

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary

2012 Legislative Priorities

1. Wastewater Treatment Facilities*Page 4*
 - Support funding for the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board to update sections of the Basin Plan
 - Pursue revision of penalty assessment methodology for varying volumes and small communities
 - Pursue increasing Small Community Water Grant funding limits
 - Pursue establishment of a Federal funding mechanism to assist small communities with capital costs related to compliance with the Clean Water Act
 - Pursue affordability factor to apply to SRF (State Revolving Fund) to offer lower interest rates to disadvantaged communities

2. Hazardous Fuels Conditions*Page 7*
 - Support fuels treatment identified in Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP)
 - Pursue State adoption of the Federal Healthy Forest Restoration Act and partner with the Federal government with the (CWPP) process to identify State lands that directly impact private property
Long-term fuels treatment at the public land management agency level
 - Support Federal and State funding for development of biomass product markets to assist with fuels treatment by-products
 - Support fuels treatment reduction in private-public, private-private public-public land boundaries in general
 - Monitor legislation that implements (AB X1 29) the Governor’s 2011 proposal to charge counties State Responsibility Area fees.

2012 State Budget Priorities

C.S.A.C. and R.C.R.C. will pursue County of Nevada budgetary interests impacted by changes in the State budget. Below are the County’s top State Budget priorities:

1. Maintain and protect funding for Public Safety.....*Page 10*
2. Maintain funding for local streets and roads.....*Page 10*
3. Provide funding for mandated and realigned responsibilities.....*Page 10*

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Appendix A – List of County Infrastructure Projects

Not in order of priority

- 1) Rural Broadband Infrastructure and Services*Page 11*
- 2) Road Projects*Page 11*
 - Combie Road Widening
 - Brunswick at Loma Rica Drive Intersection Realignment
- 3) Wastewater Projects*Page 11*
 - Planning, environmental design, preliminary design and final design, and construction of Penn Valley wastewater system improvements/expansion.
 - Planning, design and construction for next phase of Lake Wildwood wastewater treatment system improvements
 - Evaluation and planning for future repair and replacement in District wastewater collection systems
 - Wastewater treatment facility regionalization technical assistance
- 4) Solid Waste Projects*Page 12*
 - Develop Master Plan for the McCourtney Road Transfer Station
 - New Wood Waste Processing Area
 - New Recycling Facility at the McCourtney Road Transfer Station
 - Expand the Construction and Demolition Drop-Off Area at the McCourtney Road Transfer Station
 - Construction of a Leachate Storage Tank and Associated Infrastructure
 - Improve Impacts of the McCourtney Road Transfer Station on Neighborhood

Appendix B – Nevada County 2012 Board Objectives.....*Page 13*

Appendix C – Legislation pursued by State Associations

The appendix is attached for references purposes. County Agency and Department Associations are pursuing the legislative items listed here. Items have been listed in priority order by each department.

Health and Human Services Agency Administration*Page 14*

- Support Health Care Access

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

- Support for Restoration of Base Realignment Funding to FY 07-08 levels for Health and Human Services Programs
- Support Realignment of Health and Human Services Programs

Social Services *Page 20*

- Support an increase in Adult Protective Services funding
- Increase funding for Child Welfare Services (CPS)
- Support for increased Public Guardian funding to mitigate cost of compliance with the Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006

Behavioral Health *Page 26*

- Align Specialty Medi-Cal Mental Health Managed Care with Federal Requirements

Public Health..... *Page 28*

- Support increase in Chronic Disease prevention and control services and funding
- Support expansion and increased rates for Dental Health services to low-income residents
- Continued support for funding of Public Health Emergency Preparedness activities
- Support increase in state funding for Communicable Disease Control
- Support increase in cost reimbursement for vaccines and strengthen requirements for school immunizations
- Support efforts making Health Surveillance data available to Health Officers
- Support new proposals which favor Healthy Communities and prevent chronic disease
- Support allowing county discretion in setting Vital Record fees

Library.....*Page 44*

- Continue State funding for Public Libraries

Planning.....*Page 47*

- Support amendment to the State Housing Element law for county populations of less than 100,000

Appendix D – Additional Information

1. Hazardous Fuels Conditions.....*Page 50*
 - Public lands adjacent to private property

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

2012 Legislative Priorities

1. Background: The Wastewater Treatment Dilemma Faced by Rural Communities.

There continues to be a growing concern among small rural municipalities operating wastewater treatment plants in California. Although most small communities are committed to clean water, these communities are currently faced with wastewater regulations requiring high-tech; expensive compliance projects coupled with rapidly rising construction costs. This results in compliance projects that are unaffordable to many rural communities.

An example of this circumstance is the community of Cascade Shores in rural Nevada County. Cascade Shores was required by current State and Federal regulations to construct a new wastewater treatment plant. Normally, this would not seem unusual except for the fact that Cascade Shores constructed a new treatment plant in 1996 to meet the standards in effect at that time. Just a decade later, regulatory standards were changed and the county was faced with once again updating the plant.

The residents of Cascade Shores were willing participants in meeting these modern wastewater standards and moved forward with the design and construction bidding for the new treatment plant. Unfortunately, the combination of the new, more high-tech plant left the residents of Cascade Shores with sewer fees that they could barely afford. The current annual sewer rate at Cascade Shores is \$2,445, for each of the 86 hook-ups, one of the highest in the state.

We believe there are several reasons for this disconnect between the goal of cleaner water and the regulations for achieving this goal. These fall under three categories: Regulations and Implementation Policies, Minimum Mandatory Penalties Availability of Grant Funding and Affordability of Wastewater financing.

While the goal in these efforts is clean water, many small communities ironically find that the regulations actually prevent them from reaching this goal. The wastewater treatment plants that must be constructed to meet the increasingly stringent regulations are simply unaffordable for some small communities. If those communities fail to construct the required facilities because of a lack of funds, mandatory penalties are imposed that make compliance even more unattainable. The result is no improvement in water quality as well as serious financial hardship for the community.

Nevada County Sanitation District No. 1 is requesting State and Federal support to help small rural communities achieve water quality goals in an affordable manner on a sustained basis.

NEVADA COUNTY

2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

a) Issue: Regulation and Implementation Policies

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (Basin Plan) was adopted in 1975 and, in most respects, has not been reviewed and analyzed to determine if the standards contained in the Basin Plan are still appropriate today.

At the time these standards were adopted, the Regional Water Quality Control Board intended to review and update the standards as more information became available. Unfortunately, a lack of regular funding has kept the Regional Board staff from performing the studies necessary for regular updates to occur. As a result, discharge conditions and other regulatory controls are being made pursuant to standards that were adopted thirty years ago. The Regional Water Quality Control Board has been recommending for years that these reviews and updates be funded and implemented. The Regional Board's position in this matter is outlined in their 2005 triennial review of the Basin Plan. Consideration should be given to the cost involved for new wastewater plants when regulations are changed.

The California Coalition for Clean Water (CCCW) prepared a white paper, "Reassessing California's Water Quality Program" (2004) that summarizes the most significant problems with California's approach to water quality regulations and provides specific recommendations to address these problems. CCCW is an alliance of local governments and public agencies, labor, agriculture, business, housing and development interests. Member groups include California State Association of Counties and Regional Council of Rural Counties. The white paper included a number of case studies supporting their evaluation, including Case Study 9 on the Cascade Shores Wastewater Treatment Facility discharge to Gas Canyon. In general, CCCW concurs with the Regional Board's proposed Basin Plan updates.

Action:

Provide funding to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to update the "Beneficial Use Designations" and "Regulatory Guidance to Address Water Bodies Dominated by NPDES Discharges" sections of the Basin Plan.

b) Issue: Mandatory Minimum Penalties

Discharge violation penalties are "one-size-fits-all" without regard to the severity of the discharge or the ability to pay.

