

**California Water Plan Update 2009**  
**Notes from Land Use Planning and Management Strategy Workshop**  
**July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

**I. Land Use Planning and Management in California**

- Use bolder introductory language to encourage the reader to continue
- Consider the impact of utilizing non-native landscaping
- Mention flood – a public safety issue
- Cross-reference this RMS and Water Use Efficiency, noting how much water is being wasted in landscaping
- Add “maximize natural resource protection” to the second paragraph page 1
- Note the drastic room for change in land use within the Plan’s 50 year horizon
  - Development could be drastically more dense
- Note the power of redevelopment as a water supply and water quality tool
  - **Clark Anderson** to send paper the LGC has released based on Ventura County
- Consider adding infrastructure to the second paragraph
- Include a consistent benefits list to reference throughout the paper
- Quantify the benefits – many readers may not intuitively understand
- Speak to existing building blocks of land use planning – zoning, subdivision and general planning
  - **Clark Anderson** to follow up in providing/aiding with text
- Mentioning CEQA here could provide nexus to other strategies
- Mention consequences of poor water quality such as beach closers and fishing limitations

**A. Compact Sustainable Development**

- Provide more reference to geographical areas. Consider geographic trends in terms of sprawled vs. compact development in order to frame where it is most feasible to do compact development
  - **Clark Anderson** can help with this
- Unnecessary to emphasize Environmental Goals and Policy Report (EGPR) (likely a leftover from a previous draft)
- Possibly outdated references to Assembly Bills 857 and 901
  - AB 901 superseded and does not need to be mentioned here
- Recommend matching growth to available local resources. Available resources should limit development
- Include a section of lessons learned, and explain why things did not work in the past for the reference of regulatory agencies
- Keep in mind this strategy should focus on aspects that DWR has control over and has the power to influence or change. Use appropriate language, such as encourage and support rather than require and force, because the CWP will not have the power to require changes in local land use dynamics

## **B. Land Use and Energy**

- Formatting suggestion – this section reads like a laundry list of bills which makes the document difficult for the reader to access
- Include background clarification on the legislative bills mentioned, such as when they were signed and enrolled
- To the extent feasible, include an evaluation of how effective the bills have been in achieving what they have set out to do
- Suggestion to change the header to Land Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Add discussion of AB 70 and stormwater permit requirements and the connection to land use and water quality

## **C. Land Use and Water Supply**

- AB162 mentioned in the wrong section, should be under flood management not water supply
- Include a section on land use and water quality – summarize connections and issues

## **D. Land Use and Flood Management**

- Cross-reference – mention the link to Urban Runoff here
- Consider the whole state and not only the Central Valley
- Suggestion to re-title this section “Land Use and Floodplain Management” to include conjunctive use

## **II. Potential Benefits of More Compact Development**

- Focus on land and water nexus not just land use planning
  - This is a multi-agency process. The focus of RMS should be ways that improve water management, and this narrative should identify opportunities not only for DWR but for state government
    - Example: flood
- Mention quality of life benefit from compact development
- Possibly organize the section into two sections:
  - “Water-Related Benefits” - supply, quality, flood management, GHG
  - “Other Benefits” – quality of life
- Make benefits more concrete and easily identifiable
- Move low impact development from this section to water quality; this is a description of a program not a benefit
- Remove the bullets on the top of page 8 and the description of strategies from this section. This is an explanation of something that is happened not a benefit.
- Need to reconcile terminology. Must define and control use of terms in this section:
  - Compact Development
  - Smart Growth
  - Mixed Use

- Many of these terms have baggage and do not describe the same concepts and cannot be used interchangeably
      - Sustainable land development - possible new ordering choice
- Need to focus discussion on managing growth and setting limits
  - Need to set barriers
  - Need for open space
  - Public health concerns
  - Mention working and living trends that have manifested in the more urban area of the state
- Need state level policy alignment particularly concerning stormwater permitting.
  - Note stormwater permits as an added benefit
  - State can control land use through their allocation of bonds
  - IRWM integration point
- Include urban planning graphic: Transect shows gradient from the rural to urban. This would show the diversity in strategies used in different development contexts
- Possible link between water and land use is financial by making users pay for expansions in infrastructure
- Data gap – include data on how much cities can save from this type of “compact development”. Sources of information include:
  - **SF RWQCB** paper on cost savings
  - **Center for Neighborhood Technology** on green infrastructure
  - AB 857 background data
  - Bill moving forward now charging CEC and DWR to evaluate GHGE with different types of development
  - Real Estate Research Program

