Weekly ReCAP for November 29, 2019

Next CPC meeting December 2, 2019 – Please note earlier starting time – 3:00 ☺ p.m., Location Volunteer Center on Lewis Street, San Andreas

---

Planning Commission Meeting Thursday Dec. 12, posting/ summary below.
More info at http://calaverasgov.us/Meetings/ModuleID/3891/ItemID/563/mctl/EventDetails

Planning Commission Meeting
Start Date/Time:
Thursday, December 12, 2019 9:00 AM
Recurring Event:
One time event
Importance:
Normal Priority
Category:
Planning Commission
Description:

AGENDA

- 2019-074 Appeal of Ineligibility for Employment by a Medical Cannabis Dispensary - Little Trees
- 2019-079 Conditional Use Permit for CV Saddle Creek LLC - **This item has been withdrawn**
- 2004-138 Extension of Time for Las Tres Marias Tentative Subdivision Tract Map
- 2005-190 Extension of Time for North Vista Plaza Tentative Subdivision Tract Map

---

As Climate Risk Grows, Cities Test a Tough Strategy: Saying 'No' to Developers

By Christopher Flavelle and John Schwartz / The New York Times / Nov. 19, 2019

VIRGINIA BEACH — Glimpsed from a kayak on West Neck Creek, this swampy piece of land, a pocket of red maple and loblolly pine tucked behind growing subdivisions, doesn't look like the stuff of existential debate.

But this is where Virginia Beach, squeezed between the clamor for new housing and the relentlessness of flooding worsened by climate change, decided to draw its line in the mud.

The city last year became one of a small but growing number of communities willing to say no to developers — despite their political and economic clout — when it rejected a proposal to build a few dozen homes on this soggy parcel of 50 acres, arguing that those homes would be unsafe. The developers sued, accusing officials of making their project a scapegoat as voters clamored for action after disastrous flooding.

This past May, a judge ruled that Virginia Beach was within its rights to stop the development. The city's experience could become a harbinger for others nationwide.

What on Earth Is Going On?

Sign up for our weekly newsletter to get our latest stories and insights about climate change — along with answers to your questions and tips on how to help.

"It's a confrontation with reality," Bobby Dyer, Virginia Beach's mayor, said in an interview in his office. "Not everybody's going to be happy."

As the Trump administration reverses efforts to fight global warming, local officials around the country are forced to grapple with more intense flooding, hurricanes, wildfires and other disasters. That pressure is colliding with development, which provides jobs, homes and taxes but which also can increase the future risk of disaster as construction spreads into floodplains or forests that are prone to calamity.

The outcome of that battle will shape Americans' vulnerability to climate change for generations — and so far, development seems to be prevailing. In many coastal states, homes are going up at the fastest rate in the most flood-prone areas. The number of new houses in what experts call the wildland-urban interface, where the wildfire threat tends to be greatest, increased 41 percent nationwide between 1990 and 2010.

But as the financial and emotional costs of disasters increase, so does the evidence of a shifting mind-set.

On Tuesday, the Pew Charitable Trusts, a research and advocacy group, released a report describing how a few cities and states have successfully reduced flooding vulnerability. Their actions are "a recipe for success" for others, said Laura Lightbody, director of Pew's flood-prepared communities initiative.

The examples include Norfolk, Va., which last year imposed new rules on developers, including a requirement that every new home be elevated. Some home builders resisted, saying the rules would be too costly, said Andria P. McClellan, a city councilor. "There was definitely some pushback," Ms. McClellan said. "Change is difficult."

Pew also highlighted Vermont. After Tropical Storm Irene damaged or destroyed some 2,400 roads, 300 bridges and 800 homes in 2011, the state looked for ways to encourage towns to protect against flooding.

A main tool was the state’s Emergency Relief and Assistance Fund, which rewards communities that cut their climate risk by picking up more of the tab for the work. To get the most funding, communities had to take more difficult steps like coming up with a plan for limiting development along flood- and erosion-prone riverbanks.

It’s a high bar, and only about a third of the state’s communities have met it, said Lauren Oates, the state’s hazard mitigation officer. That’s partly because they fear the loss of future tax revenues if they limit building. “Often it doesn’t go over well,” Ms. Oates said.

But there are exceptions. In Northfield, where many houses were destroyed during Irene, officials bought out some 18 homes and built a park that serves as an absorbent buffer when waters overflow the Dog River.