In California certain discharge violations result in mandatory penalties of \$3,000 per violation. This fine amount is the same if the resulting discharge volume is high or very low. In the case of Cascade Shores, the discharge leaving the treatment plant is about the same volume as a garden hose. Yet,

NEVADA COUNTY

2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Cascade Shores will receive the same fine as Sacramento Regional Treatment Plant for a violation of effluent standards even though Sacramento Regional releases hundreds of times more effluent during the same violation. These fines can cripple a small community while having virtually no effect on a large community.

Action:

- Assess penalties on a sliding scale to account for the volume of discharge.
- Limit penalties for small communities with a limited ability to pay.
- Only impose penalties on those communities who do not develop and implement a compliance project. These imposed penalties will be used to offset costs for those communities who design and build new wastewater plants.
- Place a maximum time limit on retroactive violations and imposition of penalties (perhaps one year).

c) Issue: Availability of Grant Funding

State and Federal grant funding opportunities have declined, leaving small communities with inadequate funding for required upgrades.

The community of Cascade Shores is grateful for receiving a \$2 million state funded grant from the Small Communities Wastewater Grant program for their current project. The \$2 million grant amount is the maximum grant allowed under this program. Cascade Shores received a smaller grant from the same program when the original treatment plant was built in 1996. In 1996 the maximum grant allowed under that program was \$2 million. Since 1996 the cost to construct a wastewater treatment plant in California has more than doubled.

At the Federal level, the clean water grant program of the 1970's and 80's has been discontinued. The Federal government has instead been helping to provide low interest loans through the State Revolving Fund program. Although low interest loans are appreciated, they have a limited benefit in helping to keep small community wastewater projects affordable.

In order for financial aid programs to remain an effective tool to be used by small communities in achieving the clean water goals, these programs should be updated to reflect the current financial requirements of today's projects.

Action:

- Increase SCWG funding to \$4 million or more per grant.
- Create Federal funding to assist small communities with the capital cost of Clean Water Act compliance.
- Create grant application packages that are more streamlined.
- Expedite the grant application, review, and issuance process.

NEVADA COUNTY

2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

We believe that with the regulatory and funding updates discussed, that affordable rural wastewater treatment plants are achievable with no reduction of water quality throughout the State.

d) Issue: Affordability of Wastewater Financing

The affordability of wastewater financing is becoming more difficult for small communities due to high interest rates and complex application processes.

The best rate loans are typically State Revolving Fund (SRF) loans, but they and other loan packages have very ominous application packages and very long time lines to process resulting in small agencies having to come up with interim financing until the SRF or other loans are implemented.

Action:

- Create an affordability factor to apply to SRF and other loans perhaps based on median household income (lower MHI results in lower interest rate).
- Create loan application packages that are more streamlined.
- Expedite the loan application, review, and issuance process.

2. **Hazardous Fuels Conditions:**

Public lands occupy nearly 35% of the land in Nevada County, with a checkerboard pattern of discontinuous and isolated parcels of federal and state lands intermixed with private property through many areas. Nearly 30,000 acres (500 parcels) of public lands are directly adjacent to private property. While homeowners are required by state law to treat the hazardous vegetation around their property to meet defensible space standards, the State and Federal governments are not mandated to reduce the hazardous fuels conditions on public property. The lack of direct fuels treatment on public lands adjacent to developed areas increases the risk for wildfires to destroy private property. Conversely, wildfire spreading from a developed private property with or without defensible space into public lands without effective fuels treatment has potential to cause significant environmental losses to timber crops, habitats, watershed, developed properties and infrastructure.

The public expects both federal and state governments to reasonably maintain public lands. The general public perception is that both federal and state lands are not meeting public expectation in being leaders in managing these lands. Furthermore, the public is burdened with many regulations, yet the lack of fuels treatment to reduce hazardous fuels on federal and state lands poses a significant wildfire threat to private lands.

While both federal and state governments provide funds for fuels treatment activities, most fuels treatment activities focus at the community level as opposed to a single or isolated small parcel level. While funding is steadily

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

increasing to support federal fuels treatment projects on federal lands, generally fewer dollars are allocated by state agencies for fuel treatment projects on state lands. Funding by the state typically occurs through voter-approved bonds, such as Proposition 40. While both federal and state governments fund fuels treatment projects, there are, however, gaps in these funding programs. Hundreds of parcels and thousands of acres of private property are vulnerable due to inadequate fuels treatment efforts on public lands. There is a need to develop a better mechanism for addressing hazardous fuels issues for the public-private property boundary line.

In addition to these challenges the Governor proposes to shift \$250 million in fire protection services and medical response in the most highly populated SRAs to local governments. It is unlikely Nevada County would qualify as “highly populated” and this proposal is probably targeted at urban counties such as Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, etc. Since Nevada County does not have its own fire department, and the local fire districts have mutual aid agreements with Calfire in the SRAs, the potential impacts to Nevada County are difficult to assess at this time. However, the County has repeatedly requested increased funding for fuels reduction on state and federal lands, as a preventive measure that would save millions of dollars in firefighting and emergency response.

According to the Governor’s summary, the proposal would require a change in statute to revise the criteria and definitions of SRAs to ensure that local governments assume these responsibilities. The Board of Forestry would conduct an extensive field review of existing SRAs based on the revised criteria. CAL FIRE will continue to provide fire protection services in SRAs until the Board of Forestry’s reclassification process is completed. The actual amount of redefined SRA acreage, and the associated level of realignment funding transferred to local governments will depend on the Board of Forestry’s final determination of the SRA classification based on the revised criteria.

The Governor says that his proposal “will ensure that local jurisdictions making land use decisions which result in housing development encroaching in wild land areas are also responsible for providing the necessary emergency response services associated with more highly populated land use patterns.” Any impacts to the County may take the form of increased pressure to discourage development in the most rural areas or could threaten funding for fuels reduction on state lands.

Action:

- 1) For federal lands, utilize the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP), which is a component of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act. The CWPP should identify both the federal and non-federal (private) properties with hazardous fuels conditions, develop priority areas needing fuels treatments and relay this information to the local federal land managers for appropriate funding (perhaps designate this funding as CWPP funding for federal lands).

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

- 2) For the state lands, consider adopting similar legislation to the Healthy Forest Restoration Act for state lands, and/ or partnering with the CWPP process for identifying state lands that directly impact private property.
- 3) Provide federal and state funding to develop a biomass/value-added products market to assist both public and private landowners with fuels treatment. (This is also addressed in the Healthy Forest Restoration Act)
- 4) Ensure adequate long-term fuels treatment funding to support both the state and federal land management agencies for the next twenty years and for at least one full rotational fuel treatment cycle.
- 5) Monitor legislation that implements (AB X1 29) the Governor's 2011 proposal to charge counties State Responsibility Area fees.

*** NOTE: See Appendix D for more in-depth information on Hazardous Fuels Conditions*

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

2012 Budget Priorities

1. Maintain and protect funding for Public Safety

In 2011 the State realigned to Counties the incarceration and supervision of low level offenders, court security, and various other former State funding streams including Rural and Small County Sheriff's Program, Cal-MMET, Citizens' Option for Public Safety (COPS) Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) and Juvenile Probation. This realignment is funded by a combination of sales tax and motor vehicle license fees. It is early in the implementation of this realignment Nevada County has serious concerns regarding the adequacy, and constitutional protection of these funds. It is imperative that funding for these programs be adequate to carry out these responsibilities. If they are not, it will have serious consequences to Nevada County front line public safety officers and programs.

The Governor's budget assumes that the voters approve an initiative in November 2012 to increase sales taxes and certain personal income tax rates. The budget identifies trigger cuts if the initiative is not passed. Among the trigger cuts are reductions to Cal FIRE including cuts to air attack bases for wildfire protection. Nevada County's air attack base serves an essential public safety function. It is imperative that funding for this base be adequate to provide support these fire suppression capabilities.

2. Maintain funding for local streets and roads

The Governor's budget fully fund transportation as agreed to in the transportation tax swap of 2010. Failure to maintain this funding by the legislature, or provide equivalent alternative funding would have a devastating effect on the County's road maintenance and improvement program. In 2011/2012 this represents about 25% of road maintenance funding.

