



Revision to ASR and/or Exhibits/Attachments

Date: September 30, 2010

To: Darlene J. Bloom, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

CC: County Executive Office

From: *for* Thomas G. Mauk, County Executive Officer

RE: Agenda Item(s) # 23 for the October 5, 2010 Board Meeting

ASR Control #(s): 10-001477

2010 SEP 30 PM 4:56
CLERK OF THE BOARD
ORANGE COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Subject: Legislative Bulletin - October 5, 2010

Explanation:

Revised Recommended Action(s)

Make modifications to the:

Subject

Background Information

Summary

Revised Exhibits/Attachments (attached)

Replace Draft Legislative Bulletin with REVISED DRAFT Legislative Bulletin for October 5, 2010

Additional Information and/or Correspondence (attached)



Legislative Bulletin

REVISED DRAFT

A Publication of the County Executive Office/Legislative Affairs

October 5, 2010
Item No. 23
Vol. XVI, No. 21

County of Orange Positions on Proposed Legislation

The Legislative Bulletin provides the Board of Supervisors with analyses of measures pending in Sacramento and Washington that are of interest to the County. Staff provides recommended positions that fall within the range of policies established by the Board. According to the County of Orange Legislative Affairs Procedures adopted by the Board of Supervisors on June 3, 2003, staff recommendations for formal County positions on legislation will be agendized and presented in this document for Board action at regular Board of Supervisors meetings. When the Board takes formal action on a piece of legislation, the CEO will direct the County's legislative advocates to promote the individual bills as approved by the Board. The Legislative Bulletin also provides the Board of Supervisors with informative updates on State and Federal issues.

The 2010 Legislative Platform was adopted by Board of Supervisors' Minute Order dated November 24, 2009.

On October 5, 2010, the Board of Supervisors will consider the following actions:

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. **OPPOSE - Proposed Increases to Stormwater Permit Fees by the State Water Resources Control Board**
2. **OPPOSE – President's Proposed FFY 2011 Budget Amendment Dated August 20, 2010 to Public Health Emergency Preparedness Grant**
3. **Receive and File Legislative Bulletin**

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

- **Statewide Propositions Qualified for November 2, 2010 Ballot – General Election**
- **Local Measures in Orange County – November 2, 2010 Ballot – General Election**

SACRAMENTO LEGISLATIVE REPORT

SACRAMENTO UPDATE

No official details have been released but the "framework" to the close the \$19 billion deficit is rumored to consist of the following:

- Cut \$7 billion from state spending (this does not include any social welfare programs).
 - FYI - Holds education spending at about last year's level.
- New Revenue Increases
 - A possible plan to sell state buildings to help generate more than \$1 billion; also assuming/hoping the federal government will send more than \$3 billion to the State.
 - Approximately \$1.4 billion in added revenue would come from delaying a scheduled tax break that would let companies carry forward a portion of their net operating losses. This tax change would be suspended for two years under the plan.

This leaves a deficit of roughly \$5 -6 billion dollars to still be negotiated. An agreement on the fine details has not been reached and a vote on a State budget is unlikely to happen this week.

ACTION ITEMS

Proposed Increases to Stormwater Permit Fees by the State Water Resources Control Board – OPPOSE

OC Public Works staff is in receipt of the notice regarding the October 5, 2010, meeting of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the proposed Resolution adopting emergency regulations revising the core water quality fee schedules. The County of Orange, Orange County Flood Control District, and cities of Orange County are subject to Waste Discharge Requirements for discharges of urban runoff from our municipal separate storm sewer systems (Order R8-2009-0030 and Order No. R9-2009-0002) and would be subject to the proposed 21.5 percent increase in fees for municipal permit holders. This would result in a collective increase of almost \$97,100 per year for permit fees in Orange County.

CEO Legislative Affairs and OC Public Works comments

CEO Legislative Affairs and OC Public Works recommend that the County of Orange submit comments to the State Water Resources Control Board, opposing the proposed Resolution as it applies to stormwater permit fees and request that the proposed fee increase for stormwater permits be rejected.

