

Contents

Chapter # Land Use Planning and Management	1
Land Use Planning and Management in California	1
Compact Sustainable Development	2
Land Use and Energy	4
Land Use and Water Supply	4
AB 162 (Wolk) Land Use: Water Supply	5
Land Use and Flood Management	5
SB 5 (Machado) Flood Management	6
AB 156 (Laird) Flood Control	6
AB 70 (Jones) Flood Liability	6
Potential Benefits of More Compact Development	6
Potential Costs of More Compact Development	8
Major Issues	9
Disincentives for Change	9
Coordination	9
Recommendations	10
State	10
Local Government	11
Regional Government	11
Water Suppliers	11
Selected References	12

Boxes

Box #-1 Recent State Policy—AB 857	2
Box #-2 LID Runoff Control Objectives	6

About this draft: This is a working draft. It is incomplete. The chapter contains placeholders for some figures and tables. Much of the data is missing. Full discussion of some topics may be incomplete. This is the second of several drafts to be circulated in 2008 before the public review draft is distributed in December.

Subgroup: Practice Resource Management

Chapter # Land Use Planning and Management

More efficient and effective land use patterns promote integrated regional water management. Integrating land use management consists of planning for the housing and economic development needs of a growing population while providing for the efficient use of water, energy, and other resources. The way in which we use land — the pattern and type of land use and transportation and the level of intensity — has a direct relationship to water supply and quality.

This land use planning management strategy is consistent with State goals for more compact sustainable development, and furthering development that minimizes water supply and water quality impacts. In addition this strategy recognizes that the state's various programs that affect land use should be encouraging growth patterns that support the State's Greenhouse Gas emission reduction goals.

Land Use Planning and Management in California

Land use planning objectives are established by State policy and local jurisdictions. The Governor's Executive Order S-3-05 established goals for 2050 which will require an approach to land use planning for integrating federal, State, regional, and local planning processes and tools. Although the State constitution gives local governments the authority to make land use decisions within their municipal boundaries, the legislature and executive have vested some state agencies with influence over a number of land use decisions.

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 car for transportation. Private and public investments support this pattern. 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. Because only 5 percent of California's land area is in urban development, and 50 percent of the state is in public ownership, the result of current development practices is the consumption of farm land, floodplains, open space, habitat, and other natural resources all within a watershed.

Patterns of land use affect water use and water demand has a direct correlation with energy. The draft Land Use Subcommittee Climate Action Team Scoping Plan on Local Government, Land Use and Transportation (May 5, 2008) recommends that agricultural production be directed toward 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 produces 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 water demand.

Although it comprises a relatively small portion of most watersheds, impervious surfaces such as roads 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.

California State government has typically played a limited role in direct land use planning, 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. State officials prepare functional plans, such as air pollution, water quality, transportation, and solid waste management plans to guide department programs, decisions, and projects.

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.

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is responsible for coordination and direction for the state's functional plans. The OPR has several statutory duties and provides assistance to local government on planning issues. In a word, the dominant oversight for land use to ensure State policies and objectives are met is by the public citizen and enforcement by the courts.

Compact Sustainable Development

Higher density and mixed use development—development that combines residential, commercial, and retail services and job centers where appropriate—and more efficient pattern of land use and site planning can be encouraged through changes in marketing, public and private investments and financing, and public policies to promote more compact development (Box #-1 Recent State Policy—AB 857). In some of the most densely populated regions of the state, including the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles, headway is being made to grow more compactly, provide jobs closer to housing, and provide transit to connect people with community resources.

Box #-1 Recent State Policy—AB 857

Statute AB 857 (Stats. 2002; ch. 1016) establishes three planning priorities and requires that all State strategic plans and capital improvement plans—including the next update of the Governor's Environmental Goals and Policy Report and the California Water Plan—be consistent with them.

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

The State of California General Plan Guidelines, updated in 2003 (OPR), recommends that local governments consider preparing an optional Water Element in their general plans.

Three bills, SB 221, SB 610, and AB 901, were enacted by the Legislature to improve the coordination between water supply and land use planning processes at the local level and became effective January 1, 2002. The new laws are

intended to improve the assessment of water supplies during the local planning process before approval of land use projects that depend on water. They require verification of sufficient water supplies as a condition for approving developments, compel urban water suppliers to provide more information on groundwater reliability if used as a supply, and require average and drought year conditions be addressed.

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 (Wiggins, Chapter 1016, Statutes of 2002).

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 forms the basis for judgments about major state investments and capital projects, including the allocation of state resources through the budget and appropriations process.