3. Provide funding for mandated and realigned responsibilities

The State mandates many county responsibilities and provides full or partial funding for these county responsibilities through allocations, shared funding ratios, claims reimbursements and the like. Funding levels, allocations, and sharing ratios have not kept pace with the cost of fulfilling these responsibilities in the past and in fact have eroded significantly over time. The County is bearing an increasing burden of fulfilling these mandated county responsibilities from local revenues used for many primary purposes of county government such as public safety and roads.

With the additional major 2011 realignments and anticipated additional realignment proposals in the future by the Governor the County would, unless fully protected against escalating costs, be forced to bear an increasing burden of fulfilling these mandated responsibilities from local revenues, diminishing its ability to deliver primary purposes of county government.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

APPENDIX A Infrastructure Projects

1. Rural Broadband Infrastructure and Services
 - Base broadband infrastructure elements that promote both private and public sector broadband service investment into rural areas. Broadband infrastructure and supporting elements could contain:
 - Antenna Towers and structures
 - Transportation project improvement for the installation of broadband support such as conduit and fiber optic cabling.
 - Broadband aggregation studies and projects.
 - Projects that help closing the digital divide.
 - Projects that help address the lower rural broadband adoption rate compared to urban and suburban areas.
 - Projects that support tele-education and tele-medicine capabilities.
 - Small business loans for broadband deployment activities

2. Road Projects
 - Combie Road Widening
 - Widen Combie Road to ultimate build out as shown in the Combie Corridor Plan-five lanes, two in each direction with center turn lane. The County's development fee program and Higgins Area Plan show the need to widen Combie Road from Highway 49 to Lake of the Pines. Expect to construct in 2012. Total cost \$2.3 million.

 - Brunswick at Loma Rica Drive Intersection Realignment
 - The project proposes to realign a portion of Loma Rica Drive in order to eliminate the intersection at the Brunswick Road grade. Preliminary engineering and environmental review will address realignment options. The Brunswick Road and Loma Rica Drive intersection has experienced a higher than average occurrences of accidents. Sight distances as well as the grade have contributed to this problem. Expect to construct 2012. Total cost \$2.2 million.

3. Wastewater Projects
 - Planning, environmental design, preliminary design and final design, and construction of Penn Valley wastewater system improvements/expansion. Expect to construct 2013.

NEVADA COUNTY

2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

- Planning, design and construction for next phase of Lake Wildwood wastewater treatment system improvements. Expect to construct 2012.
- Evaluation and planning for future repair and replacement in District wastewater collection systems.
- Pursue grant funding for wastewater treatment facility regionalization technical assistance.

4. Solid Waste Projects

- Develop Master Plan of the McCourtney Road Transfer Station.
- Construct a new wood waste processing area: This project would entail moving the current wood waste processing area to a new location at the McCourtney Road Transfer Station – It would include applying a concrete surface to approximately one-half acre where the wood waste material would be accepted, loaded into tractor-trailer trucks and transported to a grinding and composting facility. The estimated cost is \$400,000.
- Construct a new recycling facility at the McCourtney Road Transfer Station: This project consists of constructing a new building to house the recycling operations at the station. The estimated cost is \$3 to \$5 million.
- Expand the Construction and Demolition drop-off area at the McCourtney Road Transfer Station: This project will expand the existing site to include space to sort and process various construction and demolition materials. The estimated cost is \$300,000.
- Construct a Leachate Storage Tank and Associated Infrastructure
 - The project includes designing and constructing a tank for the collection and storage of leachate that accumulates from the closed McCourtney Road Landfill site. Infrastructure will also include the necessary pumping elements and piping associated with the project. The estimated cost is \$600,000.
- Improving Impacts of the McCourtney Road Transfer Station on the Neighborhood
 - Phase in more solid waste franchise collection to reduce individual trips to MRTS
 - Pursue recreational opportunities of the McCourtney Road Transfer Station site
 - Continue waste diversion through recycling programs and drop-off locations around the County

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

APPENDIX B
2012 BOARD OBJECTIVES

County of Nevada
2012 Board Objectives

Priority A

- Maintain County's financial stability and core services in light of economic conditions
- Investigate the feasibility of maintaining cost effective operation of the Sanitation District
- Investigate potential for consolidation of offices and qualifications (additions) to statutory offices
- Develop and implement a marijuana cultivation ordinance
- Implement CDA customer service coordination

Priority B

- Work with our legislative advocates to introduce flexibility with rural counties in the affordable housing element policy
- Look for opportunities to promote local sustainable job-enhancing economic and resource management practices for the county in our economic development efforts
- Increase public awareness and civic engagement through educational information programs
- Continue to pursue control of Quagga/Zebra mussel infestation through an ordinance and/or JPA membership

Priority C

- Review the inclusionary housing policy
- Advocate for support to the increasingly aging population and disabled
- Continue to develop and improve the Airport to ensure it operates as an enterprise fund

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

APPENDIX C

Summary: Health Care Access - Support legislation to provide health insurance coverage of State's low-income residents, while protecting the local safety net and funding that supports other critical health and human service programs. Support proposals that encourage health care providers to work in rural areas, including adequate reimbursement rates to ensure there are safety net service providers in Nevada County.

1)	Department	Nevada County Health and Human Services Agency
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Jeff Brown
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	470-2562
	E-mail	jeffrey.brown@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Health Care Access
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	County data indicates that there are up to 20,000 uninsured adults and 2,000 uninsured children in Nevada County. Currently, all counties ultimately have responsibility to provide care to indigent residents as stated in Welfare & Institutions Code Section 17000. Expansion of health insurance coverage must be structured in a way to not add any unreasonable financial burdens on counties, avoid disruption of current county health care safety net services and address access, affordability and prevention issues.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Update
8)	Code Section(s) affected	Potentially Section 17000 of Welfare and Institutions Code
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act along with the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 made up the health care reform of 2010. The laws focus on reform of the private health insurance market, provision of better coverage for those with pre-existing conditions, improved prescription drug

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

		coverage in Medicare and a host of prevention initiatives to improve the health and insurance coverage of low income Americans. Current State budget proposals include cuts in reimbursement rates to providers which may result in local providers and clinics ceasing to offer services.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	This proposal would support efforts to implement provisions within the current law to provide health insurance coverage to low-income residents.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Support only proposals, which do not create any additional and/or unreasonable financial burdens on counties (e.g. expansion efforts to be funded with current contributions to CMSP for the CMSP participating counties, and without any further draw against county's VLF or Sales Tax Realignment funds).
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	Governor and the State Assembly; some private hospitals and providers, organized labor, private businesses
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	Any funding formula will be key in determining any potential negative impacts to the County and local providers. If inappropriate funding obligations are placed on counties and local providers, a net result could be a reduction the provision of critical public health, social services and hospital services due to reduced Realignment revenues being received at the local level in addition to hospital fees exceeding any increased government reimbursements.
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Supports Board Priority of "Advocate for support to the increasingly aging population and disabled"
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	This is included in CHEACs Legislative Priorities and is also a critical issue for the larger CSAC.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Restoration of Base Realignment Funding to FY 2007-08 Levels for Health and Human Services Programs – County social services, mental health, public health and probation programs depend on sales tax and vehicle license fee (VLF) Realignment funding. Realignment revenues have decreased over two of the past three fiscal years, decreasing the amounts of funding to local governments and resetting the base funding level for subsequent funding allocations. Once the economy begins to recover any increases in Realignment funding will be distributed based on a complex growth formulas that gives priority to the County Medical Services Program and county programs that have higher caseload growth. These existing growth distribution formulas fail to recognize historic funding levels of critical service programs and place undue hardships on many underfunded county programs. This proposal would ensure that any growth in Realignment revenues would be first utilized to restore base funding levels to those of FY 2007-08, prior to distribution under the current growth formulas.