The proposed fee increase for regulated municipal stormwater dischargers is based upon a justification for which no tangible evidence is presented. Further, in a period of economic hardship for all levels of government, the State Water Resources Control Board should be managing its programs within its current financial means and should not be seeking any increase in fees.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Statewide Propositions Qualified for November 2, 2010 Ballot – General Election (California Secretary of State)

Proposition 18 - Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2010

The Governor requested Proposition 18, the \$11.1 billion water bond, be delayed because of concern that voters would reject it given California's \$19 billion budget deficit and struggling economy. This proposition was moved from November 2010 statewide ballot to the November 2012 statewide ballot, after the Legislature passed AB 1265 (Caballero) and Governor Schwarzenegger signed the Safe, Clean, and Reliable Drinking Water Supply Act of 2012.

Proposition 19 - Changes California Law to Legalize Marijuana and Allow It to Be Regulated and Taxed

Summary

Allows people 21 years old or older to possess, cultivate, or transport marijuana for personal use. Permits local governments to regulate and tax commercial production and sale of marijuana to people 21 years old or older. Prohibits people from possessing marijuana on school grounds, using it in public, smoking it while minors are present, or providing it to anyone under 21 years old. Maintains current prohibitions against driving while impaired.

Fiscal Impact: According to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), depending on federal, state, and local government actions, potential increased tax, and fee revenues in the hundreds of millions of dollars annually and potential correctional savings of several tens of millions of dollars annually.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: Individuals age 21 or older could, under state law, possess and cultivate limited amounts of marijuana for personal use. In addition, the state and local governments could authorize, regulate, and tax commercial marijuana-related activities under certain conditions. These activities would remain illegal under federal law.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: The possession and cultivation of marijuana for personal use and commercial marijuana-related activities would remain illegal under state law, unless allowed under the state's existing medical marijuana law.

CSAC Position: No on Proposition 19

Proposition 20 – Redistricting of Congressional Districts

Summary

Removes elected representatives from the process of establishing congressional districts and transfers that authority to the recently-authorized 14-member redistricting commission. Redistricting commission is comprised of five Democrats, five Republicans, and four voters registered with neither party. Requires that any newly-proposed district lines be approved by nine commissioners including three Democrats, three Republicans, and three from neither party.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, no significant net change in state redistricting costs.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: The responsibility to determine the boundaries of California's districts in the U.S. House of Representatives would be moved to the Citizens Redistricting Commission, a commission established by Proposition 11 in 2008.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: The responsibility to determine the boundaries of California's districts in the U.S. House of Representatives would remain with the Legislature.

Proposition 21 - Establishes \$18 Annual Vehicle License Surcharge to Help Fund State Parks and Wildlife Programs and Grants Free Admission to All State Parks to Surcharged Vehicles

Summary

Establishes an \$18 annual state vehicle license surcharge and grants free admission to all state parks to surcharged vehicles. Requires deposit of surcharge revenue in a new trust fund. Requires that trust funds be used solely to operate, maintain and repair the state park system, and to protect wildlife and natural resources. Exempts commercial vehicles, trailers and trailer coaches from the surcharge. Requires annual independent audit and review by citizen's oversight committee.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, annual increase to state revenues of \$500 million from surcharge on vehicle registrations. After offsetting some existing funding sources, these revenues would provide at least \$250 million more annually for state parks and wildlife conservation. Increased state revenues of about \$500 million annually from the imposition of a surcharge on the VLF to be used mainly to fund state parks and wildlife conservation programs. Potential state savings of up to approximately \$200 million annually to the extent that the VLF surcharge revenues were used to reduce support from the General Fund and other special funds for parks and wildlife conservation programs. Reduction of about \$50 million annually in state and local revenues from state park day-use fees. These revenue losses could potentially be offset by increases in other types of state park user fees and revenues.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: An \$18 annual surcharge would be added to the amount paid when a person registers a motor vehicle. The surcharge revenues would be used to provide funding for state park and wildlife conservation programs. Vehicles subject to the surcharge would have free admission and parking at all state parks.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: State park and wildlife conservation programs would continue to be funded through existing state and local funding sources. Admission and parking fees could continue to be charged for vehicles entering state parks.