“There were people who were not happy,” said Michele Braun, a former zoning administrator for the town, since it meant the loss of about $2.2 million in property value for tax revenue. She recalled telling them the buyout didn’t destroy millions worth of real estate. “It was the flood.”

In parts of the West, cities and counties are imposing restrictions on building at the forest’s edge, despite resistance from developers.

In 2015, the Sleepy Hollow fire burned 28 homes in Wenatchee, Wash., a city less than 100 miles east of Seattle. In response, officials are pushing fire safety measures that include requiring houses to be built farther apart in the neighborhoods at the edge of the Cascade Range.

Spacing out homes reduces the chance that fire will jump from one to the next. However, from a developer’s perspective, it makes the property “less financially viable,” said Steve King, the city’s director of economic development.

Builders have pushed back, but Mr. King said the city had no choice. “There will be another fire,” he said. “Hopefully, next time we won’t lose a bunch of homes.”

But perhaps nowhere in the country better demonstrates the trend than Virginia Beach, where some residents delight in listing the myriad ways their city can flood: Southeastern winds can push water inland from Back Bay. Nor’easters can drop rainwater from the Atlantic. Heavy rains can overwhelm the shallow water table, pushing water up from the earth itself.

But even for a city accustomed to flooding, the storms in the fall of 2016 that culminated in Hurricane Matthew were shocking, damaging some 2,000 buildings and leaving entire neighborhoods underwater for days.

“It was scary,” Rebecca Levitt said in front of her home in Ashville Park, a new development built on what used to be wetlands. She recounted how knee-deep water covered her lawn and driveway and made roads impassable. “We could not get out.”

The inundation of Ashville Park became emblematic of the city's perceived failure to deal with the risks of climate change. Faced with irate residents, officials began looking more closely at development applications like the proposal for the 50 acres along West Neck Creek.

Six months before Matthew, a company called Argos Properties II, controlled by three brothers, Paul, Steve and Tasos Galiotos, filed an application to rezone land their father had bought decades earlier, enabling them to build some 30 homes on the highest 15 acres.

After Matthew, the application languished, as officials asked the developers for more information, according to a timeline later submitted as part of the Galiotoses' lawsuit against the city. In April 2018, the City Council voted unanimously to reject it.

The reason for that rejection depends on whom you ask. Officials said that the single road in and out of the subdivision would be subject to flooding, raising the risk that emergency vehicles would be unable to reach the homes during a storm.

If that happens, "you have 30 homes sitting truly on an island," said Gerald Harris, an attorney for Virginia Beach.

That the area floods is not in dispute. John Rice, who last year bought the house across the road from what would have been the entrance to the new development, said his property is under water constantly, "and we haven't had a bad storm yet." His front yard features a small berm to blunt the wake caused by cars as they drive along the often-flooded road.

The Galiotos brothers declined to comment. Their lawyer, Robert McFarland, said the decision had more to do with political pressure from residents wanting their representatives to take flood risk more seriously. He noted that a similar development right next to the Galiotos property was approved just before Matthew struck.

"I think Hurricane Matthew crystallized for some folks the issue of flooding and sea level rise, and that no further development of any kind should take place in this area," Mr. McFarland said. His clients, he added, "were made an example of."

Other developers noticed, as did residents. After Matthew, a group of developers that included the local state senator, Bill DeSteph, sought permission to build more than 100 homes next to Ashville Park. Nearby residents objected, saying that turning more wetlands into homes would worsen their flood problem.

The residents prevailed. Last November, city staff recommended against approving the construction. The developers, while saying that their project wouldn't increase the flood risk, nonetheless withdrew their application. "With the flooding in the area, the Council wasn't going to approve anything," Senator DeSteph said in an interview.

"Step one is stop the development until we have a solution," said Melani Moreno, a nearby farmer who started a petition to stop the project. She spoke at her kitchen table, where she laid out photographs of recent flooding.

Developers reject that argument. “If we shut everything down, prices are going up, and it’s going to make home buying unaffordable,” said Patrick L. Reynolds, president of the Tidewater Builders Association, the trade group for local home builders.

Virginia Beach’s new position has generated mixed praise from environmentalists. Jared Brandwein, executive director of the Back Bay Restoration Foundation, which works to protect the local watershed, said the city should go further, buying land from developers in vulnerable areas so that more homes don’t go up.

Others are more positive. Skip Stiles, head of Wetlands Watch, a regional environmental advocacy group, said officials deserve praise for responding to public pressure since Hurricane Matthew, rather than hoping it subsides.

“The entire City Council was going: ‘Darn right we’ve got to fix this. I’ve got a bunch of angry, wet people,’” Mr. Stiles said. The most basic step, he said, is straightforward: “Don’t build in stupid places.”

Correction: Nov. 20, 2019

An earlier version of this article, using information provided by Michele Braun, the former zoning official, misstated the amount of property value for tax revenue that was lost in Northfield, Vt., when the town bought out homes and built a park to help mitigate risks from climate change. It was $2.2 million, not $2.7 million. A quote from Ms. Braun that overstated the value of lost property has also been removed.

Board votes down Cannabis Control budget

By Noah Berner / The Calaveras Enterprise / Nov 20, 2019

The Calaveras County Board of Supervisors failed to adopt the Division of Cannabis Control-Cannabis Regulation operating budget and the Cannabis Regulatory Fees special revenue fund budget for 2019-2020 at a board meeting on Tuesday.

In order to pass, the item needed the support of four of five supervisors. District 2 Supervisor Jack Garamendi, District 3 Supervisor Merita Callaway and District 5 Supervisor Benjamin Stopper voted in support, while District 1 Supervisor Gary Tofanelli and District 4 Supervisor Dennis Mills voted in opposition.

During the meeting, County Administrative Officer Albert Alt gave a short presentation on the budget and provided background.

The document was drafted in order to fund the implementation of County Code Chapter 17.95, Commercial Cannabis Cultivation and Chapter 9.22, Cannabis Background Clearance Badge, ordinances passed 3-2 by the board on Oct. 22 in order to regulate commercial cannabis cultivation and provide background checks for workers in the industry. The implementation of the ordinances was intended to be financed through fees charged to those participating in the program.

The Division of Cannabis Control was created in order to oversee and streamline the regulation of commercial cannabis cultivation, and operates under the supervision of the County Administrative Office.

The new office resulted from lessons learned during the Urgency Ordinance (UO), Alt said. At that time, there was no oversight or coordination between county offices, large backlogs due to unexpected volume, problems with fiscal monitoring, and a lack of program performance metrics.

While Cannabis Control will be involved in developing the regulatory program, oversight of the application process, coordination between county offices, compliance and enforcement, many other agencies will be involved in the regulatory process.

Regardless of the passage of the budget, the regulatory ordinances become effective on Friday, while the fees associated with them become effective Dec. 23.

The total revenue for the first year from fees associated with the ordinances is estimated at $2.3 million.

Alt warned that failure to pass the budget would result in cannabis regulation falling on the shoulders of existing staff. While the county would still be able to collect the fees, it would be unable to spend them without an approved budget, so new staff would not be able to be hired and the cost of regulation would have to come from existing budgets.

Failure to adopt the budget would cause the performance of regulatory and administrative functions and the purchase of necessary equipment to be delayed or funded from elsewhere. Necessary equipment purchases include a card machine to make clearance badges, secure file cabinets for storing confidential files, aerial imagery, training, small tools and radios.

“Staff time and effort will be divided among existing and new programs,” Alt said. “What we’ll experience will be similar to what we experienced under the UO, in that there will be backlogs, not only in the regulatory program, but the other work of the county as well.”

“The program is very complex; it requires a lot of hands on the wheel; it requires involvement of a lot of the land-use departments; and to do that right, we need the appropriate staffing and time on-task to be able to enforce this program,” he said.

Mills, along with Tofanelli, voted against the regulatory ordinances passed last month. He was the first to voice opposition to the budget.

“I think this thing is just running down a road to nowhere. All it’s going to take is somebody to jump up with a lawsuit like what’s happened before, and it all gets kind of pushed into the corner of the court,” Mills said. “I don’t see a benefit at all here, and I certainly take deep exception to the thought that if we don’t pass this, we’re going to do it anyway.”

Garamendi defended the budget.

“Perfect doesn’t exist. What we have is a program that will work, and if we don’t do this we are hurting our county … We have the money set aside,” Garamendi said. “It’s no one else’s money except those who have paid the fee to be part of this, and we should use it accordingly. If we do not use that money, we are going to use other people’s money. Let’s not be hypocrites. Let’s build something for this county.”

Stopper argued that regulation would help alleviate environmental problems resulting from illegal grows.

“Funding this program will also help facilitate mitigating many of the environmental concerns,” he said. “The reason for regulation is to mitigate those concerns. Illegal farms abide by no rules. The people that come in, and they pay their $12,000 and then however much it costs for their building permit, and then their grading permit – to the point where they’re in $30,000 to $40,000 deep before they even get to put a plant in the ground – those people are paying that money to abide by these set of rules, and at that point, I would certainly hope that’s insurance enough that they don’t want to lose that permit.”

Callaway said that since the ordinances were already approved, the supervisors had an obligation to take the necessary steps to implement them.

“This ordinance – yes, it was approved on a 3-2 vote – but it belongs to all of us. It now is time for us to implement it with the funding that will be available to implement it, because it will be implemented,” she said.

While Callaway moved for a vote, Tofanelli said that he would like to speak first.

“I find it very ironic that I am again in a place that my vote on a cannabis issue may be a deciding factor,” Tofanelli said. “And although it might not be the determining factor as to the ordinance being enacted, it will determine how it will be funded, which is a huge issue. ... There’s a lot more at stake here than the ordinance, as it will be enacted regardless of today’s outcome.”

Tofanelli cited several perceived problems with the regulatory ordinances, which included allowing more applicants to apply for permits than the county could handle, not involving the district attorney and sheriff in the background check process, inefficiencies in the application process, the fluid nature of a funding source based on fees, and a concern that the county would have to dip into the General Fund to implement the ordinances.

"I'm not sure … the fees coming in are going to maintain this program. I don't think after the first year when you get going on it you're going to have enough fees coming in to handle all of the employees that you've brought on," he said. "It makes it very difficult for me to say that I will fund this program, and I understand the weight, again, that's going to be placed if I don't vote 'yes' for this program on all of the departments and the department heads. It will be tremendous … I'm not in favor of this budget as the way it's been presented."

The board voted 3-2, falling one vote short of the required number to adopt the budget.

While the regulatory ordinances for cannabis cultivation will soon take effect, for now they will have to be implemented using existing county staff and budgets without new employees and fees associated with the regulatory program.

At the end of the meeting, Tofanelli polled the board on bringing the item back at a future date, and it was agreed to revisit the issue at the next board meeting on Dec. 10.

Stopper was the supervisor who first polled the board about creating a department to oversee commercial cannabis regulation earlier this year. He spoke with the Enterprise over the phone following the meeting.

"We did pass an ordinance, and once that ordinance is passed, the train has basically left the station, and we are liable to uphold and implement that ordinance. So, initially I had grave disappointment in the fact that two of the supervisors were not willing to facilitate that for the county, but I think that Supervisor Tofanelli realizes the gravity of the situation, and I think that that's why he polled the board at the end of the day," he said.

In other business:

The board approved the Probation Department's Pretrial Program Policy, authorized the acceptance of $161,639 in 2019 Public Safety Power Shutoff resiliency funds from the California Office of Emergency Services, and undertook a closed session public employee performance evaluation for Alt, in which no reportable action was taken.

Valley Springs Community Plan Redux / By Muriel Zeller / Skull Survey

https://skullsurvey.wordpress.com/2019/11/27/the-valley-springs-community-plan-redux/

RCRC - The Barbed Wire - November 22, 2019

BULLETIN BOARD

RCRC Staff Testifies at CPUC Prehearing Conference on Telecommunications During PSPS Events

On Wednesday, John Kennedy, RCRC Legislative Advocate, testified before the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) during their prehearing conference on telecommunications during Public Safety Power Shutdown (PSPS) events. RCRC member counties are disproportionately impacted by these events, and RCRC was granted party status in the Emergency Disaster Relief Program (R.18-03-011) proceeding.

Mr. Kennedy acknowledged the need for PSPS events, but advocated that such events must be "carefully planned, surgical in scope," and "impacts to critical infrastructure and populations mitigated or avoided."

The first real PSPS events in 2018 caught many off guard with respect to impacts on critical services like water and wastewater infrastructure, private wells, and extended periods of time without basic services and necessities. Moreover, the lack of consistent, accurate, and comprehensive communications during PSPS events can lead to catastrophic events, including loss of life. Mr. Kennedy referenced a number of instances in a handful of rural counties where communication systems were down, impacting critical services to local residents. "Communication systems are the backbone of our local public safety and emergency services systems," said Kennedy. These systems are integral to "enabling police and fire departments to coordinate the deployment of resources and respond to service calls, enabling residents to make emergency calls, the dissemination of information on PSPS events, and providing evacuation notices and coordinating evacuations."

