbeachca.gov

Rose Gallo-Vasquez, County Clerk and Recorder, *County of Colusa*
546 Jay Street, Ste. 200, Colusa, CA 95932
Phone: (530) 458-0500
clerkinfo@countyofcolusa.org

Marlene Galvan, Deputy Finance Officer, *City of Fontana*
8353 Sierra Ave, Fontana, CA 92335
Phone: (909) 350-7671
Mgalvan@fontana.org

Anna Garan, Finance Director, *City of Bellflower*
Finance Department, 16600 Civic Center Dr, Bellflower, CA 90706
Phone: (562) 804-1424
agaran@bellflower.ca.gov

Marisela Garcia, Finance Director, *City of Riverbank*
Finance Department, 6707 Third Street , Riverbank, CA 95367
Phone: (209) 863-7109
mhgarcia@riverbank.org

Oscar Garcia, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Fresno*
2281 Tulare Street, Room 105, Fresno, CA 93721
Phone: (559) 600-3496
ogarcia@fresnocountyca.gov

Danielle Garcia, Director of Finance, *City of Redlands*
PO Box 3005, Redlands, CA 92373
Phone: (909) 798-7510
dgarcia@cityofredlands.org

Rebecca Garcia, *City of San Bernardino*
300 North , San Bernardino, CA 92418-0001
Phone: (909) 384-7272
garcia_re@sbcity.org

Martha Garcia, Director of Management Services, *City of Monterey Park*
320 West Newmark Ave, Monterey Park, CA 91754
Phone: (626) 307-1349
magarcia@montereypark.ca.gov

Jorge Garcia, Interim City Manager, *City of Pismo Beach*
760 Mattie Road, Pismo Beach, CA 93449
Phone: (805) 773-7007
finance@pismo-beach.org

Justin Garrett, Acting Chief Policy Officer, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
1100 K Street, Ste 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 327-7500
jgarrett@counties.org

David Gassaway, City Manager, *City of Fairfield*
1000 Webster Street, Fairfield,
Phone: (707) 428-7398
dgassaway@fairfield.ca.gov

Greg Gatzka, City Manager, *City of Corcoran*
832 Whitley Avenue, Corcoran, CA 93212
Phone: (559) 992-2151
greg.gatzka@cityofcorcoran.com

Elizabeth Gibbs, City Manager, *City of Beaumont*
550 E. 6th Street, Beaumont, CA 92223
Phone: (951) 769-8520
egibbs@beaumontca.gov

Carmen Gil, City Manager, *City of Gonzales*
147 FOURTH ST, P.O. BOX 647, Gonzales, CA 93926
Phone: (831) 675-5000
cgil@ci.gonzales.ca.us

John Gillison, City Manager, *City of Rancho Cucamonga*
10500 Civic Center Drive, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Phone: (909) 477-2700
john.gillison@cityofrc.us

Juliana Gmur, Executive Director, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
juliana.gmur@csm.ca.gov

Kathy Gomes, Auditor Controller, *County of Calaveras*
891 Mountain Ranch Road, San Andreas, CA 95249
Phone: (209) 754-6343
kgomes@calaverascounty.gov

Jose Gomez, Director of Finance and Administrative Services, *City of Lakewood*
5050 Clark Avenue, Lakewood, CA 90712
Phone: (562) 866-9771
jgomez@lakewoodcity.org

Sergio Gonzalez, City Manager, *City of Azusa*
213 E Foothill Boulevard, Azusa, CA 91702
Phone: (626) 812-5239
Sergio.Gonzalez@AzusaCa.Gov

Gabe Gonzalez, City Administrator, *City of Gilroy*
7351 Rosanna Street, Gilroy, CA 95020
Phone: (408) 846-0202
Denise.King@cityofgilroy.org

Cristian Gonzalez, City Manager/Planning Director, *City of Mendota*
643 Quince St., Mendota, CA 93640
Phone: (559) 655-4298
cristian@cityofmendota.com

Joe Gonzalez, *County of San Benito*
440 Fifth Street Room 206, Hollister, CA 95023
Phone: (831) 636-4090
jgonzalez@auditor.co.san-benito.ca.us

Grizelle Gonzalez, Administrative Services Director, *City of Hollister*
375 Fifth Street, Hollister, CA 95023
Phone: (831) 636-4301
Grizelle.Gonzalez@Hollister.CA.Gov

Jim Goodwin, City Manager, *City of Live Oak*
9955 Live Oak Blvd., Live Oak, CA 95953
Phone: (530) 695-2112
liveoak@liveoakcity.org

Greg Grammar, City Manager, *City of Rolling Hills Estates*
4045 Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274
Phone: (310) 377-1577
GregG@rollinghillsestates.gov

Peter Grant, City Manager, *City of Yorba Linda*
4845 Casa Loma Avenue, Yorba Linda, CA 92886
Phone: (714) 961-7100
pgrant@yorbalindaca.gov

Kristin Griffith, City Manager, *City of Brea*

1 Civic Center Circle, Brea, CA 92821

Phone: (714) 990-7710

kristing@cityofbrea.gov

John Gross, Director of Finance, *City of Long Beach*

333 W. Ocean Blvd., 6th Floor, Long Beach, CA 90802

Phone: N/A

john.gross@longbeach.gov

Troy Grunklee, Director of Administrative Services, *City of La Puente*

15900 East Main Street, La Puente, CA 91744

Phone: (626) 855-1500

tgrunklee@lapuente.org

John Guertin, City Manager, *City of Del Rey Oaks*

650 Canyon Del Rey Road, Del Rey Oaks, CA 93940

Phone: (831) 394-8511

JGuertin@DelReyOaks.org

David Guhin, City Manager, *City of Sonoma*

1 The Plaza , Sonoma, CA 95476

Phone: (707) 933-2213

dguhin@sonomacity.org

Hillary Guirola-Leon, Finance Director, *City of San Marino*

2200 Huntington Drive, San Marino, CA 91108

Phone: (626) 300-0708

hguirola-leon@sanmarinoca.gov

Shelly Gunby, Director of Financial Management, *City of Winters*

Finance, 318 First Street, Winters, CA 95694

Phone: (530) 795-4910

shelly.gunby@cityofwinters.org

Diana Gunn, Finance Director, *City of Adelanto*

11600 Air Expressway, Adelanto, CA 92301

Phone: (760) 246-2300

dgunn@adelantoca.gov

Laura Gutierrez, City Manager, *City of Calipatria*

125 North Park Avenue, Calipatria, CA 92233

Phone: (760) 348-4141

l_gutierrez@calipatria.com

Graciela Gutierrez, Auditor-Controller, *County of Butte*

25 County Center Drive, Suite 120, Oroville, CA 95965

Phone: (530) 552-3599

GGutierrez@ButteCounty.net

Anna Guzman, Director of Finance, *City of Weed*

550 Main Street, PO Box 470, Weed, CA 96094

Phone: (530) 938-5020

guzman@ci.weed.ca.us

Lani Ha, Finance Manager/Treasurer, *City of Danville*

510 La Gonda Way, Danville, CA 94526

Phone: (925) 314-3311
lha@danville.ca.gov

Isaiah Hagerman, City Manager, *City of Rancho Mirage*
69825 Highway 111, Rancho Mirage, CA 92270
Phone: (760) 324-4511
isaiahh@ranchomirageca.gov

Andy Hall, City Manager, *City of San Clemente*
910 Calle Negocio, San Clemente, CA 92673
Phone: (949) 361-8341
HallA@san-clemente.org

Dante Hall, City Manager, *City of Hercules*
111 Civic Drive, Hercules, CA 94547
Phone: (510) 799-8200
dhall@herculesca.gov

Nathan Hamburger, City Manager, *City of Agoura Hills*
30001 Ladyface Court, Agoura Hills, CA 91301
Phone: (818) 597-7300
nhamburger@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us

Andrew Hamilton, Auditor-Controller, *County of Orange*
1770 North Broadway, Santa Ana, CA 92706
Phone: (714) 834-2450
Andrew.Hamilton@ac.ocgov.com

James Hamilton, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector/Public Administrator, *County of San Luis Obispo*
1055 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Phone: (805) 781-5040
jhamilton@co.slo.ca.us

Sunny Han, Director of Finance, *City of Yorba Linda*
4845 Casa Loma Avenue, Yorba Linda, CA 92886
Phone: (714) 961-7140
shan@yorbalingaca.gov

Toni Hannah, Director of Finance, *City of Pacific Grove*
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, CA 93950
Phone: (831) 648-3100
thannah@cityofpacificgrove.org

Anne Haraksin, *City of La Mirada*
13700 La Mirada Blvd., La Mirada, CA 90638
Phone: N/A
aharaksin@cityoflamirada.org

Joe Harn, *County of El Dorado*
360 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667
Phone: (530) 621-5633
joe.harn@edcgov.us

Sydney Harris, Finance Director, *City of Barstow*
220 East Mountain View Street, Suite A, Barstow, CA 92311
Phone: (760) 255-5125
sharris@barstowca.org

George Harris, Finance Director, *City of Lancaster*
44933 Fern Avenue, Lancaster, CA 93534
Phone: (661) 723-5988
gharris@cityoflanasterca.org

Tom Haynes, Chief Financial Officer, *County of Yolo*
Financial Services, 625 Court Street, Room 102, Woodland, CA 95695
Phone: (530) 666-8190
Tom.Haynes@yolocounty.gov

Jim Heller, City Treasurer, *City of Atwater*
Finance Department, 750 Bellevue Rd, Atwater, CA 95301
Phone: (209) 357-6310
finance@atwater.org

Alexander Henderson, City Manager, *City of Kingsburg*
1401 Draper Street, Kingsburg, CA 93631
Phone: (559) 897-5821
ahenderson@cityofkingsburg-ca.gov

Eric Hendrickson, Finance Director, *City of Laguna Hills*
24035 El Toro Road, Laguna Hills, CA 92653
Phone: (949) 707-2623
ehendrickson@lagunahillsca.gov