1)	Department	Nevada County Health and Human Services Agency
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Jeff Brown
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	470-2562
	E-mail	jeffrey.brown@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Restoration of Base Realignment Funding
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	Realignment growth formulas are codified in statute. When they were created in 1991 no one ever envisioned a time when funding would ever fall below base levels. Currently, county health and human services programs are reducing critical community services that protect and promote the health and welfare of county residents. Restoration of base funding and associated service programs should be given priority for any growth in this funding stream prior to allocation for any program expansions.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Update of previously submitted proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	Sales tax and vehicle license fee (VLF) Realignment funding is distributed to counties to support a variety of programs, most notably health and human service programs and probation services. Growth in these funding

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

		streams is allocated to counties and programs using formulas which prioritize CMSP and program caseload growth.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	Change existing Realignment growth formulas to prioritize the restoration of 2007-08 base funding levels prior to allocation of any additional growth funding
11)	Fiscal Impact	This would allow currently impacted health and human service programs to restore critical services that are being currently reduced/ cut. The restoration of these services would be given priority over the allocation of increased funding to CMSP and other county programs that are currently experiencing growth.
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	County health and humans service agencies and departments, especially small and large counties.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	County Medical Services Program (CMSP), some counties' mental health and social services programs with large amounts of caseload growth
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	Would potentially reduce additional growth funding for the CMSP program.
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Supports Board Priority of "Advocate for support to the increasingly aging population and disabled"
16)	Is this included in Associations Legislative Priorities	Not at this time

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Realignment of Health and Human Service Programs – The Governor has proposed the realignment of a number of state responsibilities for currently shared state/county programs to counties, along with a proposal to develop new funding streams and/or shift state funding to counties to provide for the costs of assuming these new responsibilities. Last year a host of programs were realigned to counties, including Adult Protective Services, Child Welfare Services/Foster Care, Substance Abuse Treatment programs, Mental Health programs and a number of juvenile and adult criminal justice system programs. Furthermore, another “Phase II Realignment” proposal suggests realigning Medi-Cal Administration, In-Home Support Services, Indigent Health Care and California Children’s Services in subsequent years. It will be essential that the portions of any new and/or realigned funding streams be categorically designated for each realigned program and that these funds are sufficient to cover both current and future program costs.

1)	Department	Nevada County Health and Human Services Agency
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Jeff Brown
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	470-2562
	E-mail	jeffrey.brown@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Realignment of Health and Human Services Programs
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	The State currently has some level of fiscal and program responsibility for each of the programs proposed for realignment. In 1991, a similar proposal was enacted into law which shifted both program responsibilities and funding to the counties. Over time the caseload growth of these realigned programs has exceeded the growth of their dedicated revenues, forcing counties to either drastically reduce service levels or subsidize program operations using local revenues. Any future realignment proposals need to be crafted to avoid such outcomes which essential are just cost shifts from the state to local counties.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	Shared responsibility and costs for the proposed programs to be realigned are defined in a variety of state statutes. The governor’s proposals would shift state responsibilities to counties,

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

		reduce or eliminate required state funding contributions while at the same time provide some new funding to the counties to offset the assumption of new responsibilities for program operation and service provision. The funding for programs realigned last year is set to expire at the end of this fiscal year, creating a great deal of uncertainty regarding the future of these programs.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	While not changing existing law, it would ensure that any future law would provide counties with sufficient and dedicated revenues to carry out any newly realigned responsibilities for the provision of health and human services programs.
11)	Fiscal Impact	See comment above in #10
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	All county health and humans service agencies and departments
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	None known
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	Would potentially reduce additional growth funding for the CMSP program.
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Supports Board Priority of "Advocate for support to the increasingly aging and disabled population"
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	CHEAC, CMHDA, CADPAAC, CWDA

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Increased Funding for Adult Protective Services – Support legislation/budget proposals that will increase funding for the Adult Protective Services programs administered at the local level.

1)	Department	Department of Social Services
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Alison Lehman
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	530.265.1410
	E-mail	alison.lehman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Increase funding for Adult Protective Services Program (APS)
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	Funding for the APS program has remained stagnant despite increased reports of elder and dependent adult caseloads and despite steadily increasing caseloads in APS. This problem will be further exacerbated as the population of elders in California is expected to increase dramatically over the next few years. Increase growth in the APS caseload has occurred within a capped allocation and some counties have had to provide fewer services to abused and neglected elders and dependent adults as a result of the lack of dedicated funding. An additional workload was added in 2007 when financial institutions became reporters of financial abuse.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Continued
8)	Code Section(s) affected	NA
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	The APS Program is funded through a combination of State General Fund, County Services Block Grant (CSGB) funds, and County Maintenance of Effort (MOE). Funding for this program has remained stagnant since State Fiscal Year 2002/03, and has even eroded when considering the rising cost of inflation.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	Increase State General Funding for the APS Program. Provide sufficient funding to enable APS to investigate reports of abuse and neglect and to provide appropriate and comprehensive services for abused and neglected elders and dependent adults.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Increase State General Fund

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

12)	Significant individuals or groups that might support the proposal	AARP, Senior Councils, law enforcement
13)	Significant individuals or groups that might oppose this proposal	Aging and disabled community
14)	What if any, are the negative impacts of this proposal to the County or other entities?	None
15)	How does this proposal support the County's strategic plan, vision, mission and/or goals	BOS Priority: Advocate for support to the increasingly aging population and disabled
16)	Is this included in your associations' legislative priorities?	CWDA

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

Summary: Increased Funding for Child Welfare Services – Support legislation/budget proposals that will restore critical funding for Child Welfare Services

1)	Department	Department of Social Services
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Alison Lehman
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	530.265.1410
	E-mail	alison.lehman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Increase funding for Child Welfare Services (CPS)
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	Funding for the CPS program was reduced by \$120 million statewide in 2009-10 and has never been restored. This program is one of the most critical that the department provides as it is crucial to protecting our county's abused and/or neglected children. The last two years we have experienced caseload growth in this program. Currently, we average over 100 children each month in out of home placements. This growth within a capped allocation forces counties to ultimately reduce services to this vulnerable population.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New
8)	Code Section(s) affected	NA
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	Child Welfare services are mandated under both federal and state law. The CPS Program is funded through a combination of Federal, State and county funds. Responsibility for this program is shared between the state and counties, with county government providing program services at the local level.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	Increase State General Funding for the CPS Program.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Increase State General Fund
12)	Significant individuals or groups that might support the proposal	Law enforcement, courts, children's advocates, county government
13)	Significant individuals or groups that might oppose this proposal	None known
14)	What if any, are the	None

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

	negative impacts of this proposal to the County or other entities?	
15)	How does this proposal support the County's strategic plan, vision, mission and/or goals	BOS Priority: Advocate for support to the increasingly aging population and disabled
16)	Is this included in your associations' legislative priorities?	CWDA

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: State Funding for Local Public Guardians – Support legislation/budget proposal that will support the new requirements imposed on counties as a result of the recently passed Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act of 2006.