It is imperative that California increase resiliency of its communication networks, and Mr. Kennedy advocated in support of "increased investment even as we strive to reduce risk and the use of PSPS events."

The full hearing can be accessed here. Mr. Kennedy's testimony can be found at the 2:50 mark.

Senate Focuses on Secure Rural Schools & Federal PILT

On Thursday, the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee held a hearing titled *"Full Committee Hearing on SRS and PILT, and to Receive Testimony on Pending Legislation."* The hearing featured virtually unanimous support for continued funding of the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program and the federal Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program.

Throughout the proceedings, Senators made reference to their local counties that rely on these programs and expressed concern over the "roller coaster" each has to endure in whether or not the funds will be properly allocated each year. As such, the witnesses urged for either a longer-term funding allocation or a permanent funding allocation. Three bills were discussed by the Senators that would work toward this goal. The first bill was "*A bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000"* (S. 430), which would provide two additional years of authorization for SRS. The second bill was the "*Forest Management for Rural Stability Act"* (S.1643), which would create a permeant endowment fund to ensure that

SRS and PILT remain funded indefinitely. This fund would begin with an initial investment from Congress and comprise of annual deposits from payments of the forest revenue sharing program. The interest from this endowment would then subsequently fund SRS and PILT. The third bill was the "*Small County PILT Parity Act"* (S. 2108), which would revise the existing PILT calculation formula to provide additional monies to counties that have a population of less than 5,000 people. The Committee and witnesses all expressed support for each piece of legislation, noting that without these payments to local communities, many such services would not to be able to function.

Counties Encouraged to Participate in NACo's Coalition Letter Regarding Federal PILT & SRS Programs

The National Association of Counties (NACo) is leading a coalition of counties, school districts, and other interested organizations in sending a letter to congressional leaders urging them to fully fund the Federal Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program for FY 2020 and reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program until a permanent solution is developed. NACo's goal is to collect signatures from every Federal PILT and SRS-impacted county, school district, and interested organizations.

Congress must work quickly to pass several bills to keep the government open and fund important programs before the end of the year – ideal opportunities to fully fund Federal PILT and reauthorize the SRS program. The letter will be sent to House and Senate leaders to educate them on the critical importance of Federal PILT and SRS programs.

The coalition letter can be accessed here. To sign onto the letter, please complete this webform by 3 p.m. PST on Wednesday, December 4, 2019.

Rural Broadband Update

On Wednesday, the House Energy and Commerce Committee, which oversees broadband policy, approved a multitude of bipartisan broadband and tech-related bills on a variety of topics, from broadband mapping and network security to freeing up spectrum. Two bills in particular were notable in regard to rural broadband.

The first of which was the "*Broadband Deployment Accuracy and Technological Availability Act"* or the Broadband DATA Act (HR 4229), which would require the government to collect granular information about which areas in the U.S. have access to high-speed internet and which do not. The Senate Commerce Committee advanced its own version of the Broadband DATA Act earlier this year, meaning there is significant momentum to move the bill onto President Trump's desk. The second significant bill was the *"Mapping Accuracy Promotion Services Act"* (MAPS Act) (HR 4227). This measure would bar anyone from "willfully, knowingly, or recklessly" submitting broadband internet access service coverage information or data to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for mapping purposes if it is untrue. This legislation was largely in response to an admission earlier this year by the FCC that its maps were inaccurate because one internet service provider gave the agency false information about its broadband coverage.

Last week, Senators Maggie Hassan (D-New Hampshire) and Shelley Moore Capito (R-West Virginia) introduced two broadband-related bills. The first was the *Rural Broadband Financing Flexibility Act*, led by Senator Capito, which would allow state and local governments to issue tax-exempt bonds to finance public-private rural broadband projects, and allow the federal government to assist state and local governments in bond payments. The second was the "*Rural Broadband Investment Tax Credit Act"*, led by Senator Hassan, which would create a federal tax credit that states and localities could direct toward rural broadband projects. Read a one-pager on the new bills that Senators Hassan and Capito introduced [here](#).