Jennifer Hennessy, *City of Temecula*
41000 Main St., Temecula, CA 92590
Phone: N/A
Jennifer.Hennessy@cityoftemecula.org

Ernie Hernandez, City Manager, *City of Commerce*
2535 Commerce Way, Commerce, CA 90040
Phone: (323) 722-4805
ehernandez@ci.commerce.ca.us

Erika Herrera-Terriquez, Interim City Manager, *City of Fillmore*
250 Central Avenue, Fillmore, CA 93015
Phone: (805) 524-1500
eherrera@fillmoreca.gov

Jenavive Herrington, Auditor-Controller/County Clerk, *County of Lake*
255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, CA 95453
Phone: (707) 263-2311
jenavive.herrington@lakecountycalifornia.gov

Robert Hicks, *City of Berkeley*
2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704
Phone: N/A
finance@ci.berkeley.ca.us

Chris Hill, Principal Program Budget Analyst, *Department of Finance*
Local Government Unit, 915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Chris.Hill@dof.ca.gov

Ryan Hinchman, Administrative Services Director, *City of Saratoga*
13777 Fruitvale Avenue, Saratoga, CA 94025

Phone: N/A
rhinchman@saratoga.ca.us

Tiffany Hoang, Associate Accounting Analyst, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,
Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-1127
THoang@sco.ca.gov

Jason Holley, City Manager, *City of American Canyon*
4381 Broadway Street, Suite 201, American Canyon, CA 94503
Phone: (707) 647-5323
jholley@cityofamericancanyon.org

Linda Hollinsworth, Finance Director, *City of Hawaiian Gardens*
21815 Pioneer Blvd., Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716
Phone: (562) 420-2641
lindah@hgcity.org

Christina Holmes, Director of Finance, *City of Escondido*
201 North Broadway, Escondido, CA 92025
Phone: (760) 839-4676
cholmes@escondido.org

Susie Holmes, Finance Director, *City of Cloverdale*
124 N Cloverdale Blvd, Cloverdale, CA 95425
Phone: (707) 894-2521
sholmes@ci.cloverdale.ca.us

Willie Hopkins, City Manager, *City of Compton*
205 S Willowbrook Ave, Compton, CA 90220
Phone: (310) 605-5500
whopkins@comptontcity.org

Ken Howell, Senior Management Auditor, *State Controller's Office*
Audits, Compliance Audits Bureau, 3301 C Street, Suite 725A, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-2368
KHowell@sco.ca.gov

Betsy Howze, Finance Director, *City of Rohnert Park*
130 Avram Avenue, Rohnert Park, CA 94928-1180
Phone: (707) 585-6717
bhowze@rpcity.org

Karen Huang, Finance Director, *City of San Mateo*
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, CA 94403
Phone: (650) 522-7102
khuang@cityofsanmateo.org

Lewis Humphries, Finance Director, *City of Newman*
Finance Department, 938 Fresno Street, Newman, CA 95360
Phone: (209) 862-3725
lhumphries@cityofnewman.com

Megan Hunter, City Manager, *City of Soledad*
248 Main Street, Soledad, CA 93960
Phone: (831) 223-5043
mhunter@cityofsoledad.gov

Chris Huot, Interim City Manager , *City of Paso Robles*
1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
Phone: (805) 227-7276
citymanager@prcity.com

Scott Hurlbert, City Manager, *City of Wasco*
746 8th Street, Wasco, CA 93280
Phone: (661) 758-7214
schurlbert@cityofwasco.org

Kevin Ingram, City Manager, *City of Lakeport*
225 Park Street, Lakeport, CA 95453
Phone: (707) 263-5615
kingram@cityoflakeport.com

Joe Irvin, City Manager, *City of South Lake Tahoe*
1901 Lisa Maloff Way, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Phone: (530) 542-6000
jirvin@cityofslt.us

Emily Jackson, Finance Director, *City of San Luis Obispo*
Finance & Information Technology Department, 990 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Phone: (805) 781-7125
ejackson@slocity.org

Rachel Jacobs, Finance Director/Treasurer, *City of Solana Beach*
635 South Highway 101, Solana Beach, CA 92075-2215
Phone: (858) 720-2463
rjacobs@cosb.org

Stone James, City Manager, *City of Twentynine Palms*
6136 Adobe Road, Twentynine Palms, CA 92277
Phone: (760) 367-6799
sjames@29palms.org

Chris Jeffers, Interim City Manager, *City of South Gate*
8650 California Ave, South Gate, CA 90280
Phone: (323) 563-9503
cjeffers@sogate.org

Brooke Jenkins, District Attorney, *City and County of San Francisco*
350 Rhode Island Street, North Building, Suite 400N, San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (628) 652-4000
districtattorney@sfgov.org

Heather Jennings, Director of Finance, *City of Santee*
10601 Magnolia Avenue, Building #3, Santee, CA 92071
Phone: (619) 258-4100
hjennings@cityofsantee.ca.gov

Jason Jennings, Director, *Maximus Consulting*
Financial Services, 808 Moorefield Park Drive, Suite 205, Richmond, VA 23236
Phone: (804) 323-3535
SB90@maximus.com

Jestin Johnson, City Administrator, *City of Oakland*
1 Frank H Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: (510) 238-3301
cityadministratorsoffice@oaklandca.gov

Talika Johnson, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Azusa*
213 E Foothill Blvd, Azusa, CA 91702
Phone: (626) 812-5203
finance@azusaca.gov

Christa Johnson, Town Manager, *Town of Ross*
31 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, PO Box 320, Ross, CA 94957
Phone: (415) 453-1453
cjohnson@townofross.org

Dewayne Jones, City Manager, *City of Dos Palos*
2174 Blossom Street, Dos Palos, CA 93620
Phone: (209) 392-2174
djones@cityofdp.com

Hamed Jones, Finance Director, *City of Tehachapi*
Finance Department, 115 S. Robinson St., Tehachapi, CA 93561
Phone: (661) 822-2200
hjones@tehachapicityhall.com

Jeff Jones, City Manager, *City of Arvin*
200 Campus Drive, Arvin, CA 93203
Phone: (661) 854-3134
jeffjones@arvin.org

Daniel Jordan, City Manager, *City of La Cañada Flintridge*
One Civic Center Drive, La Cañada Flintridge, CA 91011
Phone: (808) 706-1613
Dan@wlv.org

Angelo Joseph, Supervisor, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,
Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
AJoseph@sco.ca.gov

Todd Juhasz, City Manager, *City of Mount Shasta*
305 N. Mt. Shasta Boulevard, Mount Shasta, CA 96067
Phone: (530) 926-7510
tjuhasz@mtshastaca.gov

Kim Juran Karageorgiou, Administrative Services Director, *City of Rancho Cordova*
2729 Prospect Park Drive , Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 851-8731
kjuran@cityofranchocordova.org

Will Kaholokula, Finance Director, *City of San Gabriel*
425 South Mission Drive, San Gabriel, CA 91776
Phone: (626) 308-2812
wkaholokula@sgch.org

Kerry Kallman, City Manager, *City of Palos Verdes Estates*
340 Palos Verdes Dr West, Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
Phone: (310) 378-0383
kkallman@pvestates.org

Harshil Kanakia, Administrative Services Manager, *County of San Mateo*
Controller's Office, 555 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
Phone: (650) 599-1080
hkanakia@smcgov.org

Anne Kato, Acting Chief, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-9891
akato@sco.ca.gov

Dennis Kauffman, Finance Director, *City of Roseville*
311 Vernon Street, Roseville, CA 95678
Phone: (916) 774-5313
dkauffman@roseville.ca.us

Jeff Kay, City Manager, *City of Healdsburg*
401 Grove Street, Healdsburg, CA 95448
Phone: (707) 431-3396
jkay@ci.healdsburg.ca.us

Kevin Kearney, City Manager, *City of Bradbury*
600 Winston Ave, Bradbury, CA 91008
Phone: (626) 358-3218
kkearney@cityofbradbury.org

Mandy Kellogg, Administrative Services Director, *City of St. Helena*
1088 College Avenue, City Hall, St. Helena, CA 94574
Phone: (707) 968-2649
mkellogg@cityofstheleena.gov

Naomi Kelly, City Administrator, *City and County of San Francisco*
City Hall, Room 362, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-4851
city.administrator@sfgov.org

Jon Kennedy, Interim City Manager, *City of Isleton*
101 2nd Street, PO Box 716, Isleton, CA 95641
Phone: (916) 777-7770
jon@civassist.com

Anita Kerezsi, *AK & Company*
2425 Golden Hill Road, Suite 106, Paso Robles, CA 93446
Phone: (805) 239-7994
akcompanysb90@gmail.com

Marissa Kersey, City Clerk, *City of Woodland*
300 First Street, Woodland, CA 95695
Phone: (530) 661-5830
marissa.kersey@cityofwoodland.gov

Joanne Kessler, Fiscal Specialist, *City of Newport Beach*
Revenue Division, 100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 90266
Phone: (949) 644-3199
jkessler@newportbeachca.gov

Mike Killebrew, City Manager, *City of Dana Point*
33282 Golden Lantern, Dana Point, CA 92629-1805

Phone: (949) 248-3554
mkillebrew@danapoint.org

Ben Kim, City Manager, *City of Rosemead*
8838 East Valley Boulevard, Rosemead, CA 91770
Phone: (626) 569-2169
bkim@cityofrosemead.org

Jennifer King, Acting Finance Director, *City of Tustin*
300 Centennial Way, Tustin, CA 92780
Phone: (714) 573-3079
jking@tustinca.org

Rafaela King, Finance Director, *City of Monterey*
735 Pacific Street, Suite A, Monterey, CA 93940
Phone: (831) 646-3940
King@monterey.org

Tim Kirby, City Manager, *City of Sunnyvale*
456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA 94086
Phone: (408) 730-7911
citymgr@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Tim Kiser, City Manager, *City of Grass Valley*
125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945
Phone: (530) 274-4312
timk@cityofgrassvalley.com