1)	Department	Department of Social Services
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Alison Lehman
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	530.265.1410
	E-mail	alison.lehman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	State Funding for Local Public Guardians
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	The Omnibus Conservatorship and Guardianship Reform Act were passed by the State Legislature in 2006. New requirements were added for the Public Guardian offices, however, there is no new funding nor is there any current state or federal funding for this purpose.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Continued proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	NA
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	<p>Public Guardian offices lack the resources necessary to protect elder and dependant adult abuse victims. PG offices are currently funded through county general fund and client fees.</p> <p>The Public Guardian system is a vital social service program but receives no direct state or federal financial support. The PG Office manages the care and oversight of frail elders and dependent adults. The lack of funding limits the ability of the PG office to provide critical services to those clients they are entrusted by the courts to serve.</p> <p>In 2006, the legislature passed AB 1363 to more closely regulate private conservators and guardians. Reforms, including additional requirements, were a part of the legislation for courts, court investigators, and Public Guardians. Funding was designated for the courts but no funding was designated for Public Guardians. The implementation of these mandates was</p>

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

		delayed in the final budget and the funding was cut. However the requirements for the local PG requirements increased including accountability, complexity and additional court reporting. All this requires additional staff time for programs that are already understaffed.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	Develop a state funding source for counties to use to support Public Guardian programs.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Obtaining state funding for Public Guardian would reduce the local demand on County General Fund.
12)	Significant individuals or groups that might support the proposal	AARP, Senior Councils, law enforcement, Aging and disabled community
13)	Significant individuals or groups that might oppose this proposal	NA
14)	What if any, are the negative impacts of this proposal to the County or other entities?	NA
15)	How does this proposal support the County's strategic plan, vision, mission and/or goals	BOS Priority: Advocate for support to the increasingly aging population and disabled
16)	Is this included in your associations' legislative priorities?	CWDA

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

Summary: Align Specialty Medi-Cal Mental Health Managed Care with Federal Requirements - Bring the state's requirements for Specialty Medi-Cal Mental Health Managed Care into alignment with federal requirements in order to maximize federal reimbursement

1)	Department	Behavioral Health
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Michael Heggarty
3)	Title	Director
	Phone	530.470.2784
	E-mail	michael.heggarty@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Align Specialty Medi-Cal Mental Health Managed Care with Federal Requirements
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	Need to amend state Welfare and Institutions Code to make law consistent with federal Medicaid language.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	See #10
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify in various provisions of the Bronzan-McCorquodale Act that the state's standards and guidelines must be consistent with federal Medicaid requirements and approved state plan and waivers. 2. For purposes of federal reimbursement, require reimbursement amounts to be consistent with federal Medicaid requirements and approved state plan and waivers. The goal of this provision is to eliminate California's use of administratively-established Statewide Maximum Allowances (SMAs), and instead, utilize existing federal Medicaid Upper Payment Limits. The current use of SMAs places a ceiling on MHPs' abilities to obtain federal reimbursement. 3. Clarify that administrative costs should be consistent with federal Medicaid requirements and approved state plan and waivers. Delete the provision in current law limiting

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

		<p>administrative costs to 15% of the total cost of direct client services.</p> <p>4. Require claims to be submitted by MHPs within the timeframes specified in federal Medicaid requirements and approved state plan and waivers. The goal of this provision is to eliminate California's use of an administratively-established submission deadline of six months for Specialty Medi-Cal Mental Health Managed Care claims.</p> <p>At present, the federal timeframe for Medicaid claims submission is twelve months.</p>
11)	Fiscal Impact	Increased Medi-Cal reimbursement at no expense to the state
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CMHDA
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	None known
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	CMHDA

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Chronic Disease Prevention and Control Funding - Support increases in preventive health services or activities that improve community health outcomes. Encourage the enhancement of federal and state funding to support these efforts at the local level.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State and Federal
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Chronic Disease Prevention & Control
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p><i>Platform:</i> Support increases in preventive health services or activities that improve community health outcomes. Encourage the establishment and enhancement of federal and state funding to support these efforts at the local level.</p> <p><i>Brief Background (adapted from CCLHO Statement):</i> The leading causes of death in California are heart disease, cancer, lung disease and stroke. Other chronic diseases such as diabetes, arthritis and asthma contribute greatly to disability and mortality and health care costs. Significant federal, state and local resources are expended to treat these conditions. Each of these chronic diseases is, in a large part, preventable through a focus on shared risk factors, such as smoking, obesity and lack of access to health care including community and clinical preventive services. However, inadequate resources and programs exist which dedicated to the prevention and control of these chronic conditions, contributing to more money being spent on health care and to a diminished quality of life for residents.</p>
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Continued
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	The only chronic disease control program that is funded Statewide is the Tobacco Control Program.
10)	How would this proposal change existing	Develop and increase funding and programs for chronic disease prevention activities.

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

	law	
11)	Fiscal Impact	Provide local revenues to address, develop new, and support existing chronic disease prevention activities
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, and other professional organizations.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	CHEAC, CCLHO

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Dental Health – Support proposals to expand access to dental health services for low-income Californians. Support efforts to increase Denti-Cal reimbursement levels to encourage qualified dentists to participate in providing care to low-income children. Support water fluoridation efforts. Encourage dental health education program expansions including adequate funding.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Dental Health
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p><i>Platform:</i> Favor proposals to expand access to dental health services for low-income Californians. Support efforts to increase Denti-Cal reimbursement levels to encourage qualified dentists to participate in providing care to low-income children. Support water fluoridation efforts. Encourage dental health education program expansions including adequate funding.</p> <p><i>Brief Background:</i> Many Californians, including hundreds of thousands of children, have unmet oral health needs; in fact, oral health diseases represent the most prevalent health problem of children. Untreated dental problems result in days missed at school or work and increased susceptibility to other more damaging health problems such as ear and sinus infections or heart disease. Implementation of preventive measures could save Californians hundreds of millions of dollars in treatment annually. While community water fluoridation is the most cost-effective, most equitable public health measure available for the prevention of dental caries, it is estimated that only 30% of California's water supply is fluoridated. Public health strategies such as water fluoridation and dental health education programs are not widely supported or funded.</p>
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Continued
8)	Code Section(s) affected	

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

9)	Briefly describe existing law:	The State funds the Denti-Cal program, although reimbursement levels are so low that the great majority of California dentists refuse to participate in the program. In Nevada County, there are only two public clinics and no private provider who are willing to accept new Medi-Cal patients. The State currently funds through SB 111 a number of school-based dental disease prevention programs, primarily in large counties, with schools with free and reduction lunch percentages of greater than 30%, thus excluding a large number of low-income children. State law requires fluoridation of water supplies supplying a certain size of population, but is contingent on funding being available to implement.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	This proposal seeks to support any proposal that increase access to dental care, increase Denti-Cal reimbursement rates and promote other needed prevention efforts.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Increased local revenues to support dental prevention and treatment programs
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, and other professional organizations.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	CHEAC, CCLHO

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Public Health Emergency Preparedness - Continue to pursue and support fair and equitable funding to local health departments for public health emergency preparedness.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Public Health Emergency Preparedness
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p><i>Platform:</i> Continue to pursue and support fair and equitable funding to local health departments for public health emergency preparedness. Continue to support legislation that clarifies and expands the role of the local Health Officer in recognizing, evaluating and leading the response to bioterrorism and other health emergencies.</p> <p><i>Brief Background:</i> The local Health Officer has the ultimate authority and responsibility for preparing for, responding to, mitigating and recovering from all medical and/or health emergencies and disasters that impact a local jurisdiction. The anthrax attacks post-September 11 identified the need to increase preparedness efforts and local public health jurisdictions response capabilities for dealing with terrorism (including bioterrorism) at the local level. Hurricane Katrina identified the impact of natural disasters on local, state and federal medical/health response capabilities also. The 2009 H1N1 Pandemic Influenza threatened to overrun an already fragile medical and public health system. Increases in funding are needed to ensure adequate infrastructure to prepare for, and respond to, all forms of terrorism, natural disasters and other related public health emergencies.</p>
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Continued proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

9)	Briefly describe existing law:	Existing law provides funding for some public health emergency response activities, although funding has declined each of the past few years.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	It would increase/maintain funding for supporting critical emergency response infrastructure in local counties. It would ensure federal funding to the state is shared appropriately with locals.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Increased revenues to address local emergencies
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, and other professional organizations.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Promotes general objective of protecting the health and welfare of all County residents.
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	CHEAC, CCLHO