[House Takes Aim on Restructuring Cannabis Policy](#)

On Wednesday, the Democratic-controlled House Judiciary Committee passed the "*Marijuana Opportunity, Reinvestment and Expungement"* (MORE) Act ([H.R. 3884](#)) in a 24-10 vote, setting the stage for a full floor vote. The vote saw two Republicans, Congressman Matt Gaetz (R-Florida) and Tom McClintock (R-California), join the Democrats in support of the bill. The bill would remove marijuana from the list of federally controlled substances, allow states to set their own marijuana policy and require federal courts to expunge prior convictions for marijuana offenses.

A 5% tax on marijuana products would also establish a trust fund for programs designed to help people disproportionately impacted by the "war on drugs," including job training and treatment for substance abuse. Taking marijuana off of the controlled substance list is crucial for cannabis banking advocates because de-scheduling the plant would effectively accomplish the same goals as the previously reported on "*Secure And Fair Enforcement"* (SAFE) Banking Act of 2019 ([H.R. 1595](#)). However, House Judiciary Committee Chairman Jerry Nadler (D-New York) acknowledged that the legislation could be difficult to secure passage in the Republican-controlled Senate.

[Appropriations Update](#)

On Thursday, the Senate approved a previously-passed House bill that extends government funding at last fiscal year's levels until December 20, 2019. The measure was immediately signed into law by President Trump to avoid a federal government shutdown.

The bill passed on a mostly party-line basis, with some Republicans objecting that Congress has not enacted full-year defense funding bill at higher levels. There had been talk that the bill might include a continuation of some expired funding for minority-serving institutions, but that was not included in what was a fairly "clean" continuing resolution that included just a handful of specific changes to current law. What happens in the next four weeks is less certain. Congressional appropriators had hoped to announce agreement in the last week on totals for each of the 12 appropriations bills (allocations known as the "302(b)" levels), but an agreement has been stymied over how much funding, if any, to include in the Homeland Security bill for a border wall.

[BULLETIN BOARD](#)

Calaveras County Job Opportunities

Click here

State Water Board Streamlines Permitting Process for Diversions of Floodwater and Other High Flows to Support Groundwater Sustainability

Click here

$100M Available for Disadvantaged Communities and High Fire Threat Districts Through Self-Generation Incentive Program

The Self Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) started as a program for incentivizing natural gas fired Co-Generation installations, and was modified to include Energy Storage a few years ago. When the program was modified, the California Public Utilities Commission also added an Equity Budget. The Equity Budget is to ensure that economically disadvantaged ratepayer groups have a chance to access some of the funds by setting up a separate allocation.

The Equity Budget now has $110M in available funding, including $100M available for one of two uses: Energy Storage in Disadvantaged Communities; and, Energy Storage for Critical Resilience purposes in High Fire Threat Districts (HFTD), primarily in public sector applications.

The program is anticipated to start accepting applications beginning April 1, 2020, and the funds are expected to move extremely quickly. Local governments that are interested in applying for these funds should plan to have completed applications ready for submission by late March 2020.

On Wednesday, RCRC hosted a webinar to provide further information, and assist counties with understanding the tasks that need to be completed for an application, and the options available to help with application preparation. A recorded version of the webinar can be accessed here. For additional questions, please contact Michael Day at (916) 577-1114.

The Economic Impact of Tourism on California's Rural Counties

After nine consecutive years of growth, California's travel and tourism economy continues to surge. Visitors pumped more than $140 billion in travel spending in the last year, stimulating business development and providing Californians with more than one million jobs. Increased travel spending is leading to record-setting hotel construction and more than $4 billion in annual investments in theme park, restaurant and other tourism-related infrastructure. These projects are creating secondary employment effects, generating high-quality jobs in building and construction.

Not only does tourism support the state, the industry is a boon for city and county budgets. Last year, visitor spending generated $11.8 billion in tax revenue for state and local jurisdictions and was among the top three sources of funding for many counties. This revenue helps fund vital programs and infrastructure projects and saves California households an additional $890 in taxes each year to maintain state and local services. That's enough money to resurface 17,000 miles of two-lane roads or employ 107,000 police officers.

It takes more than having the perfect destination to attract visitor dollars. For more than 25 years, Visit California's marketing programs have delivered billions of dollars of new visitor spending and helped establish California as the number one travel destination in the U.S. Over the next five years, Visit California will be building on this success by investing $500 million in global marketing campaigns to ensure that the state remains a top consideration when travelers around the world are planning a trip.

Learn more about the economic impact of tourism upon your county and the benefits of travel and tourism to California's economy.