Kyle Knopp, City Manager, *City of Rio Dell*
675 Wildwood Ave, Rio Dell, CA 95562
Phone: (707) 764-3532
knoppk@cityofriodell.ca.gov

Rob Knudson, Assistant Director of Finance, *County of Kings*
1400 W. Lacey Blvd, Hanford, CA 93230
Phone: (559) 852-2712
Robert.Knudson@co.kings.ca.us

Will Kolbow, City Manager, *City of Calimesa*
908 Park Ave, Calimesa, CA 92320
Phone: (909) 795-9801
wkolbow@calimesa.gov

Zach Korach, Finance Director, *City of Carlsbad*
1635 Faraday Ave., Carlsbad, CA 92008
Phone: (442) 339-2127
zach.korach@carlsbadca.gov

James Krueger, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Coronado*
1825 Strand Way, Coronado, CA 92118
Phone: (619) 522-7309
jkrueger@coronado.ca.us

Janet Kulbeck, Finance Supervisor, *City of Montclair*
5111 Benito Street, Montclair, CA 91763
Phone: (909) 626-8571
jkulbeck@cityofmontclair.org

Lisa Kurokawa, Bureau Chief for Audits, *State Controller's Office*
Compliance Audits Bureau, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 327-3138
lkurokawa@sco.ca.gov

Mali LaGoe, City Manager, *City of Scotts Valley*
1 Civic Center Drive, Scotts Valley, CA 95066
Phone: (831) 440-5600
mlagoe@scottsvally.gov

Edward Lamb, Director of Finance, *County of Glenn*
516 West Sycamore Street, Willows, CA 95988
Phone: (530) 934-6421
ttc@countyofglenn.net

Ramon Lara, City Administrator, *City of Woodlake*
350 N. Valencia Blvd., Woodlake, CA 93286
Phone: (559) 564-8055
rlara@ci.woodlake.ca.us

Nancy Lassey, Finance Administrator, *City of Lake Elsinore*
130 South Main Street, Lake Elsinore, CA 92530
Phone: N/A
nlassey@lake-elsinore.org

Deborah Lauchner, Chief Financial Officer, *City of Santa Rosa*
90 Santa Rosa Avenue, City Hall Annex, 2nd Floor, Santa Rosa, CA 95404
Phone: (707) 543-3140
finance@srcity.org

Government Law Intake, *Department of Justice*
Attorney General's Office, 1300 I Street, Suite 125, PO Box 944255, Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
Phone: (916) 210-6046
governmentlawintake@doj.ca.gov

Eric Lawyer, Legislative Advocate, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
Government Finance and Administration, 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 650-8112
elawyer@counties.org

Kim-Anh Le, Deputy Controller, *County of San Mateo*
555 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
Phone: (650) 599-1104
kle@smcgov.org

Linda Leaver, Finance Director, *City of Crescent City*
377 J Street, Crescent City, CA 95531
Phone: (707) 464-7483
lleaver@crescentcity.org

Kathy LeBlanc, City Clerk, *City of Loyalton*
605 School Street, P.O. Box 128, Loyalton, CA 96118
Phone: (530) 993-6750
ofclerk-cityofloyalton@psln.com

Jason Ledbetter, Town Manager, *Town of Woodside*
2955 Woodside Road, Woodside, CA 94062

Phone: (650) 851-6790
jledbetter@woodsideca.gov

Krysten Lee, Finance Director, *City of Newark*
37101 Newark Blvd, Newark, CA 94560
Phone: (510) 578-4288
krysten.lee@newark.org

Fernando Lemus, Principal Accountant - Auditor, *County of Los Angeles*
Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 West Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 974-0324
flemus@auditor.lacounty.gov

Grace Leung, City Manager, *City of Newport Beach*
100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660
Phone: (949) 644-3001
gleung@newportbeachca.gov

Jim Lewis, City Manager, *City of Atascadero*
Finance Department, 6500 Palma Ave, Atascadero, CA 93422
Phone: (805) 461-7612
jlewis@atascadero.org

Erika Li, Chief Deputy Director, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, 10th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
erika.li@dof.ca.gov

Midori Lichtwardt, City Manager, *City of Tracy*
333 Civic Center Plaza, Tracy, CA 95376
Phone: (209) 831-6115
cm@cityoftracy.org

Pearl Lieu, Director of Finance, *City of Alhambra*
111 South First Street, Alhambra, CA 91801
Phone: (626) 570-5020
plieu@cityofalhambra.org

Mark Linder, Interim Town Manager, *Town of Portola Valley*
765 Portola Road, Portola Valley, CA 94028
Phone: (650) 851-1700
pvtownmanager@portolavalley.net

Jim Lindley, City Manager, *City of Dixon*
600 East A Street, Dixon, CA 95620
Phone: (707) 678-7000
jlindley@cityofdixonca.gov

Lance Lippincott, City Manager, *City of Shafter*
336 Pacific Ave. , Shafter, CA 93263
Phone: (661) 746-5000
LLippincott@Shafter.com

Dorothy Long, City Treasurer, *City of Alturas*
200 W. North Street, Alturas, CA 96101
Phone: (530) 233-2512
dlong@cityofalturas.us

Antony Lopez, City Manager, *City of Avenal*
919 Skyline Boulevard, Avenal, CA 93204
Phone: (559) 401-9837
alopez@cityofavenal.us

Christopher Lopez, City Manager, *City of California City*
21000 Hacienda Blvd, California City, CA 93505
Phone: (760) 373-7170
clopez@californiacity-ca.gov

Robert Lopez, City Manager, *City of Cerritos*
18125 Bloomfield Ave, Cerritos, CA 90703
Phone: (562) 916-1310
ralopez@cerritos.us

Kenneth Louie, Chief Counsel, *Department of Finance*
1021 O. Street, Suite 3110, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 322-0971
Kenny.Louie@dof.ca.gov

Brian Loventhal, City Manager, *City of Campbell*
70 North First Street, Campbell, CA 95008
Phone: (408) 866-2100
dianaj@cityofcampbell.com

Everett Luc, Accounting Administrator I, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*
3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0766
ELuc@sco.ca.gov

Jessaca Lugo, City Manager, *City of Shasta Lake*
4477 Main Street, Shasta Lake, CA 96019
Phone: (530) 275-7400
jlugo@cityofshastalake.org

Elizabeth Luna, Accounting Services Manager, *City of Suisun City*
701 Civic Center Blvd, Suisun City, CA 94585
Phone: (707) 421-7320
eluna@suisun.com

Janet Luzzi, Finance Director, *City of Arcata*
Finance Department, 736 F Street, Arcata, CA 95521
Phone: (707) 822-5951
finance@cityofarcata.org

Christopher Macon, City Manager, *City of Laguna Woods*
24264 El Toro Road, Laguna Woods, CA 92637
Phone: (714) 639-0500
cmacon@cityoflagunawoods.org

Van Maddox, Auditor/Treasurer/Tax Collector, *County of Sierra*
211 Nevada Street, 2nd Floor, P.O. Box 425, Downieville, CA 95936
Phone: (530) 289-3273
auttc@sierracounty.ca.gov

Martin Magana, City Manager/Finance Director, *City of Desert Hot Springs*
Finance Department, 65-950 Pierson Blvd, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

Phone: (760) 329-6411, Ext.
CityManager@cityofdhs.org

Carmen Magana, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Santa Clarita*
23920 Valencia Blvd, Santa Clarita, CA 91355
Phone: (661) 255-4997
cmagana@santa-clarita.com

Jill Magee, Program Analyst, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
Jill.Magee@csm.ca.gov

Kathy Magenheimer, Acting Accounting/Grants Manager, *City of Marysville*
Administration and Finance Department, 526 C Street, Marysville, CA 95901
Phone: (530) 749-3903
kmagenheimer@marysville.ca.us

Amanda Mager, City Manager, *City of Blue Lake*
111 Greenwood Rd, Blue Lake, CA 95525-0458
Phone: (707) 668-5655
citymanager@bluelake.ca.gov

Jennifer Maguire, City Manager, *City of San Jose*
200 East Santa Clara Street, San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 535-8111
Jennifer.Maguire@sanjoseca.gov

Licette Maldonado, Administrative Services Director, *City of Carpinteria*
5775 Carpinteria Avenue, Carpinteria, CA 93013
Phone: (805) 755-4448
licettem@carpinteriaca.gov

Lisa Malek-Zadeh, Interim Finance Director, *City of Piedmont*
120 Vista Avenue, Piedmont, CA 94611
Phone: (510) 420-3045
lmalekzadeh@Piedmont.ca.gov

Hrant Manuelian, Director of Finance/City Treasurer, *City of Lawndale*
14717 Burin Avenue, Lawndale, CA 90260
Phone: (310) 973-3200
hmanuelian@lawndalecity.org

Darryl Mar, Manager, *State Controller's Office*
Local Reimbursements Section, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
DMar@sco.ca.gov

Terri Marsh, Finance Director, *City of Signal Hill*
Finance, 2175 Cherry Ave., Signal Hill, CA 90755
Phone: (562) 989-7319
Financel@cityofsignalhill.org

Cyndie Martel, Town Clerk and Administrative Manager, *Town of Ross*
31 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, PO Box 320, Ross, CA 94957
Phone: (415) 453-1453
cmartel@townofross.org

Barbara Martin, Administrative Services Director, *City of Chico*
411 Main St., Chico, CA 95927
Phone: (530) 879-7300
barbara.martin@chicoca.gov

Pio Martin, Finance Manager, *City of Firebaugh*
Finance Department, 1133 P Street, Firebaugh, CA 93622
Phone: (559) 659-2043
financedirector@ci.firebaugh.ca.us

Patrick Martinez, City Manager, *City of Needles*
817 Third Street, Needles, CA 92363
Phone: (760) 326-2113
pmartinez@cityofneedles.com

Alma Martinez, City Manager, *City of El Monte*
11333 Valley Blvd, El Monte, CA 91731-3293
Phone: (626) 580-2274
amartinez@elmonteca.gov