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Communicable Disease Control Funding - Support increased state funding for public health programs to combat and control communicable diseases.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD. MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Communicable Disease Control
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p><i>Platform:</i> Support increased state funding for public health programs to combat and control communicable diseases.</p> <p><i>Brief Background:</i> The control of infectious disease is one of the fundamental activities public safety activities of government, provided through local health departments. Infrastructure in California to address infectious diseases is fragmented and compromised by the lack of funding at both the state and local level. Dedicated funding sources and augmentations are needed in light of new and re-emerging infectious diseases, including H1N1 influenza, multi-drug resistant tuberculosis, and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). Communicable diseases are only kept in control by rapid response, continuing vigilance and on-going effort even when the threat may not be apparent.</p>
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Continued.
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	The control of communicable diseases in a local function under California's Health and Safety Codes. Health Realignment Funding is currently the principal source of support for these programs.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	This proposal would provide State support for increased communicable disease efforts at the local level.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Increase local funding for communicable disease activities

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, and other professional organizations.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	CHEAC, CCLHO

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Immunizations – Support proposals that expand access and uptake of childhood immunizations. Support efforts to require insurance companies to reimburse providers their costs for immunizations so that they will stock and offer them to their patients. Support proposals to strengthen current school immunization requirements and limit exemptions to medical reasons.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State and Federal
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Immunizations
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p>Immunization is an incredibly effective method to prevent infectious disease and save lives. Vaccine preventable diseases have a costly impact both on the individual infected as well as the public health system which is required to respond to control such infections. Nevada County has the lowest childhood immunization rate in the state. As a result, annually we have outbreaks of vaccine preventable diseases including Pertussis (Whooping Cough) and Varicella (ChickenPox), making county residents ill and costing the county and schools significant resources in efforts to control the spread of disease. Many physician offices in the county do not offer immunizations to their clients because the cost of obtaining and storing the vaccine exceeds the amount they are reimbursed. The result is fewer children immunized and greater pressure on the Health Department to provide this service. Legislation is needed to ensure adequate reimbursement to providers or they will not offer this service.</p> <p>In addition, current law allows parents to sign a personal belief exemption to evade school immunization requirements. Studies have demonstrated that such exemptions are linked to increases in disease outbreaks. Regulations that minimize such exemptions, through restrictions on when they are used or requirements for parents to receive physician education would improve our immunization rates and thus protect the entire community.</p>

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New Proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	California Health and Safety Code and the California Code of Regulations require children to be up-to-date on their immunizations in order to enter childcare or school. This law also provides the opportunity for parents to sign a waiver to exempt their child from such requirement for any personal belief. Nevada County has the highest rate of parents choosing such waivers of all counties in California.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	This proposal seeks to support any effort to increase access to and uptake of childhood immunizations including increasing vaccine reimbursement rates and strengthening school immunization requirements.
11)	Fiscal Impact	No direct impact on county government
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, CMA, AAP and other professional organizations.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Individuals who would prefer not to vaccinate their children.
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Health Surveillance Data – Support funding and development of electronic health surveillance systems and Health Officer access to such data. Support efforts to ensure Local Health Officers have access to healthcare associated infection data from facilities within their jurisdiction. Support efforts to facilitate sharing of information regarding specific communicable disease cases by health care facilities with Local Health Officers. Support efforts to have surveillance data available with the conversion to electronic medical records supplied to Local Health Departments.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Health Surveillance Data
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p>Access to surveillance data regarding health conditions allows Local Health Departments to monitor the health of the community and respond appropriately to issues as they arise. With the transition to electronic systems, more data is available and in real-time. Current policies prevent this sharing of data.</p> <p>During the past few decades the number of health-care associate infections, particularly those that are antibiotic resistant (i.e. MRSA) has increased dramatically in California. At present, hospitals are required to report data on health-care associated infections to the CDC and that information is distributed to the states. Under the current regulations, local jurisdictions cannot directly receive this information and if they are provided it from the state, it is with significant delay. This prevents the Health Department from identifying problems and working with facilities in controlling infections.</p> <p>New electronic systems collect far more information than previously available and access to de-identified data on non-infectious disease prevalence would allow Health Departments to tailor their efforts to meet the specific needs of their community. Legislation is necessary to permit sharing of population health data.</p>

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New Proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	California's general acute care hospitals are mandated by Senate bills 739, 1058 and 158 to report specific health-care associated infections. Information is collected for use of quality evaluations and development of safety programs. The data is not released to the Local Health Officer.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	This proposal seeks to support efforts to increase local surveillance data availability to Health Officers including local health care acquired infections from facilities in the jurisdiction as well as data on non-infectious disease.
11)	Fiscal Impact	No direct impact on county government
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, CHA
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Healthy Communities – Support policies that create healthy communities and promote healthy living. Support proposals to help prevent chronic disease including active transit/walkability, access to healthy foods, measures to reduce the attractiveness/availability of high calorie, low nutrient foods such as sugar-sweetened beverages and measures to encourage breastfeeding. Support consideration of health in program and policy development.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Healthy Communities
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	Health is largely determined by environments in which people live. Social, economic and physical settings influence the choices that people make every day, as well as their opportunities and resources for health. Policy shapes the environment, which in turn influences health. Healthy individuals ensure a stable workforce and sustainable community. Policies that promote the development of healthy communities such as increasing access to healthy food benefit the entire community.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New Proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	It would support new proposals which favor healthy communities and prevent chronic disease.
11)	Fiscal Impact	No direct impact on county government
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO, CMA, AAP and other professional organizations.

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Fulfills objectives of improving the health and welfare of all County residents.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Vital Records – Vital Records is a state mandated program without local control over revenues and expenses. Support proposals that allow the county to set fees for registering all County Births and Deaths and making certified copies to meet our costs.

1)	Department	Public Health Department
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Karen Milman, MD, MPH
3)	Title	Public Health Officer/Director
	Phone	530-265-1459
	E-mail	karen.milman@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Vital Records
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	Vital Record Fees are determined by the Health and Safety Codes Sections 103600 – 103615, regulated by the state. Counties do not have the authority to set the fees and most of the funds collected go to state programs. Historically revenue received from these fees has not paid for program expense. Over the past five years, Nevada County has had an average loss of \$70,000 per year to maintain the Vital Records office as mandated by the Health and Safety Codes. Favor proposals to increase fees for registering all Nevada County Births and Deaths and making certified copies. Support proposals that allow counties to increase fees to recapture partial or all expenditures for mandated program expense.
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New Proposal
8)	Code Section(s) affected	103600-103615
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	Vital Records is a mandated program with specific deliverables. Fees are determined by the Health and Safety Codes Sections 103600 – 103615, regulated by the state. Counties do not have the authority to adjust fees to meet their program costs.

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

10)	How would this proposal change existing law	This proposal would allow county discretion in setting Vital Records fees.
11)	Fiscal Impact	Would increase county revenues
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	CHEAC, CCLHO and other professional organizations.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Unknown
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	None
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	Supports county 3 year sustainability goal.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: The California Library Association works to insure support of library funding which enables California residents to have equal access to lifetime education in the 181 public libraries across the state. Governor Brown's January 2011 budget proposal eliminates all state funding for public libraries in California.

1)	Department	Nevada County Library
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Jessica Hudson
3)	Title	County Librarian
	Phone	265-7078
	E-mail	Jessica.hudson@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Reinstate State funding for Public Libraries
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	N/A
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	Not a proposal, but notice was given that, the budget for local libraries was zeroed out for FY 11-12 through the Governor's Trigger Cuts (AB 121) and there is no line item for libraries in the Governor's FY 12/13 budget.
8)	Code Section(s) affected	Education Code Title 1, Division 1, Part 11, Chapter 1.5 Articles 1-4, Sections 18010-18032 and Chapter 4, Articles 1-6, Section 18700-18767
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	Establishment of the Public Library Fund in 1982-1983 F/Y, which provides state funding support to public libraries on an annual basis and laws governing the California Library Services Act. This act insures that all people have free and equal access to library resources and services including providing funding for the following: 1. Universal borrowing among libraries, 2. The California Library Literacy Service, 3. The Families for Literacy Program and 4. Cooperative library systems that shall receive an annual allowance for the improvement and maintenance of coordinated support service to member libraries.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	N/A
11)	Fiscal Impact	\$15.9 million in cuts to library services state wide
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	California Library Association President Wayne Disher, CLA Lobbyists Mike and Christina Dillon, State Librarian Stacey Aldrich, California County Librarian's Association, Friends of the Nevada County

