



MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013
LAND USE PLANNING OBJECTIVE
9:00 – 10:00 A.M.
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Objectives

Discuss and suggest revisions for the Related Actions associated with the Update 2013 Objective relating to Land Use Planning:

“Strengthen the alignment of goals, policies and programs for improving local land use planning and integrated water management (IWM).”

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

The Update 2013 Objectives Web-a-thon was held on June 13-14, 2013 to discuss the draft 17 Objectives and the associated Related Action for the Water Plan. Introductions were made around the room and online. Paul Massera, DWR, Program Manager, Update 2013, welcomed everyone and noted that an online wrap up session will be conducted on July 9th, to conclude any items needing additional discussion. He explained that the workbook was prepared by DWR staff and subject matter experts, and is for discussion purposes only. The first few pages of this draft document provide definitions of terms and the Water Plan mission, vision and goals – which sets the context for the objectives and related actions. A brief review of the Conjunctive Use objective and related actions (found on pages 51-52 of the workbook) would be followed by discussion on the text.

Overview

Jose Alarcon, DWR Project Team, provided brief background on how the objectives and related actions were developed. He and Francisco Guzman have reviewed the 37 Featured State Plans, related state agency plans with bearing on the Water Plan, and correlated the respective recommendations with the Water Plan objectives. These were forwarded to the subject matter experts for consideration in updating the related actions for each objective. Collectively, the objectives identify what is needed to accomplish the goals of the Water Plan. The related actions represent what is needed to accomplish each particular objective.

The workbook contains a column for performance measures, which will help track each action and inform the next Water Plan Progress Report. Draft measures have been proposed for some of the objectives, and feedback is welcomed on potential performance measures – as well as the objectives and related actions.



Document Walk Through

Elizabeth Patterson, DWR, Lead for the Update 2013 Land Use Caucus, reviewed the Land Use Objective. This is a new objective for Update 2013 and includes more than Urban Land Use. She noted that the related actions were developed through comments received on the Land Use Resource Management Strategy (RMS), and from staff and caucus discussions. Performance measures have been suggested for each action, to assist with the next Progress Report. A caveat was provided that the accomplishment of a particular item, especially within the associated timeline, is dependent on receiving funding to proceed with the tasks.

Related Actions

The proposed Related Actions, and the ensuing discussion, are presented below. Please note that the actions below have been abridged from the original text and the sub-actions are not included:

General Discussion

- Land use and water planning are tied. When we think about land management, we need to think about water management. The decision making needs to go both ways, to think about how decisions impact each other.
- Open space conservation measures should be discussed here.
- Rural land use planning is also important for water quantity and quality. It's difficult for counties to do. Preservation of existing floodplains is an important objective. Developing more than 10% of a watershed can result in severe impacts on the ecology of streams and rivers, and for water quality.
 - The Land Use RMS has some of this, which could be pulled out for the actions.
 - Conservation efforts are needed to provide safe harbor on private land. Otherwise, developers are able to pick up previously protected lands. An example of this is a tract of ranch land east of Rancho Cordova that was covered by the Williamson Act. If that goes, heritage oaks will be lost and there will be increases in erosion and invasive species.
 - This is discussed in the Ag Lands Stewardship RMS, and can be described in the summary description for the Land Use objective.
- General plans are generally updated every 20 years, but many communities are done more frequently. There is no legal requirement for updating General Plans. There are 260 cities and counties in the state with plans that are more than 10 years old. Some are done quickly and others are more complicated. Others update only certain elements. Funding and the time consuming nature of planning updates influences when they get done. The Marin County update took 10 years and cost millions of dollars. It is not likely that any county general plan EIR will ever cost less than \$1 million to update.



-
- Can water elements be incorporated into IRWMs, rather than general plans? The General Plan can be amended to reference IRWMs. The Strategic Growth Council has more refined info about CEQA.
 - Include the Environmental Goals and Policy Report as a plan that should be considered..
1. State government should provide additional regulatory and financial incentives to developers and local governments to plan and build using compact and sustainable development patterns. (Examples include further streamlining of CEQA review for infill projects, further reducing brownfields liability for innocent purchasers, financial incentives for compact and sustainable development.)

Discussion:

- If regulations are in place, they affect developers equally.
2. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) should provide guidance and financial incentives for integration of IWM approaches in General Plan Updates and Sustainable Communities Strategies, including both substantive and planning process guidance.

Discussion:

- For IWM "approach" – strike the word approach. DWR still needs to define IWM. IWM planning or thinking is a way to plan knowing that everything is connected – such as urban land use, habitat management, flood management, etc.
- Is IWM a concept, an activity, both? Reference where in the Water Plan IWM is defined (Chapters 1 and 3). The introduction to Chapter 8 should also have this information.
- The problem is you can't integrate all of IWM into regional and local land use planning – there are certain things that work, such as not developing in flood plains, low impact development and protecting aquifer recharge areas. In other areas, it doesn't work. As a global management strategy, it won't fit with certain areas of land use planning.
- Say that IWM represents multiple disciplines and relates land use and water in support of water management.
- The role of unfunded mandates should be discussed – counties and the state can't pay for everything. This document shouldn't advocate that the state pay for everything. Some things need to be paid for at the county level, engaging the electorate.