Local agency formation commissions (LAFCOs) are regional planning agencies established to encourage logical and efficient development patterns. With the recent changes to Government Code § 56000 et. seq., LAFCOs are now required to perform municipal service reviews on a regular basis. This allows a comprehensive evaluation of how all services, including water, are delivered to developing areas of the state.

Recent State policy seeks to provide 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 managed by Caltrans. The Blueprint Grants 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 most impacted regions to deal collaboratively on issues regarding jobs, housing, and transportation.

Environmental Goals and Policy Report. Legislation passed in 2002 addressed state infrastructure planning and directed priorities and funding. The legislation clarified the information required to be included in the five-year budget plan for infrastructure prepared by the Governor. The legislation also updated the requirements for the State Environmental Goals and Policy Report. The governor's budget plan criteria and priorities used to identify and select the infrastructure proposed in the plan shall be consistent with the legislative infrastructure planning priorities. The state agencies designated by law are required to specify how their infrastructure planning is consistent with the legislative planning priorities, including the following:

- Promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety in the state, including in urban, suburban, and rural communities.
- To promote infill development and equity by rehabilitating, maintaining, and improving existing infrastructure that supports infill development and appropriate reuse and redevelopment of previously developed, underutilized land that is presently served by transit, streets, water, sewer, and other essential services, particularly in underserved areas, and to preserving cultural and historic resources.

- To protect environmental and agricultural resources by protecting, preserving, and enhancing the state's most valuable natural resources, including working landscapes such as farm, range, and forest lands, natural lands such as wetlands, watersheds, wildlife habitats, and other wildlands, recreation lands . . . and landscapes with locally unique features and areas identified by the state as deserving special protection.
- To encourage efficient development patterns . . . in an area appropriately planned for growth, served by adequate transportation and other essential utilities and services, and minimizes ongoing costs to taxpayers.

The policies in AB 857 should be presented verbatim in the text, and the strategy should specifically state how the policies apply to the Water Plan and water infrastructure investments.

All legislative references are 2007

Land Use and Energy

[AB 32]

On September 27, 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. The Act caps California's greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels by 2020. This legislation represents the first enforceable state-wide program in the U.S. to cap all GHG emissions from major industries that includes penalties for non-compliance. It requires the State Air Resources Board to establish a program for statewide greenhouse gas emissions reporting and to monitor and enforce compliance with this program. The Act authorizes the state board to adopt market-based compliance mechanisms including cap-and-trade, and allows a one-year extension of the targets under extraordinary circumstances.

Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) directs the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop CEQA Guidelines on climate change by July 2009. In the midst of these events, the California Air Resources Board, the Governor's Climate Action Team and numerous state agencies continue to implement AB 32 and the Governor's 2005 Executive Order on climate change.

[CEQA]

Land Use and Water Supply

SB 610 SB 221 [ch ? Urban Water Management Plans]

In 2001, two water supply planning bills were enacted that require greater coordination and more extensive data to be shared between water suppliers and local land use agencies for large development projects and plans. Senate Bill 610 (see California Water Code §10631, §10656, §10910, §10912, §10915, §10657) requires a water supply assessment for any development project or related land use plan of more than 500 housing units, 500,000 square feet of retail use, 250,000 square feet of office use, 500 hotel rooms, 40 acres, or 650,000 square feet of business park use or a mixed-use project with any combination equal to the scale noted above. The water supply assessment needs to be part of any CEQA document prepared for the project (EIR or negative declaration). If there is not adequate water to reliably supply the project (and all the other present and future water demands anticipated) in normal, dry, and multiple dry years, new water sources need to be identified. The Urban Water Management Plan may be used, in part, to satisfy the Water Supply Assessment requirement. A strong water element in the general plan that

incorporates a coordinated effort between the land use agency and the water supply agency will facilitate implementation of SB 610.

Senate Bill 221 (see Government Code §66410, et seq.) prohibits any land use agency from approving a subdivision map of more than 500 housing units (or a proposed subdivisions of less than 500 units if the project represents 10 percent or more of all connections of a smaller water purveyor—one with fewer than 5,000 connections) unless there is written verification from a water provider that a sufficient and reliable water supply is available. Sufficient water supply is defined as adequate water to supply the new growth in normal, dry, and multiple dry years, taking account of existing and planned water demands on the system. The statute also sets a rigorous standard for considering new water sources. The water source must include water entitlements, capital financing, and all regulatory permits. If a water provider does not respond to requests by the land use agency for water supply data, or the water provider indicates that sufficient water is not available, the land use agency has the ability to seek other water sources to serve the subdivision. However, before the project can be approved, reliable water sources must be secured. Infill housing and exclusively affordable housing are exempt from these requirements. Urban Water Management Plans and related water system master plans are very valuable tools in demonstrating adequate water supplies. An up-to-date water element could be valuable in demonstrating a comprehensive basis for future water supply. three years; to date none have been directly challenged in court regarding SB 610 compliance, but many cases have been brought regarding inadequate environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