Lana Martinez-Davis, Senior Administrative Analyst, *City of Santa Cruz*
701 Ocean Street, Room 520, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 454-2100
lana.martinezdavis@santacruzcountyca.gov

Ensen Mason, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector, *County of San Bernardino*
268 West Hospitality Lane, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018
Phone: (909) 387-8322
webinfo@sbcountyatc.gov

Ken Matsumiya, Director of Finance, *City of Vacaville*
650 Merchant Street, Vacaville, CA 95688
Phone: (707) 449-5450
Ken.Matsumiya@cityofvacaville.com

Dennice Maxwell, Finance Director, *City of Redding*
Finance Department, 3rd Floor City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA 96001
Phone: (530) 225-4079
finance@cityofredding.org

Kevin McCarthy, Director of Finance, *City of Indian Wells*
Finance Department, 44-950 Eldorado Drive, Indian Wells, CA 92210-7497
Phone: (760) 346-2489
kmccarthy@indianwells.com

Suzanne McDonald, Financial Operations Manager, *City of Concord*
Finance Department, 1950 Parkside Drive, MS 06, Concord, CA 94519
Phone: (925) 671-3136
Suzanne.McDonald@cityofconcord.org

Bridgette McInally, Accounting Manager, *City of Buena Ventura*
Finance and Technology, 501 Poli Street, Ventura, CA 93001
Phone: (805) 654-7812
bmcinally@ci.ventura.ca.us

Randy McKeegan, Finance Director, *City of Bakersfield*
1600 Truxtun Avenue, Bakersfield, CA 93301

Phone: (661) 326-3742
RMcKeegan@bakersfieldcity.us

Larry McLaughlin, City Manager, *City of Sebastopol*
7120 Bodega Avenue, P.O. Box 1776, Sebastopol, CA 95472
Phone: (707) 823-1153
lwmclaughlin@juno.com

Jon McMillen, City Manager, *City of La Quinta*
78-495 Calle Tampico, La Quinta, CA 92253
Phone: (760) 777-7030
jmcmillen@laquintaca.gov

Conal McNamara, City Manager, *City of Whittier*
13230 Penn Street, Whittier, CA 90602
Phone: (562) 567-9300
admin@cityofwhittier.org

Paul Melikian, *City of Reedley*
1717 Ninth Street, Reedley, CA 93654
Phone: (559) 637-4200
paul.melikian@reedley.ca.gov

Brittany Mello, Administrative Services Director, *City of Menlo Park*
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025
Phone: (650) 330-6675
bkmello@menlopark.gov

Erica Melton, Director of Finance / City Treasurer, *City of San Fernando*
117 Macneil Street, San Fernando, CA 91340
Phone: (818) 898-1212
EMelton@sfcity.org

Rebecca Mendenhall, *City of San Carlos*
600 Elm Street, P.O. Box 3009, San Carlos, CA 94070-1309
Phone: (650) 802-4205
rmendenhall@cityofsancarlos.org

Michelle Mendoza, *MAXIMUS*
17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340, Irvine, CA 95403
Phone: (949) 440-0845
michellemendoza@maximus.com

Olga Mendoza, *City of Ceres*
2220 Magnolia Street, Ceres, CA 95307
Phone: (209) 538-5766
olga.mendoza@ci.ceres.ca.us

Luis Mercado, Auditor, *County of Mariposa*
4982 10th Street, PO Box 729, Mariposa, CA 95338
Phone: (209) 966-7606
lmercado@mariposacounty.org

Dawn Merchant, *City of Antioch*
P.O. Box 5007, Antioch, CA 94531
Phone: (925) 779-7055
dmerchant@ci.antioch.ca.us

Brant Mesker, City Manager, *City of Corning*

794 Third Street, Corning, CA 96021

Phone: N/A

bmesker@corning.org

Keith Metzler, City Manager, *City of Victorville*

14343 Civic Drive, PO Box 5001, Victorville, CA 92393-5001

Phone: (760) 955-5029

kmetzler@victorvilleca.gov

Ron Millard, Finance Director, *City of Vallejo*

Finance Department, 555 Santa Clara Street, 3rd Floor, Vallejo, CA 94590

Phone: (707) 648-4592

alison.hughes@cityofvallejo.net

Kristina Miller, City Manager, *City of Rio Vista*

One Main Street, Rio Vista, CA 94571

Phone: (707) 374-6451

kmiller@ci.rio-vista.ca.us

Leyne Milstein, Interim City Manager, *City of Sacramento*

915 I Street, 5th Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514

Phone: (916) 808-8491

lmilstein@cityofsacramento.org

Manuel Minjares, Assistant City Manager, *City of Fillmore*

250 Central Avenue, Fillmore, CA 93015

Phone: N/A

mminjares@fillmoreca.gov

Clara Miramontes, City Manager, *City of Perris*

101 N. D Street, Perris, CA 92570

Phone: (951) 943-6100

cmiramontes@cityofperris.org

Julian Miranda, City Manager, *City of Irwindale*

5050 N Irwindale Avenue, Irwindale, CA 91706

Phone: (626) 430-2217

jmiranda@irwindaleca.gov

Talyn Mirzakhanian, City Manager, *City of Manhattan Beach*

1400 Highland Ave., Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Phone: (310) 802-5302

tmirzakhanian@citymb.info

Graham Mitchell, City Manager, *City of El Cajon*

200 Civic Center Way, El Cajon, CA 92020

Phone: (619) 441-1716

citymanager@elcajon.gov

Jeff Mitchem, City Administrator, *City of Etna*

442 Main Street, PO Box 460, Etna, CA 96027-0460

Phone: (530) 467-5256

j.mitchem@etnaca.com

Scott Mitnick, Town Manager, *Town of Moraga*

329 Rheem Boulevard, Moraga, CA 94556

Phone: (925) 888-7020
smitnick@moraga.ca.us

Kevin Mizuno, Finance Director, *City of Clayton*
Finance Department, 600 Heritage Trail, Clayton, CA 94517
Phone: (925) 673-7309
kmizuno@ci.clayton.ca.us

Brian Mohan, Chief Financial Officer, *City of Moreno Valley*
14177 Frederick Street, PO Box 88005, Moreno Valley, CA 92552
Phone: (951) 413-3021
brianm@moval.org

Rachel Molina, City Manager, *City of Hesperia*
9700 Seventh Ave. , Hesperia, CA 92345
Phone: (760) 947-1018
rmolina@cityofhesperia.us

Monica Molina, Finance Manager/Treasurer, *City of Del Mar*
1050 Camino Del Mar, Del Mar, CA 92014
Phone: (858) 755-9354
mmolina@delmar.ca.us

Gloria Molleda, Interim City Manager, *City of Hidden Hills*
6165 Spring Valley Road, Hidden Hills, CA 91302
Phone: (818) 888-9281
gloria@hiddenhillscity.org

Debbie Moreno, Finance Director, *City of Anaheim*
200 S. Anaheim Boulevard, Anaheim, CA 92805
Phone: (716) 765-5192
DMoreno@anaheim.net

Isaac Moreno, Finance Director, *City of Turlock*
156 South Broadway, Suite 230, Turlock, CA 95380
Phone: (209) 668-6071
IMoreno@turlock.ca.us

Dennis Morita, City Manager, *City of Imperial*
420 South Imperial Ave., Imperial, CA 92251
Phone: (760) 355-4373
dmorita@imperial.ca.gov

Jill Moya, Financial Services Director, *City of Oceanside*
300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054
Phone: (760) 435-3887
jmoya@oceansideca.org

Marilyn Munoz, Senior Staff Counsel, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-8918
Marilyn.Munoz@dof.ca.gov

Bill Mushallo, Finance Director, *City of Petaluma*
Finance Department, 11 English St., Petaluma, CA 94952
Phone: (707) 778-4352
financeemail@ci.petaluma.ca.us

John Nachbar, City Manager, *City of Culver City*
9770 Culver Blvd, Culver City, CA 90232
Phone: (310) 253-6000
john.nachbar@culvercity.org

Renee Nagel, Finance Director, *City of Visalia*
707 W. Acequia Avenue, City Hall West, Visalia, CA 93291
Phone: (559) 713-4375
Renee.Nagel@visalia.city

Haj Nahal, Assistant Auditor-Controller, *County of Contra Costa*
1025 Escobar Street, Martinez, CA 94553
Phone: (925) 608-9300
haj.nahal@ac.cccounty.us

Shay Narayan, Finance Director, *City of Manteca*
1001 West Center Street, Manteca, CA 95337
Phone: (209) 456-8730
snarayan@mantecagov.com

Tim Nash, Director of Finance, *City of Encinitas*
505 S Vulcan Avenue, Encinitas, CA 92054
Phone: N/A
finmail@encinitasca.gov

Renee Neermann, Finance Manager, *City of Malibu*
23825 Stuart Ranch Road, Malibu, CA 90265
Phone: (310) 456-2489
RNeermann@malibucity.org

David Neill, Chief Counsel, *Office of Emergency Services*
3650 Schriever Ave, Mather, CA 95655
Phone: (916) 845-8510
David.Neill@caloes.ca.gov

Kaleb Neufeld, Assistant Controller, *City of Fresno*
2600 Fresno Street, Fresno, CA 93721
Phone: (559) 621-2489
Kaleb.Neufeld@fresno.gov

Keith Neves, Director of Finance/City Treasurer, *City of Lake Forest*
Finance Department, 100 Civic Center Drive, Lake Forest, CA 92630
Phone: (949) 461-3430
kneves@lakeforestca.gov

Tim Nevin, Director of Finance and Administrative Services, *City of Daly City*
333 90th Street, Daly City, CA 94015
Phone: (650) 991-8040
tnevin@dalycity.org

Dan Newton, City Manager, *City of Susanville*
66 North Lassen Street, Susanville, CA 96130
Phone: (530) 252-5106
dnewton@cityofsusanville.org

Dat Nguyen, Finance Director, *City of Morgan Hill*
17575 Peak Avenue, Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Phone: (408) 779-7237
dat.nguyen@morganhill.ca.gov