-
- The suggestion is for incentives to local governments to update their General Plans and incorporate some of these concepts.
 - Dollar for dollar, if state invests in planning activities – that provides a cost-effective basis for informing longer term infrastructure investments.
3. Local governments should integrate IWM approaches into their General Plan updates.

Discussion:

- Add in more detail into this action. Agricultural land protection, groundwater recharge area protection, avoiding development in floodplains – these are good examples to include.
 - ACTION ITEM: In the performance measure, say “optional” water element, and strike the word “new.”
4. The Strategic Growth Council should provide guidance and financial incentives for regional planning agency integration of IWM approaches into Sustainable Communities Strategies, transportation blueprint plans, and other regional plans.

Discussion:

- It was noted that a regional planning agency usually refers to metropolitan planning organizations.
5. Regional planning agencies should integrate IWM issues into their Sustainable Communities Strategies, transportation blueprint plans, and other regional plans.

Discussion:

- PM: Say “effectively” rather than “meaningfully.”
6. Local governments should ensure that Urban Water Management Plans inform and reflect Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) plan preparation and implementation, to further IWM integration in local land use planning promoting compact and sustainable development.

Discussion:

- No comments.
7. Local governments should implement specific land use planning and regulatory measures to reduce flood risks, consistent with IWM principles and DWR “best practices” for land use planning. (E.g. preservation of existing floodplains, aquifer recharge areas and alluvial fans; restoration of natural floodplain functions; design measures to increase post-flood resiliency.)



Discussion:

- PM: Strike “meaningful.”
 - This includes preservation of alluvial fans.
8. DWR should assist local governments and developers with implementing the “Integrated Water and Land Smart Planning Tool,” which calculates life-cycle infrastructure costs for different development patterns.

Discussion:

- No comments.
9. State government should evaluate the effectiveness of the 2007 flood management legislation in coordinating land use planning, flood planning, and natural resources, and recommend changes to existing laws and their implementation as appropriate.

Discussion:

- Some of these related actions use the terms “state government” others use “State” or “state agencies.” This needs to be consistent or define the variations. State government means executive and legislative. A small “s” state refers to the geographic/geopolitical area of the state of California. Capital “S” means State government and should be upper case in all aspects of the document.
10. State government should evaluate the effectiveness of SB 610 and SB 221 in coordinating land use and water supply planning, and recommend changes to existing laws and their implementation as appropriate.

Discussion:

- Does this mean you’ll look at how 610 and 221 connect to land use or are you looking at outcomes of water supply? Answer: The intent is looking at the effectiveness of these laws – have they resulted in the outcomes they were to achieve?
 - This action affects CEQA and subdivision map act. Explain that for clarity.
11. State government should invest in innovation and technology for assessment of land use and water supply and flood conditions to further integrate water management and land use.

Discussion:

- How does this fit with technology objectives? It’s important to define what is out there. Some water managers don’t have good information on land use. Data and



technology can provide information. Where does data go, how is it available and in what format? We want to provide data that is useful for local government.

12. State agencies and local government should endorse and/or adopt the California Biodiversity Council's Resolution (April 2013) on "Strengthening Agency Alignment for Natural Resource Conservation" which complements land use and IWM.

Discussion:

- This is duplicated in objective 16.



Attendance

In-Room

Al Herson, American Planning Association
John Hopkins, Institute for Ecological Health
Karl Longley, California Water Institute, UC Fresno
Bob Siegfried, Carmel Area Wastewater District

Jose Alarcon, DWR, Water Quality Lead
Megan Fidell, DWR, RMS Coordinator, Progress Report Lead
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management
Paul Massera, DWR, Water Plan Program Manager
Lewis Moeller, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR, Land Use Lead

Lisa Beutler, MWH, Water Plan Executive Facilitator
Heidi Hill Drum, CCP, Facilitator
Judie Talbot, CCP, Facilitator

Webinar

Rebecca Crebbin-Coates, Planning and Conservation League
Anisa Divine, Imperial Irrigation District
Cheryl Essex, State Parks
Bruce Gwynne, Department of Conservation
Zia Hosseinipour, Ventura County Watershed Protection District
Karen Keene, California Association of Counties
Alex Kim, UC Irvine
Stathis Kostopoulos, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Seth Litchney, Office of Planning and Research
Margie Namba, Granite Construction
Eric Osterling, Kings River Conservation District
Chris Potter, California Resources Agency (Ocean Grants and Wetlands)
Nathaniel Roth, UC Davis
Tony St. Amant, Water Policy Advocate
Marsha Westropp, Orange County Water District
Betty Yee, Central Valley Regional Water Board
Salomon Miranda, DWR, Floodplain Management