Proposition 22 - Prohibits the State from Taking Funds Used for Transportation or Local Government Projects and Services (Initiative Constitutional Amendment)

Summary

Prohibits the State from shifting, taking, borrowing, or restricting the use of tax revenues dedicated by law to fund local government services, community redevelopment projects, or transportation projects and services. Prohibits the State from delaying the distribution of tax revenues for these purposes even when the Governor deems it necessary due to a severe state fiscal hardship.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, Proposition 22 puts significant constraints on state authority over city, county, special district, and redevelopment agency funds. There would be commensurate reductions in state resources, resulting in major decreases in state spending and/or increases in state revenues probably in the range of \$1 billion to several billions of dollars annually. There would be comparable increases in funding for state and local transportation programs and local redevelopment.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: The state's authority to use or redirect state fuel tax and local property tax revenues would be significantly restricted.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: The state's current authority over state fuel tax and local property tax revenues would not be affected.

Proposition 23 - Suspends Air Pollution Control Laws Requiring Major Polluters to Report and Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions That Cause Global Warming Until Unemployment Drops Below Specified Level for Full Year

Summary

Suspends State laws requiring reduced greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming, until California's unemployment rate drops to 5.5 percent or less for four consecutive quarters. Requires State to abandon implementation of comprehensive greenhouse-gas-reduction program that includes increased renewable energy and cleaner fuel requirements, and mandatory emission reporting and fee requirements for major polluters such as power plants and oil refineries, until suspension is lifted.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, likely modest net increase in overall economic activity in the state from suspension of greenhouse gases regulatory activity, resulting in a potentially significant net increase in state and local revenues.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: Certain existing and proposed regulations authorized under state law ("Assembly Bill 32") to address global warming would be suspended. These regulations would remain suspended until the state unemployment rate drops to 5.5 percent or lower for one year.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: The state could continue to implement the measures authorized under Assembly Bill 32 to address global warming.

Proposition 24 - Repeals Recent Legislation That Would Allow Businesses to Carry Back Losses, Share Tax Credits, and Use a Sales-Based Income Calculation to Lower Taxable Income

Summary

Repeals recent legislation that would allow businesses to shift operating losses to prior tax years and that would extend the period permitted to shift operating losses to future tax years. Repeals recent legislation that would allow corporations to share tax credits with affiliated corporations. Repeals recent legislation that would allow multistate businesses to use a sales-based income calculation, rather than a combination property, payroll and sales-based income calculation.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, this would increase state revenues of about \$1.3 billion each year by 2012–13 from higher taxes paid by some businesses. Smaller increases in 2010–11 and 2011–12.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: Three business tax provisions will return to what they were before 2008 and 2009 law changes. As a result: (1) a business will be less able to deduct losses in one year against income in other years, (2) a multistate business will have its California income determined by a calculation using three factors, and (3) a business will not be able to share tax credits with related businesses.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: Three business tax provisions that were recently changed will not be affected. As a result of maintaining current law: (1) a business will be able to deduct losses in one year against income in more situations, (2) most multistate businesses could choose to have their California income determined based only on a single sales factor, and (3) a business will be able to share its tax credits with related businesses.

Proposition 25 - Changes Legislative Vote Requirement to Pass a Budget from Two-Thirds to a Simple Majority. Retains Two-Thirds Vote Requirement for Taxes

Summary

Changes the legislative vote requirement necessary to pass the state budget from two-thirds to a simple majority. Provides that if the Legislature fails to pass a budget bill by June 15, all members of the Legislature will permanently forfeit any reimbursement for salary and expenses for every day until the day the Legislature passes a budget bill.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, in some years, the contents of the state budget could be changed due to the lower legislative vote requirement in this measure. The extent of changes would depend on the Legislature's future actions.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: The Legislature's vote requirement to send the annual budget bill to the Governor would be lowered from two-thirds to a majority of each house of the Legislature.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: The Legislature's vote requirement to send an annual budget bill to the Governor would remain unchanged at two-thirds of each house of the Legislature.

Proposition 26 - Increases Legislative Vote Requirement to Two-Thirds for State Levies and Charges. Imposes Additional Requirement for Voters to Approve Local Levies and Charges with Limited Exceptions

Summary

Increases legislative vote requirement to two-thirds for state levies and charges, with limited exceptions, and for certain taxes currently subject to majority vote. Changes Constitution to require voters to approve, either by two-thirds or majority, local levies and charges with limited exceptions.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, depending on decisions by governing bodies and voters, decreased state and local government revenues and spending (up to billions of dollars annually). Increased transportation spending and state General Fund costs (\$1 billion annually).