Trang Nguyen, Director of Finance, *City of Orange*
300 E. Chapman Avenue, Orange, CA 92866-1508
Phone: (714) 744-2230
nguyent@cityoforange.org

John Nibbelin, County Attorney, *County of San Mateo*
500 County Center, Redwood City, CA 94063
Phone: (650) 363-4757
jnibbelin@smcgov.org

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*
1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Dale Nielsen, Director of Finance/Treasurer, *City of Vista*
Finance Department, 200 Civic Center Drive, Vista, CA 92084
Phone: (760) 726-1340
dnielsen@ci.vista.ca.us

Martee Nieman, Auditor-Controller, *County of Plumas*
520 Main Street, Room 205, Quincy, CA 95971
Phone: (530) 283-6246
marteenieman@countyofplumas.com

Amy Nilsen, City Manager, *City of Fortuna*
621 11th Street, Fortuna, CA 95540
Phone: (707) 725-1410
anilsen@ci.fortuna.ca.us

Robert Nisbet, City Manager, *City of Goleta*
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117
Phone: (805) 961-7501
misbet@cityofgoleta.org

David Noce, Accounting Division Manager, *City of Santa Clara*
1500 Warburton Ave, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Phone: (408) 615-2341
dnoce@santaclaraca.gov

Vibeke Norgaard, City Manager, *City of Sand City*
1 Pendergrass Way, Sand City, CA 93955
Phone: (831) 394-3054
vibeke@sandcityca.org

Vontray Norris, City Manager Director of Community Services, *City of Hawthorne*
4455 W 126th St, Hawthorne, CA 90250
Phone: (310) 349-2908
vnorris@hawthorneca.gov

Kiely Nose, Interim Director of Administrative Services, *City of Palo Alto*
250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
Phone: (650) 329-2692
Kiely.Nose@cityofpaloalto.org

Damien O'Bid, City Manager, *City of Cotati*
201 W Sierra Avenue, Cotati, CA 94931
Phone: (707) 665-3622
dobid@cotaticity.gov

Michael O'Brien, Administrative Services Director, *City of San Dimas*
245 East Bonita Ave, San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone: (909) 394-6200
mobrien@sandimasca.gov

Patrick O'Connell, County Clerk Recorder, *County of Alameda*
1221 Oak Street, Room 249, Oakland, CA 94512
Phone: (510) 272-6565
pat.oconnell@acgov.org

Michael O'Kelly, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Fullerton*
303 West Commonwealth Avenue, Fullerton, CA 92832
Phone: (714) 738-6803
mokelly@cityoffullerton.com

Jim O'Leary, Finance Director, *City of San Bruno*
567 El Camino Real, San Bruno, CA 94066
Phone: (650) 616-7080
webfinance@sanbruno.ca.gov

Scott Ochoa, City Manager, *City of Ontario*
393 E. B Street, Ontario, CA 91764
Phone: (909) 395-2010
sochoa@ontarioca.gov

Karen Ogawa, Finance Director, *City of West Covina*
1444 West Garvey Street South, West Covina, CA 91790
Phone: (626) 939-8438
kogawa@westcovina.org

Margaret Olaiya, Director of Finance, *County of Santa Clara*
Claimant Contact
70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 2nd Floor, San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5201
Margaret.Olaiya@fin.sccgov.org

Diane Olson, Auditor-Controller, *County of Siskiyou*
311 Fourth Street, Room 101, Yreka, CA 96097
Phone: (530) 842-8078
dlolson@co.siskiyou.ca.us

Brenda Olwin, Finance Director, *City of East Palo Alto*
2415 University Avenue, East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 853-3122
financedepartment@cityofepa.org

Erika Opp, Administrative Analyst, *City of St. Helena*
City Clerk, 1480 Main Street, St. Helena, CA 94574
Phone: (707) 968-2743
eopp@cityofstheleena.gov

Mark Orme, City Manager, *City of Eastvale*
12363 Limonite Avenue, Suite 910, Eastvale, CA 91752

Phone: (951) 703-4479
morme@eastvaleca.gov

Cathy Orme, Finance Director, *City of Larkspur*
Finance Department, 400 Magnolia Ave, Larkspur, CA 94939
Phone: (415) 927-5019
cathy.orme@cityoflarkspur.org

John Ornelas, Interim City Manager, *City of Huntington Park*
, 6550 Miles Avenue, Huntington Park, CA 90255
Phone: (323) 584-6223
scrum@hpcg.gov

Jennifer Ott, City Manager, *City of Alameda*
2263 Santa Clara Ave, Room 320, Alameda, CA 94501
Phone: (510) 747-4700
manager@alamedaca.gov

Patricia Pacot, Accountant Auditor I, *County of Colusa*
Office of Auditor-Controller, 546 Jay Street, Suite #202, Colusa, CA 95932
Phone: (530) 458-0424
ppacot@countyofcolusa.org

Arthur Palkowitz, *Law Offices of Arthur M. Palkowitz*
12807 Calle de la Siena, San Diego, CA 92130
Phone: (858) 259-1055
law@artpalk.onmicrosoft.com

Kirsten Pangilinan, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*
Local Reimbursements Section, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-2446
KPangilinan@sco.ca.gov

Deborah Paolinelli, Assistant County Administrative Officer, *County of Fresno*
2281 Tulare, Suite 304, Fresno, CA 93271
Phone: (559) 600-1710
dpaolinelli@fresnocountyca.gov

Alice Park-Renzie, *County of Alameda*
CAO, 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: (510) 272-3873
Alice.Park@acgov.org

Yamini Pathak, Director of Finance, *City of Industry*
15625 Mayor Dave Way, City of Industry, CA 91744
Phone: (626) 333-2211
ypathak@cityofindustry.org

Luis Patlan, City Manager, *City of Dinuba*
405 E. El Monte Way, Dinuba, CA 93618
Phone: (559) 591-5900
LPatlan@dinuba.ca.gov

Rob Patterson, Town Manager, *Town of Mammoth Lakes*
437 Old Mammoth Road, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
Phone: (760) 965-3601
rpatterson@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov

Bill Pattison, Finance Director, *City of Coachella*
1515 Sixth St., Coachella, CA 92236
Phone: (760) 398-3502
bpattison@coachella.org

Nancy Pauley, Director of Finance, *City of Palm Springs*
3200 E. Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs, CA 92262
Phone: (760) 323-8229
Nancy.Pauley@palmspringsca.gov

Virginia Penaloza, City Manager, *City of Huron*
36311 Lassen Avenue, PO Box 339, Huron, CA 93234
Phone: (559) 945-3827
Virginia@cityofhuron.com

Diana Perkins, Interim City Manager, *City of Monte Sereno*
18041 Saratoga-Los Gatos Road, Monte Sereno, CA 95030
Phone: (408) 354-7635
cityclerk@cityofmontesereno.org

David Persselin, Finance Director, *City of Fremont*
3300 Capitol Ave, Fremont, CA 94538
Phone: (510) 494-4790
DPersselin@fremont.gov

Krista Peterson, Auditor-Controller, *County of Tehama*
444 Oak Street, Room J, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Phone: (530) 527-3474
kpeterson@tehama.gov

Joan Phillipe, Interim City Manager, *City of Nevada City*
317 Broad Street, Nevada City, CA 95959
Phone: (530) 265-2496
Joan.Phillipe@nevadacityca.gov

Jim Pia, interim City Manager, *City of Hollister*
375 Fifth Street, Hollister, CA 95023
Phone: (831) 636-4300
COH.Manager@hollister.ca.gov

Marcus Pimentel, *City of Santa Cruz*
701 Ocean Street, Room 520, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 454-2100
dl_Finance@cityofsantacruz.com

Johnnie Pina, Legislative Policy Analyst, *League of Cities*
1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 658-8214
jpina@cacities.org

Steven Pinkerton, City Manager, *City of Mountain House*
251 E. Main Street, Mountain House, CA 95391
Phone: (209) 831-2300
spinkerton@sjgov.org

Peter Pirnejad, City Manager, *Town of Los Altos Hills*
26379 Fremont Road, Los Altos Hills, CA 94022

Phone: (650) 941-7222
ppirnejad@losaltoshills.ca.gov

Adam Pirrie, City Manager and Acting Finance Director, *City of Claremont*
207 Harvard Ave, Claremont, CA 91711
Phone: (909) 399-5456
apirrie@ci.claremont.ca.us

Sheila Poisson, Finance Director, *City of Torrance*
Finance Department, 3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503
Phone: (310) 618-5850
SPoisson@TorranceCA.Gov

Neil Polzin, City Treasurer, *City of Covina*
125 East College Street, Covina, CA 91723
Phone: (626) 384-5400
npolzin@covinaca.gov

Brian Ponty, *City of Redwood City*
1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA 94063
Phone: (650) 780-7300
finance@redwoodcity.org

Diona Pope, Finance Director, *City of Yuba City*
1201 Civic Center Blvd, Yuba City, CA 95993
Phone: (530) 822-4615
dpope@yubacity.net

Trevor Power, Accounting Manager, *City of Newport Beach*
100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach , CA 92660
Phone: (949) 644-3085
tpower@newportbeachca.gov

Rajneil Prasad, Deputy Finance Director, *City of Napa*
955 School Street, PO Box 660, Napa, CA 94559
Phone: (707) 257-9510
rprasad@cityofnapa.org

Mark Prestwich, City Manager, *City of Hemet*
445 East Florida Avenue, Hemet, CA 92543
Phone: (951) 765-2301
mprestwich@hemetca.gov

Tom Prill, Finance Director, *City of San Jacinto*
Finance Department, 595 S. San Jacinto Ave., Building B, San Jacinto, CA 92583
Phone: (951) 487-7340
tprill@sanjacintoca.gov

Rod Pruett, City Administrator, *City of Chowchilla*
130 South 2nd Street, Chowchilla, CA 93610
Phone: (559) 665-8615
RPruett@cityofchowchilla.org