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

		Libraries, Truckee Friends of the Library, Citizens Library Oversight Committee, Nevada County Library Foundation, Counties and Cities.
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	Those who think that in the competition for state funding the public library's self-educational programs are not as important as other programs.
	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	Loss of Public Library Fund, Transaction Based Reimbursement, through the California Library Services Act fund and California Library Literacy funding in F/Y 11/12. Projected to be \$61,055 F/Y 12/13.
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	As stated in our County vision "We are dedicated to outstanding public service" and our mission conveys that we strive to "deliver excellent services". The public library is an important part of the public services we provide and is recognized as a place where one can continue to gain knowledge throughout life. We encourage all who enter our doors to freely use library materials, computers and attend educational and recreational programs which enhance the quality of life that is so important to Nevada County Residents.
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	Yes
17)	Other Comments	<p>Gov. Jerry Brown's enactment of the Trigger Cuts in December of 2011 removed all State Library funding for the fiscal year 11/12. His proposed 2012-2013 budget continues to show libraries no support through his elimination of funding streams for the Public Library Fund, the California Library Services Act fund, and the California Library Literacy Services Fund.</p> <p>Elimination of libraries from the proposed budget will not only result in loss of funding for public libraries, but will also seriously impact the State's ability to receive millions of dollars in Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) money from the Federal Government which requires a maintenance of effort on the part of the state. Nevada County Library has received funding from LSTA in previous years to the benefit of the library system and its users. It would be a hardship to be unable to qualify for these monies in the future. Libraries are busier than ever and remain the backbone of our democracy. People are coming to libraries for</p>

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

		traditional services, seeking reading material and information. In addition, libraries are the destination for people in search of fast internet access, programs for their children, job-seeking help, literacy tutoring, homework help, meeting rooms, etc.
--	--	---

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Summary: Housing Element Implementation - Support legislation to provide flexibility in the implementation of State Housing Element policy for rural local government.

1)	Department	Community Development Agency; Planning
2)	Person completing the questionnaire	Brain Foss
3)	Title	Interim Director
	Phone	530-265-1770
	E-mail	Brian.foss@co.nevada.ca.us
4)	Indicate whether it is State or federal	State
5)	Title of Legislative Proposal	Housing Element Implementation
6)	Why is legislative remedy appropriate to this issue	<p>There are great differences between rural and urban areas. But when it comes to mandates of State housing policy with regards to Housing Element mandates, existing legislation does not account for these differences. Rural areas such as Nevada County, especially the unincorporated areas of such a county, lack sufficient infrastructure to support high density development. Yet, State law currently mandates that low and very low affordable housing needs be accommodated by the local jurisdiction with readily available vacant land zoned R-3 Residential High-Density with a 16 dwelling unit <u>minimum</u> density or through the designation of an affordable housing overlay that provides the opportunity for the same.</p> <p>Density this high requires sufficient infrastructure to support the density. In Nevada County, this would include infrastructure such as public water and sewer, sufficient road capacity as well as social infrastructure such as family support services, schools, libraries, recreational facilities as well as jobs and other services. One of the most limiting factors in Nevada County is sewer infrastructure. Currently, all public sewer facilities in the county are operating at functional capacity, with the exception of one which has limited available capacity. Timing for availability has resulted in property owner disinterest in participating in a County effort to rezone vacant lands to R-3. Some interest in an overlay district may be possible but if developed at less than the State mandated density it would not count towards</p>

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

		<p>our Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) as mandated by the State. Not meeting this mandate puts the County at risk in being non-compliant with State mandates and thus ineligible for CDBG funds.</p> <p>The other issue involved with meeting the State mandate that R-3 zoned vacant land is readily available is that environmental review must be performed by the jurisdiction at their expense. It is estimated that in order for Nevada County to meet the current mandate, the cost of environmental review of all properties identified would result in a cost to the County of approximately \$300,000 in staff and consultant time on special studies.</p> <p>Finally, the mandates of State housing laws conflict with other State mandates when applied to rural counties. Specifically, AB32 which mandates GHG reduction strategies that include developing land near existing services and using service capacity in an efficient manner. By thrusting rural poorly served areas into a mandated accommodation of high-density housing is counter to the idea of developing in existing urban areas. By developing R-3 in a rural area where there are few jobs and poor support services, local rural government creates enclaves of rural poverty where commutes are longer and less affordable to these households not to mention the negative impact on GHG reduction objectives.</p>
7)	Is this a new proposal or an update of a previously submitted one?	New
8)	Code Section(s) affected	Potentially Section 65583(a)(3), 65583.2(c)(1), (h) and (i) of California Government Code
9)	Briefly describe existing law:	The local jurisdiction must identify in their Housing Element programs that shall provide for sufficient sites with zoning that permits owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use by right, including density and development standards that could accommodate and facilitate the feasibility of housing for very low- and low-income households. Sites must be allowed without a CUP, planned-unit

**NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES**

		development or other discretionary review and approval and allow a minimum of 16 units per site.
10)	How would this proposal change existing law	Insert a provision that allows rural unincorporated areas with populations of less than 100,000 people to defer rezoning of sites until such time as infrastructure to serve the sites is available. Infrastructure in this sense would be limited to linear infrastructure such as sewer, water and road systems.
11)	Fiscal Impact	None
12)	Significant Individual/Groups That Might Support	RCRC, CSAC, other rural counties throughout the State of California
13)	Significant Individuals/Groups that Might Oppose	HCD, affordable housing advocates
14)	Negative Impacts to County or other Entities	No anticipated negative impacts
15)	How does this Support the County's Strategic Plan, Vision, Mission and/or Goals	1) Supports the Mission of working with the community to develop sound and innovative public policy
16)	Is this Included in Associations Legislative Priorities	No

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

APPENDIX D

Hazardous Fuels Conditions: Public Lands adjacent to Private Property

Public lands within Nevada County present a significant wildfire hazard to the private property owners. Several hundred parcels of federal and state lands are directly adjacent to private developed property. Most of these public lands have not been managed and have resulted in a buildup of hazardous fuel conditions. These conditions pose a wildfire hazard and increase the risk to developed properties adjacent to these public lands.

The Tahoe National Forest is the largest Federal landholder within Nevada County. It covers over 800,000 acres and spans across multiple counties: Yuba, Sierra, Plumas, Placer, El Dorado, and Nevada Counties. In Nevada County, the Tahoe National Forest represents 29% of the county, or nearly 180,000 acres. The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest is the other national forest within Nevada County and manages only 2,400 acres on the eastside of the county near the Nevada state line. The Folsom Office for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) manages nearly about 17,000 acres in Nevada County, which is about 3% of the area in Nevada County. The State of California, through the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Fish and Game and other state departments, manages over 23,500 acres, which accounts for 4% of the area in Nevada County.

Problem

Public lands occupy nearly 35% of the land in Nevada County, with a checkerboard pattern of discontinuous and isolated parcels of federal and state lands intermixed with private property through many areas. Nearly 30,000 acres (500 parcels) of public lands are directly adjacent to private property. While homeowners are required by state law to treat the hazardous vegetation around their property to meet defensible space standards, public lands are not mandated to reduce the hazardous fuels conditions on their property. The lack of direct fuels treatment on public lands adjacent to developed areas increases the risk for wildfires to destroy private property. Conversely, wildfire spreading from a developed private property with or without defensible space into public lands without effective fuels treatment has potential to cause significant environmental losses to timber crops, habitats, watershed, developed properties and infrastructure.

The public expects both federal and state governments to reasonably maintain public lands. The general public perception is that both federal and state lands are not meeting public expectation in being leaders in managing these lands. Furthermore, the public is burdened with many regulations, yet the lack of fuels treatment to reduce hazardous fuels on federal and state lands poses a significant wildfire threat to private lands. The public is seeking cooperative efforts by federal and state governments.