A **YES** vote on this measure means: The definition of taxes would be broadened to include many payments currently considered to be fees or charges. As a result, more state and local proposals to increase revenues would require approval by two-thirds of each house of the Legislature or by local voters.

A **NO** vote on this measure means: Current constitutional requirements regarding fees and taxes would not be changed.

CSAC Position: No on Proposition 26

Proposition 27 - Eliminates State Commission on Redistricting. Consolidates Authority for Redistricting with Elected Representatives

Summary

Eliminates the 14-member redistricting commission selected from applicant pool picked by government auditors. Consolidates authority for establishing State Assembly, Senate, and Board of Equalization district boundaries with elected state representatives responsible for drawing congressional districts. Reduces budget, and imposes limit on amount Legislature may spend, for redistricting. Provides that voters will have the authority to reject district boundary maps approved by the Legislature. Requires populations of all districts for the same office to be exactly the same.

Fiscal Impact: According to the LAO, a possible reduction of state redistricting costs of around \$1 million over the next year. Likely reduction of these costs of a few million dollars once every ten years beginning in 2020.

A **YES** vote on this measure means: The responsibility to determine the boundaries of State Legislature and Board of Equalization districts would be returned to the Legislature. The Citizens Redistricting Commission, established by Proposition 11 in 2008 to perform this function, would be eliminated. (Proposition 20 on this ballot also concerns redistricting issues. If both Proposition 27 and Proposition 20 are approved by voters, the proposition receiving the greater number of "yes" votes would be the only one to go into effect.)

A **NO** vote on this measure means: The responsibility to determine the boundaries of Legislature and Board of Equalization districts would remain with the Citizens Redistricting Commission.

**Local Measures in Orange County – November 2, 2010 Ballot – General Election
(Registrar of Voters)**

Schools

G – Anaheim City School District, Local Elementary School Classroom Safety, Repair and Improvement Measure

To improve local elementary schools by fixing leaky roofs, deteriorating restrooms, plumbing, sewer systems, wiring, dry rot, termite damage; removing asbestos/ other hazardous materials; improving fire/school safety; improving classroom instructional technology for teaching math, science and 21st-century skills; relieving overcrowding; and qualifying for up to \$84 million in state matching funds, shall Anaheim City (Elementary) School District issue \$169,300,000 of bonds, at legal rates, with independent citizen oversight and no money for administrator salaries?

H – Capistrano Unified School District, Trustees Elected ‘By Trustee Area’

For the election of one member of the governing board of the Capistrano Unified School District residing in each trustee area elected by the registered voters in that trustee area.

I – Magnolia School District, School Improvement and Repair Measure

To improve the quality of education; upgrade technology; repair leaky roofs; modernize classrooms, restrooms and school facilities; make health and safety improvements; make handicapped accessibility upgrades; install solar panels to improve energy efficiency; replace temporary portable classrooms; and increase campus security; shall the Magnolia School District issue \$16,300,000 of bonds at legal interest rates, have an independent citizens' oversight committee and have NO money used for administrative or teacher salaries or be taken by the state?

Cities:

J – Anaheim, Authorization Of Design-Build Procurement For Public Works Projects

Shall Section 1212 be added to the City Charter to authorize the use of design-build procurement for public works projects in the City of Anaheim?

K – Anaheim, Prohibition Of Automated Traffic Enforcement Systems (Red Light Cameras)

Shall Section 1213 be added to the City Charter to prohibit the use of red light cameras or other automated traffic enforcement systems in the City of Anaheim?

L – Costa Mesa, Transient Occupancy Rate Increase

Shall the City increase the existing Transient Occupancy Tax from 6% to 8%, which tax is, and will continue to be, imposed only on transients occupying hotels and motels within the City, for the funding of general city services and programs?

M – Fullerton, Term Limits

Shall an ordinance be adopted to enact term limits upon members of the Fullerton City Council, preventing any person who serves three (3) successive terms from serving again until an intervening period of four (4) years has elapsed?