Laura Pruneda, Finance Director, *City of Marina*
211 Hillcrest Avenue, Marina, CA 93933
Phone: (831) 884-1221
lpruneda@cityofmarina.org

Mubeen Qader, Acting Director of Finance, *City of Richmond*
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804
Phone: (510) 620-2077
Mubeen_Qader@ci.richmond.ca.us

Jonathan Quan, Associate Accountant, *County of San Diego*
Projects, Revenue, and Grants Accounting, 5530 Overland Ave, Suite 410, San Diego, CA 92123
Phone: 6198768518
Jonathan.Quan@sdcounty.ca.gov

Frank Quintero, *City of Merced*
678 West 18th Street, Merced, CA 95340
Phone: N/A
quinterof@cityofmerced.org

Sean Rabe, City Manager, *City of Auburn*
1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, CA 95603
Phone: (530) 823-4211
srabe@auburn.ca.gov

Juan Raigoza, Auditor-Controller, *County of San Mateo*
555 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
Phone: (650) 363-4777
jraigoza@smcgov.org

Jerry Ramar, Interim City Manager, *City of Oakdale*
280 N. Third Avenue, Oakdale, CA 95361
Phone: (209) 845-3571
jramar@oakdaleca.gov

Claudia Ramirez, Junior Accountant, *City of Montclair*
5111 Benito Street, Montclair, CA 91763
Phone: (909) 626-8571
cramirez@cityofmontclair.org

Vina Ramos, Finance Director, *City of Rancho Palos Verdes*
30940 Hawthorne Blvd., Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275
Phone: (310) 544-5278
vramos@rpvca.gov

Derek Rampone, Finance and Administrative Services Director, *City of Mountain View*
500 Castro Street, Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 903-6316
Derek.Rampone@mountainview.gov

James Ramsey, Finance Director, *City of Live Oak*
Finance, 9955 Live Oak Blvd, Live Oak, CA 95953
Phone: (530) 695-2112
jramsey@liveoakcity.org

Paul Rankin, Finance Director, *City of Orinda*
22 Orinda Way, Second Floor, Orinda, CA 94563
Phone: (925) 253-4224
prankin@cityoforinda.org

Roberta Raper, Director of Finance, *City of West Sacramento*
1110 West Capitol Ave, West Sacramento, CA 95691

Phone: (916) 617-4509
robertar@cityofwestsacramento.org

Brad Raulston, Town Manager, *Town of Yountville*
6550 Yount Street, Yountville, CA 94599
Phone: (707) 944-8851
braulston@yville.com

Crystal Reams, Finance Director, *City of El Cerrito*
10890 San Pablo Ave, El Cerrito, CA 95430-2392
Phone: (510) 215-4335
creams@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us

Linda Reich, City Manager, *City of Chino*
13220 Central Avenue, Chino, CA 91710
Phone: (909) 334-3304
lreich@cityofchino.org

Mike Reid, Interim City Manager, *City of Fowler*
2035 Tulare Street Suite 201, Fresno, CA 93721
Phone: (559) 834-3113
mreid@ci.fowler.ca.us

Chip Rerig, City Administrator, *City of Carmel by the Sea*
P.O. Box CC, Carmel-by-the-Sea, CA 93921
Phone: (831) 620-2058
crerig@ci.carmel.ca.us

Jose Reynoso, City Manager, *City of Sierra Madre*
232 W. Sierra Madre Blvd, Sierra Madre, CA 91024
Phone: (626) 355-7135
jreynoso@sierramadrecal.gov

Terry Rhodes, Accounting Manager, *City of Wildomar*
23873 Clinton Keith Rd., Suite 201, Wildomar, CA 92595
Phone: (951) 677-7751
trhodes@cityofwildomar.org

Marie Ricci, Administrative Services Director/City Treasurer, *City of Glendora*
116 East Foothill Road, Glendora, CA 91741-3380
Phone: (626) 914-8245
mricci@cityofglendora.org

David Richstone, Auditor-Controller, *County of Madera*
200 W. 4th Street, Madera, CA 93637
Phone: (559) 675-7707
David.Richstone@maderacounty.com

Jennifer Riedeman, Director of Finance, *City of Patterson*
1 Plaza Circle, Patterson, CA 95363
Phone: (209) 895-8046
jriedeman@ci.patterson.ca.us

Dustin Rief, City Manager, *City of Dunsmuir*
5915 Dunsmuir Ave, Dunsmuir, CA 96025
Phone: (530) 235-4822
citymanager@ci.dunsmuir.ca.us

Jessica Riley, Finance Director, *City of Seaside*
440 Harcourt Ave., Seaside, CA
Phone: (831) 899-6716
jriley@ci.seaside.ca.us

Brian Ring, City Administrator, *City of Oroville*
Office of the City Administrator, 1735 Montgomery Street, Oroville, CA 95965
Phone: (530) 538-2535
bring@cityoforoville.org

Rosa Rios, *City of Delano*
1015 11th Ave., Delano, CA 93216
Phone: N/A
rrios@cityofdelano.org

Luke Rioux, Finance Director, *City of Goleta*
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117
Phone: (805) 961-7500
Lrioux@cityofgoleta.org

Mark Roberts, Director of Finance, *City of Salinas*
200 Lincoln Ave, Salinas, CA 93901
Phone: (831) 758-7211
Dof@ci.salinas.ca.us

David Roberts, City Manager, *City of Carson*
701 E. Carson St, Carson, CA 90745
Phone: (310) 952-1730
DRoberts@carsonca.gov

Monica Rocha, *County of Santa Cruz*
701 Ocean Street, Room 340, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Phone: (831) 454-2440
monica.rocha@santacruzcountyca.gov

Rob Rockwell, Director of Finance, *City of Indio*
Finance Department, 100 Civic Center Mall, Indio, CA 92201
Phone: (760) 391-4029
rrockwell@indio.org

George Rodericks, City Manager, *Town of Atherton*
91 Ashfield Road, Atherton, CA 94027
Phone: (650) 752-0504
grodericks@ci.atherton.ca.us

Paul Rodrigues, Director of Finance, *City of Pittsburg*
65 Civic Avenue, Pittsburg, CA 94565
Phone: (925) 252-4848
prodriques@pittsburgca.gov

Janie Rodriguez, Finance Director, *City of Porterville*
291 North Main Street, Porterville, CA 93257
Phone: (559) 782-7566
jrodriguez@ci.porterville.ca.us

Arnoldo Rodriguez, City Manager, *City of Madera*
205 W 4th Street , Madera, CA 93637

Phone: (559) 661-5402
arodriguez@madera.gov

Erick Roeser, Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Sonoma*
585 Fiscal Drive, Suite 100, Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Phone: (707) 565-3285
Erick.Roeser@sonoma-county.org

Lydia Romero, City Manager, *City of Lemon Grove*
3232 Main Street, Lemon Grove, CA 91945
Phone: (619) 825-3819
lromero@lemongrove.ca.gov

Benjamin Rosenfield, City Controller, *City and County of San Francisco*
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 316, San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 554-7500
ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org

Tacy Oneto Rouen, Auditor, *County of Amador*
810 Court Street, Jackson, CA 95642-2131
Phone: (209) 223-6357
trouen@amadorgov.org

Tammi Royales, Director of Finance, *City of La Mesa*
8130 Allison Avenue, PO Box 937, La Mesa, CA 91944-0937
Phone: (619) 463-6611
findir@cityoflamesa.us

Micah Runner, City Manager, *City of Rancho Cordova*
2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 851-8700
mrunner@cityofranchocordova.org

Cynthia Russell, Chief Financial Officer/City Treasurer, *City of San Juan Capistrano*
Finance Department, 32400 Paseo Adelanto, San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
Phone: (949) 443-6343
crussell@sanjuancapistrano.org

Jim Sadro, City Manager, *City of La Habra*
110 E. La Habra Blvd., La Habra, CA 90631
Phone: (562) 383-4474
jsadro@lahabraca.gov

Rene Salas, City Manager, *City of South El Monte*
1415 Santa Anita Avenue, South El Monte, CA 91733
Phone: (626) 579-6540
rsalas@soelmonte.org

Stephen Salvatore, City Manager, *City of Lathrop*
Lathrop City Hall, 390 Towne Center Drive, Lathrop, CA 95330
Phone: (209) 941-7220
ssalvatore@ci.lathrop.ca.us

Janelle Samson, Director of Finance, *City of Palmdale*
38300 Sierra Highway, Suite D, Palmdale, CA 93550
Phone: (661) 267-5440
jsamson@cityofpalmdale.org

Tony Sandhu, Interim Finance Director, *City of Capitola*
Finance Department, 480 Capitola Ave, Capitola, CA 95010
Phone: (831) 475-7300
tsandhu@ci.capitola.ca.us

Sage Sangiacomo, City Manager, *City of Ukiah*
300 Seminary Avenue , Ukiah, CA 95482
Phone: (707) 463-6217
ssangiacomo@cityofukiah.com

Jessica Sankus, Senior Legislative Analyst, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*
Government Finance and Administration, 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 327-7500
jsankus@counties.org

Fernando Santillan, City Manager, *City of Selma*
1710 Tucker Street, Selma, CA 93662
Phone: (559) 891-2200
FernandoS@CityofSelma.com

Will Sargent, Finance Director, *City of Tulelake*
591 Main Street, Tulelake, CA 96134
Phone: (530) 667-5522
info@cityoftulelake.com

Lori Sassoon, City Manager, *City of Norco*
2870 Clark Avenue, Norco, CA 92860
Phone: (951) 270-5617
LSassoon@ci.norco.ca.us

Clinton Schaad, *County of Del Norte*
981 H Street, Suite 140, Crescent City , CA 95531
Phone: (707) 464-7202
cschaad@co.del-norte.ca.us

Betsy Schaffer, Auditor-Controller, *County of Santa Barbara*
105 East Anapamu Street, Room 303, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Phone: (805) 568-2101
bschaffer@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

Jay Schengel, Finance Director/City Treasurer, *City of Clovis*
1033 5th Street, Clovis, CA 93612
Phone: (559) 324-2113
jays@ci.clovis.ca.us