Background

Preliminary information was obtained from the Tahoe National Forest. No information was garnered from the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest or from the Folsom Office for the Bureau of Land Management or from the state agencies. The general information regarding state lands was provided by the California Department of Forestry.

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Nevada County covers approximately 611,000 acres. As mentioned above, nearly 35%, or about 212,000 acres falls under federal or state jurisdiction. The city and town areas of the county occupy only 4% of the area, or 23,000 acres. The residual areas, which is the unincorporated areas of Nevada County is approximately 376,000 acres. The vast majority of developed parcels (91%) are on private property parcels that are ten acres in size or less. Commonly, small-developed parcels are adjacent to larger non-developed parcels, both private and public. Interestingly, 14% of public lands in the county are adjacent to private property. Moreover, there are approximately 27,000 developed parcels in the county. Based on the assumption that developed properties must meet defensible space requirements, collectively, private property owners treat, as a minimum, 21,000 acres annually. Furthermore, if private property owners spend a minimum of \$300 dollars per acre to meet defensible space requirements, then collectively, private property contribute over \$6 million dollars annually for fuels treatment.

In terms of fuels treatment on federal lands, the Tahoe National Forest typically treats approximately 7,000-10,000 acres annually and has an average budget of \$1.8 million dollars to support this effort. For the 2008 fiscal year, the Tahoe National Forest received an additional \$400,000 for a total budget of \$2.2 million dollars to treat 11,000 – 13,000 acres. For the next fiscal year, the fuels treatment budget is estimated to increase to a total of \$3.0 million dollars.

Fuels treatment activities, in terms of location and size, type, etc, are defined by several factors. One of the primary factors determining where fuels treatment activities occur is directly associated with the environmental review process – in this case, National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Another factor that influences the location of fuels treatment project is proximity to community areas, commonly identified as Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) areas. Additionally, another factor guiding the location of fuels treatment projects are areas near scenic highways or scenic areas – such as the Highway 20 corridor to Interstate 80. Governmental earmarks also define the general location for fuels treatment projects. For example, the Sierraville District has for several years has been mandated to treat the fuels within this district, and this resulted in three quarters of the fuels treatment budget being spent within this one district. The other three districts divided the remaining \$450,000 for their fuels treatment projects.

In Nevada County, the Tahoe National Forest is currently engaged in three projects. These projects are based on available funding and factors described above. The end result is that only 50 to 3,000 acres are treated annually in Nevada County. This represents, at best, only 2% of the Tahoe National Forest within Nevada County.

Funding imbalance issues remain a concern. Normally, budget for fuels treatment are shifted to the other districts - American River, Truckee and Yuba Districts, with the residual balance to support the Sierraville District projects.

The Tahoe National Forest desirable target is to treat approximately 20,000 acres annually on a ten to twenty year rotation but current treatment falls below this target. The chief issue for federal agencies is to appropriately balance fuels treatment in community areas with other agency specific fuels treatment projects.

NEVADA COUNTY

2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

In terms of community protection, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003 identifies the need for fuels treatment and restoration of healthy forest conditions throughout many federally managed federal lands, including federal areas near community areas. The Act identifies the Community Wildfire Protection Plan as one of the key methods for identifying hazardous fuels on federal lands adjacent to private properties. From the Act:

(2) AUTHORIZED HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION PROJECT

The term “authorized hazardous fuel reduction project” means the measures and methods described in the definition of “appropriate tools” contained in the glossary of the Implementation Plan, on Federal land described in section 102(a) and conducted under sections 103 and 104.

(3) COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

The term “community wildfire protection plan” means a plan for an at risk community that:

- (A) Is developed within the context of the collaborative agreements and the guidance established by the Wildland Fire Leadership Council and agreed to by the applicable local government, local fire department, and State agency responsible for forest management, in consultation with interested parties and the Federal land management agencies managing land in the vicinity of the at-risk community;
- (B) Identifies and prioritizes areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments and recommends the types and methods of treatment on *Federal and non-Federal* land that will protect 1 or more at-risk communities and essential infrastructure; and
- (C) Recommends measures to reduce structural ignitability throughout the at-risk community.

The State does not have a regulation similar to the Healthy Forest Restoration Act. However, Public Resources Code 4291 does apply to both private and state properties within the wildland areas and are required to meet Defensible Space regulations. Yet there are no specific regulations requiring the State to treat hazardous vegetation on state lands to reduce the risk to adjacent private property from wildfires. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) provides the Vegetation Management Program to assist both private and state property owners with fuels treatment projects – these are voluntary cost-share projects. As an example, Malakoff State Park has utilized this program. Furthermore, agencies like CAL Trans, and State Fish and Game indirectly engage in fuels treatment project associated with site-specific issues, such as roadside clearance, or habitat restoration.

The State Fire Marshal’s Office approach to the wildfire issues primarily focuses on reducing structure losses from wildfires by implement the new regulations regarding ignition resistant building materials and designs. Recent changes to Public Resources Code 4291, effective January 1, 2009, indicates a shift in the defensible space requirements in several areas including:

NEVADA COUNTY 2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

4291. (a) A person who owns, leases, controls, operates, or maintains a building or structure in, upon, or adjoining a mountainous area, forest-covered lands, brush-covered lands, grass-covered lands, or land that is covered with flammable material....
... The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection shall develop.... a guidance document on fuels management pursuant to this chapter. Guidance shall include, but not be limited to, regionally appropriate vegetation management suggestions that preserve and restore native species, minimize erosion, minimize water consumption, and permit trees near homes for shade, aesthetics, and habitat; and suggestions to minimize or eliminate the risk of flammability of Non-vegetative sources of combustion such as woodpiles, propane tanks, wood decks, and outdoor lawn furniture....

In general, the State typically provides funding to non-profit organizations, such as Fire Safe Councils, for fuels treatment projects on private property. Most funds allocated by the State are funds that have been allocated from the federal land management agencies to the State, typically through the CAL FIRE. Proposition 40, the Watershed Restoration Program for the Sierra Nevada, has recently funded fuels treatment projects on private properties through various programs administered by CAL FIRE. Locally, in the last four years, CAL FIRE has provided over \$2 million dollars to support various fuels treatment and forest stewardship projects on private property. Like the federal fuels treatment projects, state fuels treatment focus at the community level as opposed to a single or isolated parcel level management. This practice is primary, and based on cost, time and effectiveness. Additionally, governmental funds for fuels treatment emphasize public benefit verse single, individual property benefit.

Final Comment and Suggestions:

Both federal and state governments provide funds for fuels treatment activities. Most fuels treatment activities focus at the community level as opposed to a single or isolated small parcel level. While funding is steadily increasing to support federal fuels treatment projects on federal lands, generally fewer dollars are allocated by state agencies for fuel treatment projects on state lands. Funding by the state typically occurs through voter-approved bonds, such as Proposition 40. While both federal and state governments fund fuels treatment projects, there are, however, gaps in these funding programs. Hundreds of parcels and thousands of acres of private property are vulnerable to inadequate fuels treatment efforts on public lands. There is a need to develop a better mechanism for addressing hazardous fuels issues for the public-private property boundary line. Here are four suggestions to consider:

- 1) For federal lands, utilizes the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP), which is a component of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act. The CWPP should identify both the federal and non-federal (private) properties with hazardous fuels conditions, develop priority areas needing fuels treatments and relay this information to the local federal land managers for appropriate funding (perhaps designate this funding as CWPP funding for federal lands).
- 2) For the state lands, consider adopting similar a Healthy Forest Restoration Act for state lands, and/ or partnering with the CWPP process for identifying state lands that directly impact private property.
- 3) Provide federal and state funding to develop biomass/value-added products market to assist both public and private landowners with fuels treatment protects. (This is also addressed in the Healthy Forest Restoration Act)

NEVADA COUNTY
2012 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

- 4) Ensure adequate long-term fuels treatment funding to support both the state and federal land management agencies for the next twenty years – for at least one full rotational fuel treatment cycle.