N – Huntington Beach, Huntington Beach City Charter Comprehensive Update Measure

Shall proposed Charter Amendment No. 1, revising and restating the Charter of the City of Huntington Beach (excluding changes to Section 617 entitled Infrastructure Fund) as set forth in the proposed measure be approved?

O – Huntington Beach, Huntington Beach City Charter Section 617, Infrastructure Fund Measure

Shall proposed Charter Amendment No. 2, amending Section 617 of the Charter of the City of Huntington Beach entitled Infrastructure Fund, as set forth in the proposed measure be approved?

P – Huntington Beach, Huntington Beach UUT Modernization/Reduction Measure

To preserve vital city services shall Huntington Beach's existing utility users' ordinance be modernized and reduced by .1% to maintain 9-1-1 emergency response times, police officers, firefighters, public safety communications/equipment, senior services, storm drains and other city services, requiring equal treatment of taxpayers regardless of technology used with low-income senior exemptions, annual audits, local control of funds, and no rate increase without voter approval?

Q – Huntington Beach, Huntington Beach Private Wireless Communication Facilities Advisory Measure

Shall the City permit the installation of a mobile telephone antenna at Harbour View Park located at 16600 Saybrook Lane and at Bolsa View Park located at 5741 Brighton Drive?

R – Irvine, Irvine School Support Initiative

Shall an ordinance be adopted to direct the City of Irvine to continue financial support to Irvine schools, through the Irvine Educational Partnership Fund and the Challenge Match Grant programs, on the same general terms and conditions and at same general levels as approved in Fiscal Year 2010-2011, for three additional fiscal years commencing with Fiscal Year 2011-2012?

S – Irvine, Irvine Sustainable Community Initiative

Shall an ordinance be adopted by the City of Irvine to ratify and implement policies in support of renewable energy and environmental programs for a sustainable community?

T – Laguna Hills, A Proposed Ordinance Limiting the Number of Terms a Member of the City Council May Serve

Shall Laguna Hills Municipal Code Section 2-04.080 be adopted to establish that any person who has served two (2) consecutive terms of office as a member of the City Council is not eligible to hold office again as a member of the City Council until the expiration of at least two (2) years following the conclusion of such person's last term of office?

U – La Palma, Utility Users Tax Amendment

Shall Initiative Ordinance 10-01, authorizing the City Council to annually reduce the rate of the Utility Users Tax to a lower rate than the law currently allows, be adopted?

V – Newport Beach, Charter Amendments and Ordinance Repeals

Shall the Charter be amended and ordinances repealed to: close Charter loopholes that circumvent Proposition 13; restrict oil operations; amend legal document publication requirements; simplify franchise processes; increase formal bidding thresholds; adjust misdemeanor penalties; require redistricting appointments every ten years; amend Civil Service System; repeal Chamber of Commerce contribution limit; remove City contract term limitations; require vote for the sale of City owned waterfront property; make administrative changes to comply with state and federal law?

W – Placentia, City of Placentia Utility Users Tax Modernization Measure

Without raising current tax rates and to preserve funding for critical city services, including police, fire, 911 emergency response, street repair, graffiti removal, park maintenance, and other city services; shall the City of Placentia's existing utility user tax ordinance be amended to reflect changes in technology and Federal law, treating taxpayers equally regardless of technology services used; including exemptions available for low-income residents, independent audits, with all funds dedicated to preserving Placentia city services?

X – Tustin, Appointment of City Clerk

Shall the office of the City Clerk be appointive?

Y – Yorba Linda, Yorba Linda Ethics Ordinance

Shall an ordinance titled the "Yorba Linda Ethics Ordinance" be adopted to ensure that the highest level of ethics is practiced by all elected and appointed officials and staff that serve the City of Yorba Linda?

Z – Yorba Linda, Yorba Linda Affordable Housing Ordinance – Savi Ranch

Shall an ordinance be adopted amending the Yorba Linda General Plan and approving a zone change to permit the development of affordable housing up to a maximum density of 30 dwelling units per acre and a maximum height of 45 feet within the Savi Ranch Planned Development zone?

AA – Westminster, Repeal of Current Ban on State-Approved Fireworks

Shall Chapter 9.64 of the Westminster Municipal Code prohibiting the possession, storage, sale, and use of state-approved fireworks in the City of Westminster, be repealed?

