

Contents

Chapter # Land Use Planning and Management	1
Land Use Planning and Management in California	1
Local Planning and Land Use Regulation	1
State and Regional Land Use Planning and Regulations	1
Compact and Sustainable Development	2
Need for Compact and Sustainable Development	2
Emerging State Policies Encouraging Compact Sustainable Development.....	3
Coordinating Land Use and Flood Management	6
Coordinating Land Use and Water Quality	7
Potential Benefits of Compact and Sustainable Development.....	7
Potential Costs of Compact and Sustainable Development	8
Major Issues	9
Disincentives for Change.....	9
Need for Coordination.....	10
Recommendations	10
State	10
Local Government	12
Regional Agencies.....	13
Water Suppliers	13
Selected References.....	14

Boxes

PLACEHOLDER Box #-1 Land Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	5
Box #-2 LID Runoff Control Objectives.....	8

Subgroup: Practice Resource Management

Chapter # Land Use Planning and Management

Land use planning and management that promotes compact and sustainable development has at least four main benefits directly tied to the California Water Plan:

- Water supply: reducing municipal and industrial water demand, capturing and reusing storm water, and encouraging growth in areas with sufficient reliable water supplies
- Flood management: keeping people and structures out of flood hazard zones, and reducing runoff volumes and intensity
- Water quality: reducing runoff volumes and improving runoff water quality
- Climate change: reducing greenhouse gas emissions

This land use planning management strategy is consistent with State goals for more compact sustainable development (AB 857), with regional blueprint planning being funded by Caltrans, and with strategies being developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to achieve AB 32's greenhouse gas reduction target.

Land Use Planning and Management in California

Local Planning and Land Use Regulation

Cities and counties have the primary jurisdiction over land use planning and regulation. Their authority derives from the constitutional police power to regulate land use to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. Also, several statutes specifically authorize the preparation of local general plans and specific plans, regulation of land use through zoning and subdivision regulations, and urban redevelopment. OPR issues General Plan Guidelines and other advisory guidance to assist local governments in land use planning and management.

In addition, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) has emerged as an important tool for local land use planning and regulation. Though intended as an environmental full disclosure law for discretionary local government decisions, in practice CEQA is often the main forum for local governments to make project-level land use decisions and consider the potential impacts of those decisions.

State and Regional Land Use Planning and Regulations

State and regional agencies currently play a limited role in local land use planning and regulation, with the exceptions noted below:

- The California Coastal Commission regulates land use planning and development in the coastal zone, together with local agencies (cities and counties).
- The California Energy Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over siting of thermal power plants.

- Regional Councils of Government prepare regional growth plans and transportation plans.
- Land use in specific regions of the state is regulated by the Delta Protection Commission, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

California State government has typically played a limited or indirect role in land use planning, with the exceptions noted above, granting the lion's share of land use authority to local governments. State law requires State policies, to the extent they exist for land use, to be expressed and "enforced" through local general plans and land use regulations. The State's general plan enabling law establishes a detailed *process* for local planning, but with limited exceptions does not require local plans to achieve *substantive State policies*; the exceptions are the Housing Element requirements and recent flood management legislation (see below).

State officials prepare strategic and functional plans, such as air pollution, water quality, transportation, and solid waste management plans to guide department programs, decisions, and projects. OPR is responsible for coordination of state functional plans to be consistent with state policies.

There is no cabinet-level administrative department in California dealing with land use planning or community affairs for the State. Unlike all other resources subject to State oversight and in some cases management—water, aquatic and terrestrial species and habitat, air, transportation, energy, and utilities—there is no state oversight agency for land use.

Compact and Sustainable Development

Need for Compact and Sustainable Development

Existing urban development patterns reflect a post-World War II market demand for single-family homes in suburban locations relying for the most part on the automobile for transportation. Private and public investments support this traditional pattern of development, which often encourages conversion of agricultural and open space lands to urban uses. Local government and private sector decisions on the placement of offices, industrial sites, and retail centers are driven by a combination of workforce availability and State tax policy which reinforce this traditional pattern of development.

The Central Valley and the Inland Empire have been recent hot spots for urbanization in the state due to lower housing prices, available land, and local government policies that encourage growth. This trend may be moderated in the future through high gas prices, which make it less affordable for suburban and ex-urban area residents to commute long distances to urban job centers.

The draft report of the Land Use Subcommittee of the Climate Action Team (LUSCAT) to CARB on Local Government, Land Use and Transportation (May 5, 2008) recognizes that traditional land use patterns consume more water and increase surface runoff, relative to more compact and sustainable development. The LUSCAT report recommends that agricultural production be directed toward areas with good soils, mild climate, and available water. When prime and productive farmlands are converted to urban development, agriculture may be displaced to other locations, which could impact water and other resource uses.

Traditional large-lot urban development creates high water demand for landscaping. As urban development occurs in hotter regions of the state, this pattern of land use is projected to increase water use for landscaping to about 80 percent of total water demand. More compact, mixed use urban development reduces landscaping-related water demand by minimizing front and back yards and their associated landscape water demands. Traditional large-lot urban development also can expose larger numbers of people and structures to flood hazards, and increases the amount of vehicular miles traveled, which has a direct relationship to greenhouse gas emissions and energy use.

Although it comprises a relatively small portion of most watersheds, impervious surfaces such as roads, buildings, and parking lots result in more rapid and larger amounts of surface runoff. This change in runoff can alter streamflow and watershed hydrology, reduce groundwater recharge, increase stream sedimentation, and increase the need for infrastructure to control storm runoff.

Mention the two other problems with sprawl: more people and structures exposed to flood hazards, and GHG emissions from VMT and energy use.

Emerging State Policies Encouraging Compact Sustainable Development

Generally, the description of existing programs was too long, and more evaluation is needed about the effectiveness of these programs in achieving their goals promoting compact sustainable development. Where are the gaps in existing legislation and regulatory programs?

Higher density and mixed use development—development that combines residential, commercial, and retail services and job centers where appropriate—and more efficient patterns of land use and site planning can be encouraged through changes in marketing, public and private investments and financing, and public policies. In some of the most densely populated regions of the state, including the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San Diego, headway is being made to grow more compactly, provide jobs closer to housing, and provide transit to connect people with community resources and centers of employment.

State Planning Priorities (AB 857, Statutes of 2002)

California Government Code section 65041.1 establishes three State planning priorities and requires that all state strategic plans and capital improvement plans—including the California Water Plan—be consistent with them. These priorities, briefly stated, are:

- Promote infill development and equity,
- Protect environmental and agricultural resources, and
- Encourage efficient development patterns.

With the passage of AB 857 in 2002, the State legislature took a major step toward fostering more efficient land use patterns to promote infill development and social equity in existing communities, protect and conserve environmental and agricultural resources, and achieve more efficient use of land, transportation, energy, and public resources outside the infill areas.

AB 857 also requires the Governor's *Environmental Goals and Policy Report* (EGPR) to be consistent with these planning priorities. The EGPR is intended to provide a 20-to 30-year overview of state growth and development as well as articulate the Governor's environmental

goals and policies including, but not limited to, land use, population growth and distribution, development, the conservation of natural resources, and air and water quality. The EGPR serves as the basis for judgments about major state investments and capital projects, including the allocation of state resources through the budget and appropriations process.

Regional Blueprint Planning Grants

Recent State policy seeks to encourage more regional coordination in land use decisions. The 2005 Regional Blueprint Planning Grants Program was initiated by the Secretary of Building, Transportation, and Housing and is co-sponsored by Caltrans and OPR. The program's purpose is to "encourage state land-use patterns that balance the location of employment-generating uses so that employment-related commuting is minimized," and to provide a forum for some of the State's largest regions to deal collaboratively on issues regarding jobs, housing, transportation and natural resource protection.

Through the blueprint planning process, regions throughout California develop preferred land use planning and transportation scenarios that encourage compact sustainable development and also meet GHG emissions reduction targets (see below). However, local government implementation of regional blueprint plans is not required by law, and as a result, implementation of blueprint plans has been inconsistent to date. Senate Bill SB 375 (enrolled but not enacted as of 9-17-08) may strengthen these plans by providing by law that each region in California has to create a preferred growth scenario that will minimize greenhouse gas emissions, with state transportation funds tied to projects that conform to that preferred growth scenario. **[note: this section will need to be revised depending on fate of sb 375.]**

Land Use and Climate Change

There is growing recognition of the relationship between land use development patterns, community form and the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that cause climate change. State, regional and local governments are learning how to reduce GHG emissions through more sustainable development practices and environmental impact assessment of new development.

AB 32 and CEQA implementation provide opportunities for reducing GHG emissions from land use decisions. In 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. The Act caps California's greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels and requires these levels be achieved by 2020. It requires CARB to establish a program for statewide GHG emissions reporting, and adopt regulations by 2012 to achieve the GHG emissions reduction target. In addition, the Act authorizes CARB to adopt market-based compliance mechanisms including emissions cap-and-trade credits, and allows a one-year extension of the emissions reductions targets under extraordinary circumstances.

In June, 2008, CARB released a Draft Scoping Plan which describes proposed strategies to achieve AB 32's emission reduction target; the final Scoping Plan is scheduled for adoption in November 2008. Relying in part on the recommendations of the LUSCAT report, the Draft Scoping Plan includes recommendations for actions by local government and regional planning agencies to reduce GHG emissions. The Draft Scoping Plan's preliminary recommendation is to "encourage local governments to set quantifiable emissions reduction targets for their jurisdictions." CARB recommends the establishment of regional GHG emissions targets, and local implementation by local governments.

The Draft Scoping Plan further recommends that local governments:

- Adopt best practices for GHG emissions reduction associated with transportation, energy, waste/recycling, and water use
- Develop Climate Action Plans to achieve 2020 emissions reductions targets.
- Incorporate GHG reduction measures and regional blueprint plans into their General Plans.

When implemented, these recommendations will help reduce statewide GHG emissions, thereby reducing the potential adverse cumulative effects of global climate change on water supply, water quality, and flood management.

Methodologies for conducting CEQA climate change analysis and thresholds of significance for GHG emissions are not well-established. GHG analyses and mitigation are most efficiently addressed at a plan or policy scale (for example, in a city or county General Plan) as opposed to individual project by project basis because the analysis at a macro-level provides the opportunity for advanced and up-front planning for GHG emission reductions. Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) directs the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop draft CEQA Guidelines for analyzing the climate change impacts of new projects, and the Resources Agency to adopt the CEQA Guidelines by January 2010.

Several recently-adopted and ongoing General Plan updates (e.g., Marin County, Solano County) have included local Climate Action Plans that establish local policies to both reduce GHG emissions and to adapt to the potential effects of climate change. The areas of local government influence and authority for reducing GHG emissions include community energy use, waste reduction and recycling, water and wastewater systems, transportation, and site and building design.

PLACEHOLDER Box #-1 Land Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

add box with information that links land use and GHG, i.e. avoids ag conversion through restrictive initiative based ordinance.

Compact sustainable development (as described in this Resource Management Strategy) that reduces energy use and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is consistent with the implementation strategy recommended by CARB and has the potential to be an effective CEQA mitigation strategy for reducing the climate change impacts of new development.

Coordinating Land Use and Water Supply

Local land use planning and water supply are coordinated through a patchwork of existing state laws and policies. Regional water wholesalers such as Metropolitan Water District and San Diego County Water Authority base their water supply plans on regional growth projections developed by regional planning agencies. The effectiveness of existing programs and regulations in steering development towards areas with existing reliable water supplies, and away from areas where new water supplies must be developed, has not been comprehensively assessed.

Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) must be prepared by large water purveyors (3,000 acre-feet/year or 300 customers), must evaluate water supplies and demands over a 20-year period, and must be updated every 5 years (Water Code Sec. 10610 et seq.).

Senate Bills 610 and 221 (statutes of 2001) were enacted by the State Legislature to improve the coordination between land use planning and development and available long-term water supplies. These laws are intended to require assessment and verification, respectively, of water supply reliability prior to approval of specified large land use projects. SB 610 applies during the CEQA process, and SB 221 applies to subdivision approvals. Both laws require a demonstration of sufficient reliable 20-year water supplies to serve both the proposed project and other water users relying on the same water supplies, during normal, single dry, and multiple dry years. They require the water agencies responsible for water resource planning to work with the local land use agencies that often have little control over water supplies. Increased coordination, particularly at a regional level, such as occurred within the SANDAG region in 2003-2004 in conjunction with the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) demonstrates the advantages and benefits of proactive growth management planning and water supply planning to support projected long-term regional population growth.

this is only a 20 year horizon, which is less than the life of a mortgage. Risk analysis of the water supply reliability would indicated far greater uncertainty - I would suggest we tone this down a little.

Other state laws and policies play a more indirect role in coordinating land use and water supply planning. The OPR *General Plan Guidelines* (2003) encourage local governments to plan at a watershed level for better regional self sufficiency; and to consider adopting an optional water element in general plans to address water supply and other water related impacts of land use policies. Local agency formation commissions (LAFCOs) are regional agencies that approve local agency boundary changes; they perform municipal service reviews on to evaluate how all services, including water, are delivered to developing areas of the state.

Coordinating Land Use and Flood Management

Several state laws have been recently enacted or proposed to better coordinate flood management and land development within floodplains, consistent with the approach in SB 221 and SB 610 to coordinate the actions of water supply agencies and local land use authorities.

AB 5 (Wolk) Flood Management

Over the next eight years, AB5 aims to limit development in areas without 100-year flood protection, places where the chance of flooding is greater than 1-in-100 in a given year. After 2015, development would not be allowed without 200-year flood protection in areas of more than 10,000 people or that will reach 10,000 people in a decade. Existing communities will have until 2025 to reach 200-year protection. [Ch366, Statutes of 2007]

Can DWR list out some of the 1-in-100 locales to demonstrate the magnitude of the threat?

SB 5 (Machado) Flood Management

SB 5 requires DWR to prepare the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Valley. In addition, it requires local governments to revise general plans to address flood risks, collaborate with local flood agencies to identify parcels that may be protected by a flood protection plan or other flood management facilities, develop funding mechanisms to finance local flood responsibilities, and provide public notice of

specific areas that may be protected by a flood control facility or that are located in a flood hazard area. [Ch364, Statutes of 2007]

AB 156 (Laird) Flood Control

AB 156 amends provisions to DWR's flood management activities, including mapping of areas at risk of flooding, preparation of a status report on the State Plan of Flood Control, notification of property owners at risk of flooding, environmental enhancement activities, and maintenance area formation.

AB 70 (Jones) Flood Liability

AB 70 provides that a city or county may be responsible for its reasonable share of property damage caused by a flood, if that the city or county has increased the State's exposure to liability for property damage by approving new development. It applies only to decisions made by local governments after January 1, 2008.

AB 162 (Wolk) General Plans

AB 162 requires that the land use element of a city or county's general plan identify specific areas subject to flooding. It requires that the conservation element of general plans identify rivers, flood corridors, and other land that may be inundated with floodwater, and requires cities and counties to establish policies to minimize flood risks for new development. It also requires cities and counties, when revising the safety element, to consult with the state's Central Valley Flood Protection Board.

Coordinating Land Use and Water Quality

[WE HAVE SECTIONS ON WATER SUPPLY AND FLOODPLAIN, BUT NOT ON WATER QUALITY. Should the discussion about Low Impact Development (LID) be included here under Water Quality?]

Potential Benefits of Compact and Sustainable Development

Please describe four benefits: water supply, water quality, flood management, and reduced GHG emissions

There are water- and energy-related benefits that accrue from compact development. Specifically, compact development can reduce landscaped areas and, therefore, reduce landscape-related water use. Although higher density development may actually increase impervious surfaces and increase traffic congestion in urban areas, it may reduce the total development footprint in the State and reduce urbanization impacts to farmlands, habitat, watershed functions, and groundwater recharge areas. In addition low impact development (LID) approaches incorporated in the more dense development further reduce the impact of runoff and water pollution. (Box #-2 LID Runoff Control Objectives)

Box #2 LID Runoff Control Objectives

[note: this is a description of a program, not a benefit, and should be moved. Does it belong under "water quality"?] I think the benefit is described above and the box is supposed to describe what it is -

Low Impact Development is a different approach to storm water management using site design and storm water management to maintain the site's pre-development runoff rates and volumes. The goal of LID is to mimic a site's predevelopment hydrology by using design techniques that infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate and detain runoff close to the source of rainfall. LID is seen as an alternative to conventional storm water management. The State Water Boards are advancing LID in California through the following:

- Regulation through site-specific and general permits.
- Providing advocacy and outreach to local governments through the Water Board's Training Academy and regional workshops.
- Seeking ways to incorporate LID language in to Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan.
- Funding LID related projects through the consolidated grants program

Compact, mixed-use development can reduce water and energy demand, even with moderate increases in density. Water supply uses energy for capturing, storage, conveyance, and treatment, and thus, efficient water use is also an energy conservation (and greenhouse gas emission reduction strategy). As a rule of thumb, landscaping irrigation accounts for almost half of residential water use. [need citation] An increase in residential density from 4 units per acre to 5 reduces the landscaping area by 20 percent, which should cut water usage by roughly 10 percent compared to the lower density development. A smaller urban footprint reduces impervious surfaces. This generates less surface runoff and minimizes intrusion into watersheds and groundwater recharge areas, which receive the runoff.

Potential Costs of Compact and Sustainable Development

Replace with the following costs: 1) Economic costs are not borne equally. Rural landowners and local governments most adversely affected by smart growth policies. 2) Compact development can cause traffic congestion and density which some existing residents oppose. 3) Major public expenditures are needed to upgrade deteriorated infrastructure in urban areas. Land and development costs in cities are often higher than in greenfields. 4) Infill developments are more susceptible to delays from CEQA lawsuits that greenfield sites, because infill sites have more neighbors are concerned about neighborhood character issues.

Major Issues

The ARB draft scoping report does not address cost estimates for compact sustainable development, Not a reliable source for future cost estimates.

Move text on costs of sprawl to benefits. Also, APA has published an entire book devoted to updated costs of sprawl research.

Other important issues: how to promote regional planning given local control desires of local governments; how to address affordable housing in compact development strategies; how to incentivize the private sector to invest in urban infill vs. sprawl; how to provide funds to financially strapped local governments to prepare updated general plans that address water issues; how to assure the SB 610 and 221 are effective in achieving their goals, and adequately address risks to water supply reliability from climate change and Delta export litigation and regulatory constraints.

Disincentives for Change

Local governments make most of the land use decisions in California. Local governments may not promote or implement resource-efficient development patterns for many reasons, including land ownership, marketing of so-called consumer preferences for single-family homes with yards, community resistance to infill projects and/or higher density development, traditional and out of date local zoning ordinances that, for instance, segregate stores from residential uses the added cost to conduct coordinated regional planning efforts, the cost and potential liability associated with pursuing infill projects (Brownfields), and environmental mitigation strategies that encourage lower density development. In addition, landscape, soils, environmental hazards, and infrastructure limitations are additional factors that guide local governments in the development of land use policy decisions. Changing land use planning practices and development standards statewide would be a significant and expensive public policy undertaking with as yet unknown water use savings compared to more direct and traditional methods of and approaches to water conservation.

Access to revenues for cities and counties shape California's development patterns as local governments seek to balance revenues and expenditures by way of land use decisions including balancing commercial and residential land uses in their jurisdictions. The passage of Propositions 13 and 218, which reduced the role of property-based taxation as a local government revenue source, and the decline of federal and State financing for funding of infrastructure, have forced local governments to be increasingly focused on the potential fiscal effects of land use decisions. Additional federal fiscal policies, such as capital gains taxes, make property ownership an attractive investment, adding to the urban development expansion in recent years. These fiscal policies combine to encourage local governments to seek and approve development that increases sales tax revenue, such as regional retail and commercial uses. Some local governments seek higher priced housing over moderately priced housing because housing development only produces property tax at a fixed rate, which is less than the rate of inflation for providing city-based services such as road repair, infrastructure maintenance, parks, libraries, fire protection and public safety. Focusing on higher end housing has the potential to establish a higher tax base to support the provision of ongoing municipal services. Overall, simple economics dictate that counties and cities will as a practical matter favor development that generates higher property and sales tax, which is referred to as the "fiscalization of land use."

Financially strapped cities and counties are more inclined to favor land use for retail, commercial, and sales tax revenue over housing. For residential projects, communities have adopted

“development pays its way” policies to cover infrastructure improvements. Developers are assessed a variety of development impact fees for such services and amenities as roads, parks, and water to public safety and social infrastructure costs. The net result of these fiscal constraints is that the short-term need for revenue generated by this type of land use is pursued without budgeting for the long-term costs. As a result of these property tax policies, local communities compete with one another for businesses that generate sales tax. Community housing needs and jobs are rarely balanced with the competition for revenue-driven development.

Development impact fees studies typically evaluate the long term O&M costs associated with the provision of the service or amenity being provided and these are calculated into the overall per unit development impact fee. The challenge is that these fees are then passed on to the consumer/homeowner as part of the applicant’s development costs which drives up the cost of the home or commercial space.

Need for Coordination

Some important issues: how to assure the SB 610 and 221 are effective in achieving their goals, and that WSAs and WSVs adequately address risks to water supply reliability from climate change and Delta export litigation and regulatory constraints.

Recent changes to the Government Code and the Water Code require local governments to determine whether there will be enough water to supply a proposed development project before it can be approved. This will require land use agencies and water agencies to improve their communication and coordination on project-level development decisions that have been made independently in the past. Many of the water supply coordination issues for new development are now addressed in the state’s Water Code through existing requirements for the preparation and approval of Urban Water Management Plans every five years and the implementation of SB 610 (Costa) and SB 221 (Kuehl) enacted in 2001. Increased coordination will also be necessary among all levels of government to coordinate inter-agency planning, to develop databases, and to interpret and share data and information to optimize the relationship of land use planning and water supply planning.

Elaborate on databases?

Recommendations

[Notes: (1) make sure that each recommendation below has a relationship to the text above. Each recommendation should respond to an issue or problem discussed above. (2) commenter asked that we reorganize the recommendations by theme, not by state-regional-local. Examples of themes could be “state technical assistance”, “funding incentives”, “revise local land use plans”, “facilitate supportive infrastructure improvements”, “encourage interagency coordination”, “data and research,” etc.] Response: This is the format we are using and I am not sure we should . . . while it makes sense, it is not critical and it does make the piece long, which creates a host of other problems, what do you think?

State

1. Consider Greenhouse Gas emissions reductions that could be achieved? in the development of water quality standards. [what does this mean? Recommend deletion?]

2. Provide funding, incentives, and technical support for the AB 32 Scoping Plan's local government recommendations to reduce GHG emissions.
3. Use adopted criteria for grants to support watershed planning for more self sufficient water portfolios to reduce water conveyance and associated energy costs.
Covered in another RMS?
4. Support and incentivize community design standards and land use patterns that implement compact sustainable development principles.
5. Use consistency with the 3 state planning priorities (AB 857) as a factor in the award of state discretionary funds and grants for water facilities, infrastructure and other projects.
6. Foster greater involvement of land use planning agencies and water purveyors in regional partnerships to develop and implement integrated regional growth and water management plans. This includes providing technical assistance and capacity-building.
7. Provide incentives to developers and local governments to plan and build using more resource-efficient development patterns. This can be done through CEQA exemptions for infill development, reductions in brownfields¹ liability for innocent land purchasers, prioritizing planning grants and other incentives to increase consumer interest in urban living and to encourage infill and compact development forms.
8. Increase funding for conservation and agricultural easements.
9. Encourage local governments to: (a) review the Urban Water Management Plans adopted by water agencies within their jurisdiction, (b) work with these water agencies to show compliance with Water Code sections that require local governments to consider water supply availability when making land use decisions for significant (500 homes or more) new development projects, (c) prepare the water resource section of their general plans as described in the State's General Plan Guidelines Update (OPR 2003).
10. Provide technical and financial assistance to local governments to incorporate resource efficient development into their local general plan, related zoning ordinances, and specific plans; and to prepare required water supply assessments before approving major new development projects.
11. Encourage more research on the benefits and impacts of resource efficient development patterns. Develop an inventory of best practices by local governments and land management agencies.
12. Promote performance-based planning with metrics including establishing a baseline for each watershed for impervious surfaces, vehicle miles traveled per capita, comprehensive flood management using floodplain planning, and land coverage. These metrics should be the basis for evaluating projects that request discretionary State funding, grants, and other financial assistance.
13. Revise the General Plan Guidelines to recommend that general plans include either an optional separate Water Element, or updated water resources data and information (UWMP) and policies, to address water supply, flood management, and water quality issues. .

1. <http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/liab.htm>

14. Provide funding, technical information and best practices for local government General Plan updates to address water issues. Develop and publicize accurate and relevant data on water supply and water quality to help local agencies update plans.
15. Provide more funding for preparation and implementation of regional blueprint plans and assure they address water supply, water quality, flood management, and GHG reduction. Require state infrastructure funding to be consistent with regional blueprint plans.
16. Incentivize green building codes that incorporate low impact development principles and reduce impervious surfaces, especially near waterways.

Local Government

17. Accelerate implementation of flood management legislation (2007).

[Note: what does this mean? The legislation was just passed. What is this trying to “speed up?”]

considering most FIRM maps are 20 years old it seems urgently needed that we have more accurate flood risk information in order to update general plans The whole planning process takes a long time and the current flight of flood legislation does not reflect the urgency.

18. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the package of flood management laws that were enacted in 2007. Prepare a report documenting the study’s conclusions and potential recommendations for changes to existing laws.
19. Update General Plans to address water supply, water quality, flood management, and GHG emission issues. General Plans should be long-range, comprehensive, reviewed regularly, and stable (not frequently amended)..
20. Improve communication, coordination, and information-sharing with other local agencies, regional planning agencies, and local water agencies and watershed managers.
21. Update General Plans to implement the AB 32’s Scoping Plan recommendations. Adopt policies that promote compact sustainable development, implement regional blueprint plans, respond to climate change risks, encourage reuse of land such as brownfields and greyfields (out-of-date shopping centers) and provide affordable housing. .Provide incentives for projects consistent with these policies, and disincentives for projects that promote sprawl.
22. Adopt policies that promote the rehabilitation of aging or inadequate infrastructure to help infill development.
23. Through the CEQA process, mitigate the significant impacts of new development on prime agricultural land, open space, floodplains, recharge areas, wetlands, and water supply. Develop CEQA streamlining incentives for infill projects and other projects implementing compact sustainable development principles.
24. Update landscape irrigation ordinances to promote consumer choices for more water-efficient landscaping and water conservation systems in existing and new developments including the use of native species and drought-tolerant species.
25. Adopt green building codes that include low impact development principles that include water conservation and reduction of impervious surfaces.

26. Fund a research study to evaluate the effectiveness of SB 610 and SB 221 in coordinating land use and water supply planning, and recommend changes to these laws or their implementation as appropriate.
27. Develop guidance on how SB 610 and SB 211 water supply assessments and verifications should address the effects of climate change and Delta export uncertainties on supply reliability
28. Provide comprehensive water resources information and policies to land use project applicants during pre-application meetings.
29. Improve coordination between local housing plans and LAFCO policies on boundary changes.

Regional Agencies

30. LAFCOs should consider water supply issues in the context of their charge to encourage logical and efficient development patterns that minimize impacts on agricultural land and maximize meeting housing needs and affordability.
31. Regional planning agencies should participate in the blueprint planning process and develop incentives for regional blueprint plans to be implemented by local governments. Regional plans should be required to address water supply planning issues, and should also set targets for GHG emissions reduction as recommended by the AB 32 Scoping Plan. Require state funded infrastructure funding programmed by regional planning agencies to be consistent with regional blueprint plans.
32. Regional planning agencies should develop or participate in the development of regional plans prepared by water agencies and purveyors that address regional water issues, and provide technical assistance and financial incentives to local governments that implement these plans. They should serve as an information clearinghouse for regional water supply, water quality, flood management, and climate change vulnerability information that local governments can use in preparing General Plans.

Water Suppliers

Comment AH: These actions are already required.

33. Develop and make available to local governments water resource information, such as water supply and water quality in Urban Water Management Plans, which can be used in local and regional land use decisions, including general plan formulation and municipal service reviews.
34. Collaborate with local land use agencies to assess water supply availability for new development.
35. Collaborate with regional planning organizations to development long-term water supply plans that are consistent with long-term population growth projections and planned patterns of physical land development.

Selected References

Comment: Include references documenting the benefits of compact sustainable development for water supply, water quality, flood management, and reduced GG emissions. The Smart Growth Network is a good place to start. <http://www.smartgrowth.org/>

Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Environmental Goals and Policy Report, November 2003.

DWR White Paper: Evapotranspiration Adjustment Factor, January 25, 2008

Statutes of 2001 (California), ch 642. (Senate Bill 221), an act to amend § 11010 of the Business and Professions Code, and to amend § 65867.5 of, and to add §§ 66455.3 and 66473.7 to the Government Code, relating to land use. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=66824129462+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

Statutes of 2001 (California), ch. 643. (Senate Bill 610), an act to amend § 21151.9 of the Public Resources Code, and to amend §§ 10631, 10656, 10910, 10911, 10912, and 10915 of, to repeal § 10913 of, and to add and repeal Section 10657 of the Water Code, relating to water. http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/01-02/bill/sen/sb_0601-0650/sb_610_bill_20011009_chaptered.html

Statutes of 2002 (California), ch. 1016. (Assembly Bill 857), an act to amend §§ 13102, 13103, 65041, 65042, 65048, 65049, and 66037 of, and to add §§ 65041.1 and 65404 to, the Government Code, relating to state planning. <http://info.sen.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=6684692404+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

Statutes of 2004 (California), ch. 682. (Assembly Bill 2717 (2004, Laird)-California Urban Water Conservation Council: stakeholders

Statutes of 2006, ch. 559 (Assembly Bill 1881), Water Conservation, An act to add Section 1353.8 to the Civil Code, to repeal and add Article 10.8 (commencing with Section 65591) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code, to add Section 25401.9 to the Public Resources Code, and to add Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 535) to Chapter 8 of Division 1 of the Water Code, relating to water conservation.

Statutes of 2006 (California), ch. 488 (Assembly Bill No. 32) An act to add Division 25.5 (commencing with Section 38500) to the Health and Safety Code, relating to air pollution.