### **III. Potential Costs of More Compact Development**

- Need for quantification of costs. Make this data available
- Consider the different perspectives throughout geographic areas in the state
  - Areas that want to grow such as rural areas in the Central Valley, foothills, or high deserts
  - These areas would see growth as a benefit and would look forward to increased tax revenue and land development
- Bottom of page 8 is a description of benefits and not costs
- Too much focus on the delta

### **IV. Major Issues**

- Suggested to tighten up this section – clearly define issues with headings and not categories
- This section needs to address
  - How to promote better regional planning given institutional arrangements, regional level has most benefits but institutions weak
  - Affordable housing – compact increases prices
  - Incentives for compact sustainable development – what funding?

- Lack of coordination of state agencies and water districts
- Stormwater permits incentivizes lower density development – trying to protect WQ, but affecting development
- Page 9, third paragraph, last words “in the Delta” needs to be change to reflect the whole state of CA

## V. Recommendations

- Use stronger language than “consider”- encourage would be a stronger word

### Recommendations:

- #1 is not clear and does not seem to address the issues directly. Need for context
  - Follow up with Lorraine Marsh to expand
- #2 change to say in grant criteria include support for watershed planning that does these things (this criterion has already been adopted)
- #3 protect lands for absorption – link to recharge area protection RMS
- #5 should clarify, encourage inclusion of land use agencies in regional partnerships or water districts
- #7 should recommend also look at cumulative impacts for non-significant developments
  - this was point of SB or AB 821, proposed last year, put on hold, Research Bureau investigating
- #8 add financial after technical
- local level: can split #14 into regional planning and new, second one about water supply/quality benefits of redevelopment and transit oriented development

### General Comments for the recommendation section:

- Include feedback and recommendations that came out of the CWP Regional Workshops
- Note that General Plan guidelines regarding floodplain management are being developed currently
- Data gap: Research on the effectiveness of SB 610 and SB 221
- Nexus: Agriculture land stewardship and avoided cost of development
  - Add recommendation to increase open space conservation and agriculture land conservation
- Add recommendation to strengthen Caltrans blueprint regional planning program. Recommend that water to be a considered in the plan
- Need to include a state level assessment of barriers to compact sustainable development, such as green lawn requirements
  - Mention regulatory programs: recognize patterns of community form (at state level)
- Include housing planning – recommendation from APA, increased coordination between local housing plans and LAFCO review process

- Solution to integration is to include land use agencies in regional water planning
- Include something about rural to urban development contexts, note that there are different solutions
- Important to outline barriers to infill development (for example, level of service in intersection could out-price a builder, and realtors need affordable and different qualities and styles of housing for different populations)
- Important to assess local codes and ordinances for their water quality and supply – what gets built is through these, really valuable to audit, not just for stormwater but irrigation practices, all these things – local development regulations can prevent sustainable development
  - for example: sloping front lawn and irrigation runs right off, but for flood management this is to have house above the floodplain; flat lawn with little berm is more expensive
  - CCNRs and the ASCE manuals tells engineers how to design sidewalks are another source of how things are done

Please email comments that were not captured or corrections to the notetaker Charlotte Chorneau at [cchorneau@ccp.csus.edu](mailto:cchorneau@ccp.csus.edu)

**List of Attendees**

In- Room:

Sara Agahi, County of San Diego  
 Clark Anderson, LGC  
 Evon Chambers, PCL  
 Steve Cruz, CBIA  
 Al Herson, American Planning Association  
 Elizabeth Gavric, CAR  
 Pal Hegedus, RBF Consulting/FMA  
 Charlotte Hoode, PCL  
 Rebecca Kanegawa, MWH  
 Seth Litchney, OPR  
 Jonas Minton, PCL  
 Nicole Phipps, PCL  
 Terry Roberts, OPR  
 Iovanka Todt, FMA  
 Betty Yee, RWQCB

On-Phone:

Amy Flower  
 Connie Gallippi  
 John Tallman, Trustee with Reclamation District 765  
 Kevin Kashi, City of Oakland  
 Melanie Powers  
 Marci Coglianesi

DWR and CCP:

Charlotte Chorneau, CCP  
 Dorian Fougères, CCP  
 Elizabeth Patterson, DWR  
 Jennifer Kofoed, DWR  
 Lew Moeller, DWR  
 Lisa Beutler, CCP