A foundational document for compliance with both SB 610 and SB 221 is the Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Both of these statutes repeatedly identify the UWMP as a planning document that, if properly prepared, can be used by a water supplier to meet the standards set forth in both statutes. Thorough and complete UWMPs will allow water suppliers to use UWMPs as a foundation to fulfill the specific requirements of these two statutes. Cities, counties, water districts, property owners, and developers will all be able to utilize this document when planning for and proposing new projects. UWMPs serve as important source documents for cities and counties as they update their General Plan. Conversely General Plans are source documents as water suppliers update their UWMPs. These planning documents are linked and their accuracy and usefulness are interdependent. It is crucial that cities /counties and water suppliers work closely when developing and updating these planning documents.

AB 162 (Wolk) Land Use: Water Supply

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 accommodate floodwater, and requires cities and counties to establish policies to minimize flood risk for new development. It also requires cities and counties, when revising the safety element, to consult with the Reclamation Board.

Land Use and Flood Management

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]

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.

Potential Benefits of More Compact Development

Currently the system of water management is dependent on conveyance and export water. In order to provide more regional self sufficiency, water supply needs to be managed in a manner that reduces demand, reduces regional reliance on imported water, and increases a mixed portfolio of water sources and management.

There are water- and energy-related benefits that accrue from compact development. It can reduce landscaped areas and, therefore, reduce landscape 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 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

Low Impact Development is a different approach to stormwater management using site design and stormwater 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 stormwater 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 storage, conveyance, and treatment, and thus, efficient water use is also an energy conservation (and greenhouse emission reduction strategy). As a rule of thumb, landscaping irrigation accounts for almost half of residential water use. 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.

In 2004, AB 2717 was passed, it requested the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) to convene a stakeholder task force, composed of public and private agencies, to evaluate and recommend proposals by December 31, 2005, for improving the efficiency of water use in new and existing urban irrigated landscapes in California. Based on this charge, the Task Force adopted a comprehensive set of 43 recommendations, essentially making changes to the AB 325 of 1990 and updating the Model Local Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The recommendation of the bill charges DWR to update the Model Efficient Landscape Ordinance and to upgrade CIMIS.

The Water Conservation in Landscaping Act of 2006 (AB 1881) enacts many, but not all of the recommendations reported to the Governor and Legislature in December 2005 by the CUWCC Landscape Task Force (Task Force). AB 1881 requires DWR, not later than January 1, 2009, by regulation, to update the model ordinance in accordance with specified requirements, reflecting the provisions of AB 2717. AB 1881 requires local agencies, not later January 1, 2010, to adopt the updated model ordinance or equivalent or it will be automatically adopted by statute. Also, the bill requires the Energy Commission, in consultation with the department, to adopt, by regulation, performance standards and labeling requirements for landscape irrigation equipment, including irrigation controllers, moisture sensors, emission devices, and valves to reduce the wasteful, uneconomic, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy or water. (See the Urban Water Use Efficiency strategy, Chapter #, Volume 2 for the draft recommendations by the Landscape Task Force).

[Update]

Through the requirements of AB 32, the California Energy Commission is preparing land use and transportation strategies to achieve the greenhouse emission reductions set for 2012, 2020, and 2050. These strategies include:

- Use adopted criteria for grants to support watershed planning for more self sufficient water portfolio to reduce water conveyance and associated energy costs; designate protected watershed lands for water absorption; direct urban development toward existing urban centers; avoid conversion of floodplains and farmlands (better soils require less water); foster regional partnerships; develop and implement integrated regional water management plans.
- Assist local governments and agencies to improve coordination between land use planning and water planning and management including energy and climate uncertainty.
- Provide incentives to developers and local governments to plan and build using more resource efficient development patterns that reduce water and energy demands. Grants and other incentives should be used to increase consumer interest in urban living and to encourage infill and compact development forms.

Potential Costs of More Compact Development

Recent legislation (AB 32) requires greenhouse emission reductions and provides for the development of financing mechanism. State agencies and others are developing cost estimates of energy and water strategies that include land use. These estimates are expected by the **summer of 2008**. Based on these estimates, it is expected to have general estimates implementing this land use strategy. The potential State, local, and private costs for promoting higher density and more compact development need to be balanced with the need for more housing, economic development and consumer preferences.