WASHINGTON LEGISLATIVE REPORT

WASHINGTON UPDATE

With one foot out the door, the House and Senate convened just long enough to vote on a continuing resolution, a stopgap measure to keep the government in operating funds for the next two months and avoid a pre-election federal shutdown. The Senate on September 29, 2010, approved the temporary spending bill 69-30. The House joined in several hours later with a 228-194 vote.

The stopgap bill is a reminder of the dismal performance by Congress in doing its most basic job - passing an annual budget and the spending bills for agency operations. Only two of a dozen annual appropriations bills have passed the House this year, the Veterans Affairs and the Transportation, and none has passed the Senate.

For now, Congress is heading home without what was to be the Democrats' closing argument of the campaign: an extension of expiring Bush-era tax cuts for families making less than \$250,000 and individuals making less than \$200,000. Conservative and moderate Democrats joined Republicans in calling for the preservation of all the expiring cuts, even for the wealthiest Americans. If Congress

takes no action by the end of the year, Americans of every income level face significantly higher tax bills.

Other end-of-session items included:

- The House, on a 304-118 vote, passed a legislative blueprint for NASA's future that would extend the life of the space shuttle program for a year while backing the President's intent to use commercial carriers to carry humans into space.
- Also being sent to the President is the first intelligence authorization bill since 2004, with compromise language on demands by Congress for greater access to top secret intelligence. The most secret briefings will still only be provided to top congressional leaders, but members of the intelligence panels will receive a general description of the programs. The House vote was 244-181.
- The House approved legislation, 348-79, that would allow the U.S. to seek trade sanctions against China and other nations for manipulating their currency to gain trade advantages. Its prospects in the Senate are unclear.
- The child nutrition bill ran into trouble after House supporters abandoned their own \$8 billion version and proposed passing the Senate version, which would be partially paid for by using future funding for food stamp programs. The bill now faces opposition from hunger groups, and some Democrats have said they will not support it if the food stamp money is used.

ACTION ITEMS

President's Proposed FFY 2011 Budget Amendment Dated August 20, 2010, to Public Health Emergency Preparedness Grant – OPPOSE

Reviewed by: Health Care Agency and CEO/Legislative Affairs

The current FFY 2011 budget includes \$688,259,211 for the Centers of Disease Control's (CDC) Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) grant program. This program provides state and local health departments funding for health disaster planning activities. PHEP is the core funding stream nationally for health jurisdictions to do preparedness activities and increase response capabilities for all health related and all-hazards events.

Health Care Agency (HCA) and CEO/Legislative Affairs Comments

Health Care Agency and CEO/Legislative Affairs recommend your Honorable Board to adopt an oppose position on the proposed budget amendment, which includes a request by President Obama's Administration for a reduction of \$184,000,000 to the PHEP program, and send a letter requesting Congress to preserve current funding levels for this program. HCA has been informed by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to anticipate a 25 percent reduction in funding.

This amendment will have significant impact on HCA and the operations of the Health Disaster Management Division (HDM). HDM's 2010-11 PHEP allocation is \$4,566,079. CDPH's recommendation to plan for a 25 percent reduction equates to a \$1,141,519 reduction in revenue. HDM's PHEP primarily funds personnel costs. Staff levels would be reduced with loss of funding,

however, the workload would remain the same. The workload and preparedness activities are outlined by CDPH and are requirements to receive funding. Scaling back planning, outreach, training, and exercises would be required. The reductions would mean staff reductions, up to six personnel, within HDM. The PHEP performance period runs from August to August. CDC and CDPH are continuing to work through the full impact of this reduction.

Current funding levels for PHEP should be maintained. HCA is responsible for the health related aspects for emergency preparedness and disaster response. Since 9/11, the health care sector has made large and concrete gains in the area of preparedness. New response capabilities have been established, as seen in the H1N1 response and HCA's support in the Santiago and Freeway Complex Fires.

A copy of the 2010 County of Orange Legislative Platform is available at: <http://www.oc.ca.gov/> under OC Links. If you or your staff have any questions or require additional information on any of the items in this bulletin, please contact Donna Grubaugh at 714.834.7218.