

RESPONSES TO BOARD QUESTIONS ON VIOLENCE PREVENTION PLAN

NOTE 1: Page references marked PH are to Attachment 3 of December 14 packet of material, and those marked CC are to the December 10 memo from County Counsel.

NOTE 2: I do not have a copy of the questions from Jim Beall's Office to check if staff responded to all the questions.

ALCOHOL

A. Questions for which there appears to be no response by either the County Counsel or the Public Health Department.

None

B. Questions whose responses may require further development or elaboration.

1. Page 13 PH: Specifics and purposes of a revised Conditional Use Permit ordinance - County Counsel response gives two general options (other uses or other zoning districts) on page 3 PH which may not be specific enough.
2. Page 3 CC: Structure, utility and need for a nuisance abatement ordinance - County Counsel only addresses structure; no discussion of utility or need apparent in Public Health response.
3. Page 18 PH: Asked if consultants for Fairgrounds revitalization have included sponsorship prohibition in their estimates - no direct response; it may be inferred the answer is no.
4. Page 19 PH: Asked which events might not happen without alcohol sponsorship - no statement about which events with a large number of youth participants have alcohol sponsors (of the 10 large cultural celebrations) and which might not happen.
5. Page 20 PH: Asked if VPC wants to regulate content or location, or both of billboards and window signs - Page 17 PH says location of billboards and page 20 PH says both content and placement of advertisements.
6. Page 20 PH: Asked about existing County policy to regulate window signs and the costs and impact of more rigorous enforcement - response only states that this does not appear to be an issue in the unincorporated - no statement of existing policy on regulating.

FIREARMS

A. Questions for which there appears to be no response by either the County Counsel or the Public Health Department.

None

RESPONSES TO BOARD QUESTIONS ON VIOLENCE PREVENTION PLAN

B. Questions whose responses may require further development or elaboration.

1. Page 31 and 32 PH: Asked what amount of a licensing fee would be fully cost recovery for a County like Santa Clara and the likely cost to residents to undergo the training - no estimate provided.
2. Page 39 PH: Asked for an estimated sales tax rate and expected revenue - response lists what information VPC does not have to make the estimate.
3. Page 43 PH: Asked if there are other options to an ordinance to limit or reduce the availability of easily concealable weapons - response talks about justification and the task force to develop an ordinance; no discussion of other options.

GOVERNANCE

A. Questions for which there appears to be no response by either the County Counsel or the Public Health Department.

None

B. Questions whose responses may require further development or elaboration.

1. Page 56 PH: Asked what other alternatives to proposed structure were considered and why they were rejected - response indicates they looked at LA and Santa Clara County's Child Abuse Council as models and adapted a proposal - no indication that they looked at other options to the "collaborative" model.