While there may be significant new costs associated with changing the way local, regional, and State agencies plan urban areas, savings are expected from avoided costs, especially in terms of future energy and long-term maintenance of infrastructure and other life cycle costs. However, immediate costs are projected for increased communication, coordination and information sharing between land use agencies, water suppliers, and agencies that regulate water quality.

Studies show that sprawl is costly, not only for the loss of valuable farmland and wildlands, but for the public and private investments: the costs to state and local government of providing new highways, new schools and new water pipes to spreading subdivisions.

The benefits of smart growth are documented by national and state research that so-called smart growth – compact and mixed-use development versus sprawl can save taxpayers money.

Research by the Real Estate Research Corp., Robert Burchell and others documents that compact growth can be as much as 70 percent cheaper for governments than equivalent volumes of scattered growth. It simply costs less to provide infrastructure (such as streets, schools, flood control or sewers) and services (like police and fire protection) to denser, more contiguous households than to far-flung, low-density communities.

http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2003/0413metropolitanpolicy_katz.aspx

Therefore, by implementing this strategy, lower long-term costs will likely be associated with reduced urban runoff, less infrastructure expansion for water supply, and lower mitigation costs for displaced farm land and/or wildlife habitat.

Major Issues

Disincentives for Change

Local governments make most of the land use decisions in California. Local governments do not use more resource-efficient development patterns for many reasons, including consumer preferences and demands for single-family homes with yards, community resistance to infill or higher density development, local zoning ordinances that have not been updated for many years, the added cost to conduct regional planning efforts, the cost and liability associated with pursuing infill projects, 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 methods of 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. The passage of Proposition 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 fiscal effects of land use decisions. Additional federal fiscal policies, such as capital gains taxes, make property ownership an attractive investment, adding to the rapid 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 retails and commercial uses. Local governments seek the 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, and public safety. Focusing on higher end housing establishes a higher tax base for these ongoing services. Overall, counties and cities 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 ranging from 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. These fiscal forces continue to collide across city and county boundaries in the Delta.

Coordination

Recent changes to the Government Code and the Water Code requires 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.

Recommendations

State

1. Consider Greenhouse Gas emissions that could be produced in the development of water quality standards.
2. Use adopted criteria for grants to support watershed planning for more self sufficient water portfolios to reduce water conveyance and associated energy costs.
3. Direct urban development toward existing urban center and avoid conversion of floodplains and farmlands (better soils require less water); designate protected watershed lands for water absorption.
4. Use AB 857 (Wiggins) as criteria in assessing water facilities, infrastructure and other projects for receiving state funds.
5. Foster regional partnerships and provide technical assistance to develop and implement integrated regional water management plans.
6. Provide incentives to developers and local governments to plan and build using more resource-efficient development patterns. This can be done through California Environmental Quality Act 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.
7. 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).
8. Provide technical assistance to local governments on how to incorporate resource efficient development into their local general plan, related zoning ordinances, and specific plans; and how to prepare required water supply assessments before approving major new development projects.
9. Encourage more research on the impacts of resource efficient development patterns and best practices.
10. Promote performance-based planning with metrics including establishing a baseline for each watershed for impervious surfaces, vehicle miles traveled per capita, comprehensive flood

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

management using floodplain planning, and land coverage. These metrics should be the basis for State funding, grants, and other financial incentives.

11. Consider State requirements for updating existing general plans to include a separate Water Element, or updated water resources data and information (UWMP) and policies within existing elements to reflect state water policies for self-sufficiency goals. Develop and publicize accurate and relevant data on water supply and water quality to help local agencies update plans.

Local Government

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

13. Recognize regional needs and resources when developing local general plans and designing and building neighborhoods and communities. Improve communication, coordination, and information-sharing with other local agencies, regional planning agencies, and local water agencies and watershed managers.

14. Promote regional planning, reuse of land such as brownfields, greyfields (out-of-date shopping centers), and transit-oriented development.

15. Promote the rehabilitation of aging or inadequate infrastructure to help infill development.

16. Evaluate the potential environmental impacts of new development on prime agricultural land, open space, floodplains, recharge areas, and wetlands and consider the water supply impacts when developing appropriate mitigation measures.

17. Update landscape irrigation ordinances to promote consumer choices for more water-efficient landscaping in existing and new developments.

18. Look for opportunities to reduce impervious surfaces, especially near waterways.

Regional Government

19. 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.

Water Suppliers

20. Develop and make available to local governments water resource information, such as water supply and water quality in Urban Water Management Plans, that can be used in local and regional land use decisions, including general plan formulation and municipal service reviews.

21. Collaborate with local land use agencies to assess water supply availability for new development.

Selected References

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.