Craig Schmollinger, Director of Finance, *City of Poway*
13325 Civic Center Drive, Poway, CA 92064
Phone: (858) 668-4411
cschmollinger@poway.org

Sarah Schoen, Director of Finance, *City of Chula Vista*
276 Fourth Avenue , Chula Vista, CA 91910
Phone: (619) 691-5117
sschoen@chulavistaca.gov

Tracy Schulze, Auditor-Controller, *County of Napa*
1195 Third Street, Suite B-10, Napa, CA 94559

Phone: (707) 299-1733
tracy.schulze@countyofnapa.org

Donna Schwartz, City Clerk, *City of Huntington Park*
6550 Miles Avenue, Huntington park, CA 90255-4393
Phone: (323) 584-6231
DSchwartz@hpcg.gov

Reina Schwartz, Director of Finance/City Treasurer, *City of Albany*
1000 San Pablo Avenue , Albany, CA 947061
Phone: (510) 528-5730
rschwartz@albanycg.org

Cindy Sconce, Director, *Government Consulting Partners*
5016 Brower Court, Granite Bay, CA 95746
Phone: (916) 276-8807
cindysconcecgcp@gmail.com

Anita Scott, City Manager, *City of Pomona*
505 South Garey Ave, Pomona, CA 91766
Phone: (909) 620-2051
Anita.Scott@pomonacg.org

Shelly Scott, Assessor-Recorder-County Clerk, *County of Marin*
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 208, San Rafael, CA 94903
Phone: (415) 473-7215
Assessor@marincountycg.org

Peggy Scroggins, *County of Colusa*
546 Jay Street, Ste 202, Colusa, CA 95932
Phone: (530) 458-0400
pscroggins@countyofcolusa.org

Kelly Sessions, Director of Administrative Services, *City of San Ramon*
Finance Department, 7000 Bollinger Canyon Road, Building #2, San Ramon, CA 94583
Phone: (925) 973-2500
ksessions@sanpablocg.org

Rupa Shah, Auditor-Controller, *County of Monterey*
168 West Alisal Street, 3rd Floor, Salinas, CA 93901
Phone: (831) 755-5040
shahr@co.monterey.ca.us

Mel Shannon, Director of Finance, *City of La Habra*
201 E. La Habra Blvd, La Habra, CA 90631
Phone: (562) 383-4050
mshannon@lahabracg.org

Terry Shea, Finance Director, *City of Canyon Lake*
31516 Railroad Canyon Road, Canyon Lake, CA 92584
Phone: (951) 244-2955
terry@ramscpg.net

Carla Shelton, Senior Legal Analyst, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
carla.shelton@csm.ca.gov

Camille Shelton, Chief Legal Counsel, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
camille.shelton@csm.ca.gov

Amy Shepherd, Auditor-Controller, *County of Inyo*
Auditor-Controller, 168 N. Edwards Street, Independence, CA 93526
Phone: (760) 878-0343
ashepherd@inyocounty.us

Nolda Short, Auditor-Controller, *County of Shasta*
1450 Court Street, Suite 238, Redding, CA 96001
Phone: (530) 245-6657
nshort@co.shasta.ca.us

Chet Simmons, City Manager, *City of Los Alamitos*
3191 Katella Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720
Phone: (562) 431-3538
csimmons@cityoflosalamitos.org

Dan Singer, City Manager, *City of Santa Paula*
970 Ventura Street, Santa Paula, CA 96061
Phone: (805) 933-4225
dsinger@spcity.org

Andrew Sisk, *County of Placer*
2970 Richardson Drive, Auburn, CA 95603
Phone: (530) 889-4026
asisk@placer.ca.gov

Kim Sitton, Director of Finance, *City of Corona*
400 South Vicentia Ave., Corona, CA 92882
Phone: (951) 279-3532
Kim.Sitton@CoronaCA.gov

Ryan Smith, Director of Finance, *City of Fountain Valley*
10200 Slater Avenue, Fountain Valley, CA 92708
Phone: (714) 593-4501
Ryan.Smith@fountainvalley.org

Eugene Solomon, City Treasurer, *City of Redondo Beach*
415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Phone: (310) 318-0657
eugene.solomon@redondo.org

Greg Sparks, City Manager, *City of Eureka*
531 K Street, Eureka, CA 95501
Phone: (707) 441-4144
cityclerk@ci.eureka.ca.gov

Kenneth Spray, Finance Director, *City of Millbrae*
621 Magnolia Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030
Phone: (650) 259-2433
kspray@ci.millbrae.ca.us

Niroop Srivatsa, City Manager, *City of Lafayette*
3675 Mount Diablo Blvd., #210, Lafayette, CA 94549

Phone: (925) 284-1968
nsrivatsa@lovelafayette.org

Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager, *City of Davis*
23 Russell Blvd, Davis, CA 95616
Phone: (560) 757-5602
kstachowicz@cityofdavis.org

Paul Steenhausen, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, , Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8303
Paul.Steenhausen@lao.ca.gov

Carolyn Steffan, City Administrator, *City of Tehama*
P.O. Box 70, Tehama, CA 96090
Phone: (530) 384-1501
cityhall@cityoftehama.us

Cherie Stephen, Town Administrator, *Town of Fort Jones*
11960 East Street, P.O. Box 40, Fort Jones, CA 96032
Phone: (530) 468-2281
cstephen@fortjonesca.com

Katherine Stevens, Director of Finance, *City of Rialto*
150 South Palm Avenue, Rialto, CA 92376
Phone: (909) 421-7242
kstevens@rialtoca.gov

Jana Stuard, Finance Director, *City of Norwalk*
12700 Norwalk Blvd, Norwalk, CA 90650
Phone: (562) 929-5748
jstuard@norwalkca.gov

Lauren Sugayan, Acting Finance Director, *City of Martinez*
525 Henrietta Street, Martinez, CA 94553
Phone: (925) 372-3579
lsugayan@cityofmartinez.org

Suzanne Sweitzer, Director of Administrative Services, *Town of Tiburon*
1505 Tiburon Boulevard, Tiburon, CA 94920
Phone: (415) 435-7373
ssweitzer@townoftiburon.org

Matthew Szabo, City Administrative Officer, *City of Los Angeles*
200 N. Main St. Suite 1500, Los Angeles, CA 90012-4137
Phone: (213) 473-7500
Matt.Szabo@lacity.org

Tatiana Szerwinski, Assistant Director of Finance, *City of Beverly Hills*
455 North Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Phone: (310) 285-2411
tszerwinski@beverlyhills.org

Rose Tam, Finance Director, *City of Baldwin Park*
14403 East Pacific Avenue, Baldwin Park, CA 91706
Phone: (626) 960-4011
rtam@baldwinpark.com

Stacey Tamagni, Director of Finance / CFO, *City of Folsom*
50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 461-6712
stamagni@folsom.ca.us

Christopher Tavarez, Finance Director, *City of Hanford*
315 North Douty Street, Hanford, CA 93230
Phone: (559) 585-2500
ctavarez@cityofhanfordca.com

Phyllis Taynton, Auditor-Controller, *County of Solano*
675 Texas Street, Suite 2800, Fairfield, CA 94533
Phone: (707) 784-6280
ptaynton@solanocounty.com

Jeri Tejeda, Human Resources Director/Acting Finance Director, *City of Oakley*
3231 Main Street, Oakley, CA 94561
Phone: (925) 625-7010
tejeda@ci.oakley.ca.us

Julie Testa, Vice Mayor, *City of Pleasanton*
123 Main Street PO Box 520, Pleasanton, CA 94566
Phone: (925) 872-6517
jtesta@cityofpleasantonca.gov

T. Jarb Thaipe Jr., City Manager, *City of Loma Linda*
25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, CA 92354
Phone: (909) 799-2810
JThaipejr@lomalinda-ca.gov

Sokniorn Than, City Manager, *City of Gustine*
352 Fifth Street, Gustine, CA 95322
Phone: (209) 854-6471
sthan@cityofgustine.com

Donna Timmerman, Financial Manager, *City of Ferndale*
Finance Department, 834 Main Street, Ferndale, CA 95535
Phone: (707) 786-4224
finance@ci.ferndale.ca.us

Jolene Tollenaar, *MGT Consulting Group*
2251 Harvard Street, Suite 134, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 243-8913
jolenetollenaar@gmail.com

Joseph Toney, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Simi Valley*
2929 Tapo Canyon Road, Simi Valley, CA 93063
Phone: (805) 583-6700
adminservices@simivalley.org

Robert Torrez, Interim Chief Financial Officer, *City of Huntington Beach*
2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Phone: (714) 536-5630
robert.torrez@surfcity-hb.org

Marissa Trejo, City Manager, *City of Lemoore*
711 W. Cinnamon Drive, Lemoore, CA 93245

Phone: (559) 924-6744
citymanager@lemoore.com

Colleen Tribby, Finance Director, *City of Dublin*
100 Civic Plaza, Dublin, CA 94568
Phone: (925) 833-6640
colleen.tribby@dublin.ca.gov

Albert Trinh, Finance Manager, *City of South Pasadena*
1414 Mission Street, South Pasadena, CA 91030
Phone: (626) 403-7250
FinanceDepartment@southpasadenaca.gov

Alex Trinidad, Acting Executive Director and City Treasurer, *City of Santa Ana*
20 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana, CA 92701
Phone: (714) 647-5295
atrinidad@santa-ana.org

Jeff Tschudi, Finance Director, *City of Benicia*
250 East L Street, Benicia, CA 94510
Phone: (707) 746-4225
JTschudi@ci.benicia.ca.us

Stefanie Turner, Finance Director, *City of Rancho Santa Margarita*
Finance Department, 22112 El Paseo, Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688
Phone: (949) 635-1808
sturner@cityofrsm.org

Mark Uribe, Finance Director, *City of Camarillo*
601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo, CA 93010
Phone: (805) 388-5320
muribe@cityofcamarillo.org

Tameka Usher, Director of Administrative Services, *City of Rocklin*
3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677
Phone: (916) 625-5050
tameka.usher@rocklin.ca.us

Jessica Uzarski, Consultant, *Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee*
1020 N Street, Room 502, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 651-4103
Jessica.Uzarski@sen.ca.gov

Nicole Valentine, Interim Director of Administrative Services, *City of Arroyo Grande*
300 E. Branch Street, Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
Phone: (804) 473-5410
nvalentine@arroyogrande.org

Julie Valverde, *County of Sacramento*
700 H Street, Room 3650, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-7248
valverdej@saccounty.net

James Vanderpool, City Manager, *City of Anaheim*
200 S. Anaheim Blvd. Ste. 733, Anaheim, CA 92805
Phone: (714) 765-5162
CityManager@anaheim.net

Jennifer Vasquez, City Manager, *City of Maywood*
4319 E. Slausen Avenue, Maywood, CA 90270
Phone: (323) 562-5700
jennifer.vasquez@cityofmaywood.org

Matthew Vespi, Chief Financial Officer, *City of San Diego*
202 C Street, 9th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 236-6218
mvespi@sandiego.gov

Andrew Vialpando, City Manager, *City of Lomita*
24300 Narbonne Ave., Lomita, CA 90717
Phone: (310) 325-7110
a.vialpando@lomitacity.com

Armando Villa, City Manager, *City of Menifee*
29844 Haun Road, Menifee, CA 92586
Phone: (951) 672-6777
avilla@cityofmenifee.us

Brian Villalobos, City Manager, *City of Duarte*
1600 Huntington Drive, Duarte, CA 91010
Phone: (626) 357-7931
bvillalobos@accessduarte.com

Alejandra Villalobos, Management Services Manager, *County of San Bernardino*
Office of Auditor-Controller, 222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415
Phone: (909) 382-3191
alejandra.villalobos@sbcountyatc.gov

Diego Viramontes, City Manager, *City of McFarland*
401 W. Kern Avenue, McFarland, CA 93250
Phone: (661) 792-3091
dviramontes@mcfarlandcity.org

Nawel Voelker, Acting Director of Finance (Management Analyst), *City of Belmont*
Finance Department, One Twin Pines Lane, Belmont, CA 94002
Phone: (650) 595-7433
nvoelker@belmont.gov

Cliff Wagner, Interim City Administrator, *City of Biggs*
465 C Street, PO Box 307, Biggs, CA 95917
Phone: (530) 868-0100
cliff.wagner@biggs-ca.gov

Joshua Walden, Deputy County Counsel, *County of Santa Clara*
Claimant Representative
Office of the County Counsel, 70 West Hedding Street, 9th Floor, San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 229-9052
joshua.walden@cco.sccgov.org

Ron Walker, City Manager, *City of Colfax*
33 South Main St, Colfax, CA 95713
Phone: (530) 346-2313
city.manager@colfax-ca.gov

Brandon Walker, Administrative Services Director, *City of Hermosa Beach*
1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Phone: (310) 318-0225
bwalker@hermosabeach.gov

Dave Warren, Director of Finance, *City of Placerville*
Finance Department, 3101 Center Street, Placerville, CA 95667
Phone: (530) 642-5223
dwarren@cityofplacerville.org

Gary Watahira, Administrative Services Director, *City of Sanger*
1700 7th Street, Sanger, CA 93657
Phone: (559) 876-6300
gwatahira@ci.sanger.ca.us

Tom Weiner, City Manager, *City of Walnut*
21201 La Puente Rd. , Walnut, CA 91789
Phone: (909) 348-0701
tweiner@cityofwalnut.org

Stephanie Wellemeyer, Auditor/County Clerk, *County of Modoc*
108 E. Modoc Street, Alturas, CA 96101
Phone: (530) 233-6231
auditor@co.modoc.ca.us

Renee Wellhouse, *David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.*
3609 Bradshaw Road, H-382, Sacramento, CA 95927
Phone: (916) 797-4883
dwa-renee@surewest.net

Nick Wells, City Manager, *City of Holtville*
121 W 5th Street, Holtville, CA 92250
Phone: (760) 356-2912
NWells@Holtville.ca.gov

Kevin Werner, City Administrator, *City of Ripon*
Administrative Staff, 259 N. Wilma Avenue, Ripon, CA 95366
Phone: (209) 599-2108
kwerner@cityofripon.org

Tom Westbrook, City Manager, *City of Red Bluff*
555 Washington Street , Red Bluff, CA 96080
Phone: (530) 527-2605
twestbrook@cityofredbluff.org

Cindy Wheeler, Finance Director, *City of Anderson*
1887 Howard Street, Anderson , CA 96007
Phone: (530) 378-6626
cwheeler@ci.anderson.ca.us

Adam Whelen, Director of Public Works, *City of Anderson*
1887 Howard St., Anderson, CA 96007
Phone: (530) 378-6640
awhelen@ci.anderson.ca.us

Isaac Whippy, City Manager, *City of Fort Bragg*
416 N Franklin Street, Fort Bragg, CA 94537
Phone: (707) 961-2825
IWhippy@fortbragg.com

Michael Whitehead, Administrative Services Director & City Treasurer, *City of Rolling Hills Estates*

Administrative Services, 4045 Palos Verdes Drive North, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

Phone: (310) 377-1577

MikeW@RollingHillsEstatesCA.gov

Rod Wilburn, City Manager, *City of Willits*

111 E. Commercial Street, Willits, CA 95490

Phone: (707) 459-7120

rwilburn@cityofwillits.org

Gina Will, Auditor-Controller, *County of Nevada*

950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 230, Nevada City, CA 95959

Phone: (530) 265-1244

auditor.controller@nevadacountyca.gov

David Wilson, City Manager, *City of West Hollywood*

8300 Santa Monica Blvd., West Hollywood, CA 90069

Phone: N/A

dwilson@weho.org

Chris Woidzik, Finance Director, *City of Avalon*

Finance Department, 410 Avalon Canyon Rd., Avalon, CA 90704

Phone: (310) 510-0220

Scampbell@cityofavalon.com

Jeff Woltkamp, *County of San Joaquin*

44 N San Joaquin St. Suite 550, Stockton, CA 95202

Phone: (209) 468-3925

jwoltkamp@sjgov.org

Harry Wong, Director of Finance, *City of Lynwood*

11330 Bullis Road, Lynwood, CA 90262

Phone: (310) 603-0220

hwong@lynwood.ca.us

Paul Wood, Interim City Manager, *City of Greenfield*

599 El Camino Real, Greenfield, CA 93927

Phone: 8316745591

pwood@ci.greenfield.ca.us

Kevin Woodhouse, City Manager, *City of Pacifica*

170 Santa Maria Avenue, Pacifica, CA 94044

Phone: (650) 738-7409

woodhousek@ci.pacifica.ca.us

Rafferty Wooldridge, City Manager, *City of La Habra Heights*

1245 N. Hacienda Road, La Habra Heights, CA 90631

Phone: (562) 694-6302

rwooldridge@lhhcity.org

Nita Wracker, Finance Director, *City of Lincoln*

600 6th Street, Lincoln, CA 95648

Phone: (916) 434-2490

nita.wracker@lincolnca.gov

Jane Wright, Finance Manager, *City of Ione*

Finance Department, 1 East Main Street , PO Box 398, Ione, CA 95640

Phone: (209) 274-2412
JWright@ione-ca.com

Arthur Wylene, General Counsel, *Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)*
1215 K Street, Suite 1650, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 447-4806
awylene@rcrcnet.org

Joanna Wynant, City Administrator, *City of Dorris*
307 S Main Street, Dorris, CA 96023
Phone: (530) 397-3511
cityofdorris@gmail.com

Elisa Wynne, Staff Director, *Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee*
California State Senate, State Capitol Room 5019, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 651-4103
elisa.wynne@sen.ca.gov

Curtis Yakimow, Town Manager, *Town of Yucca Valley*
57090 Twentynine Palms Highway, Yucca Valley, CA 92284
Phone: (760) 369-7207
townmanager@yucca-valley.org

Kaily Yap, Budget Analyst, *Department of Finance*
Local Government Unit, 915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Kaily.Yap@dof.ca.gov

Siew-Chin Yeong, Director of Public Works, *City of Pleasanton*
3333 Busch Road, Pleasanton, CA 94566
Phone: (925) 931-5506
syeong@cityofpleasantonca.gov

Bobby Young, *City of Costa Mesa*
77 Fair Drive, Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Phone: N/A
Bobby.Young@costamesaca.gov

Kelcey Young, City Manager, *City of Pinole*
2131 Pear Street, Pinole, CA 94564
Phone: (510) 724-8933
kelcey.young@pinole.gov

Michael Yuen, Finance Director, *City of San Leandro*
835 East 14th St., San Leandro, CA 94577
Phone: (510) 577-3376
myuen@sanleandro.org

Robert Zadnick, City Manager, *City of Belvedere*
450 San Rafael Avenue, Belvedere, CA 94920
Phone: (415) 435-8906
rzadnik@cityofbelvedere.org

Shannel Zamora, Finance Director, *City of Buellton*
107 West Highway 246, PO Box 1819, Buellton, CA 93427
Phone: (805) 688-5177
shannelz@cityofbuellton.com

Luis Zamora, Confidential Executive Assistant to the City Attorney, *City and County of San Francisco*

Office of the City Attorney, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4748

Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org

Chris Zapata, City Manager, *City of Sausalito*

420 Litho Street, Sausalito, CA 94965

Phone: (415) 289-4102

czapata@sausalito.gov

Aly Zimmermann, City Manager, *City of Rocklin*

3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677

Phone: (916) 625-5585

alyz@rocklin.ca.us

Helmholt Zinser-Watkins, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, *State Controller's Office*

Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-7876

HZinser-watkins@sco.ca.gov

Jeffery Zuba, Finance and Administrative Services Director, *Town of San Anselmo*

525 San Anselmo Ave, San Anselmo, CA 94960

Phone: (415) 258-4600

jzuba@townofsananselmo.org