



August 10, 2020

The Honorable Ash Kalra  
Member, California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 2196  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Assembly Bill 3030 – CONCERNS  
As Amended July 21, 2020**

Dear Assembly Member Kalra:

On behalf of the Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), we would like to share our concerns with you regarding your measure, Assembly Bill 3030. This measure articulates as goals of the state the protection of 30 percent of water and land resources by 2030, among others. Our organizations represent all 58 counties of the State and our respective Boards of Directors are comprised of elected supervisors from member counties.

We regret the delay in sharing these concerns, but have been collecting guidance from our member counties, the receipt of which has been made more complicated by the priority being given to coronavirus-related imperatives. We do want to acknowledge that we have had conversation with your staff and sponsor where we shared these concerns prior to the measure's hearing in Senate Natural Resources & Water Committee. Below is a summary of the bill's aspects that give our member counties greatest pause:

- A number of RCRC/CSAC member counties are already over 90 percent publicly-owned. To the extent that AB 3030 anticipates the addition of land and water resources to the State's current portfolio, it raises the prospect of further reducing property tax receipts into an affected county's member General Fund. This reduction in General Fund revenues translates into reduced/eliminated services for the communities in our counties, many of which are defined as "disadvantaged communities" (e.g. economically distressed, poor internet connectivity, etc.).

- Adding to our conservation goals without having an up-to-date inventory of lands currently held in state and federal ownership means we are doing so “blindly” without any sense of what the biodiversity needs are or how best to augment them. We recommend establishing the baseline to allow for the development of appropriate metrics to achieve improvements.
- In our experience, publicly-owned lands does not always equate into well-stewarded lands. The State has a mixed record of providing the needed “O&M” to maintain these lands for the purposes acquired. Along the same lines, the facilities that support the visitors to these lands are also often suffering from deferred maintenance which reduces the visitor experience and, at times, increases the degradation of the resource overall.
- The measure lacks assigning a “manager” for implementation. Without a designated lead agency, achieving these goals falls to no agency. We would suggest the California Natural Resource Agency as the best placed entity to be assigned the task of implementing this measure.
- How are the current program criteria around land and water conservation incorporated into the measure? And, what is the additional “call” on state funding resources given our current economic situation at the state and local level?

For the above reasons, RCRC and CSAC respectfully requests your consideration of amendments to address these areas. If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either of us at [mwarmerdam@rcrcnet.org](mailto:mwarmerdam@rcrcnet.org) or [cfreeman@counties.org](mailto:cfreeman@counties.org).

Sincerely,



MARY-ANN WARMERDAM  
Senior Legislative Advocate



CATHERINE FREEMAN  
Legislative Representative

cc: Members of the Senate Natural Resources & Water Committee  
Catherine Baxter, Consultant, Senate Natural Resources & Water Committee  
Todd Moffitt, Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus