

Section O: Relation to Local Land Use Planning

The purpose of the Relation to Local Land Use Planning standard in the Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Program Guidelines is to require an exchange of knowledge and expertise between land use and water resource managers through the IRWM planning process; to examine how Regional Water Management Groups (RWMGs) and land use planning agencies currently communicate; and to identify how to improve planning efforts between the RWMGs and land use planning agencies. One of the goals of the *California Water Plan Update 2009* is to ensure that water managers and land use planners make informed, collaborative water management decisions on a statewide basis. The purpose of including the Relation to Local Land Use Planning standard in the IRWM Program Guidelines is to help meet that goal.¹

Every city and county in California must adopt a comprehensive long-term General Plan in accordance with §65300 of the California Government Code. There are seven required elements of a General Plan including Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety, which provide a broad overview of the issues within a jurisdiction. Water-related supply and treatment issues are included in the Conservation element. Policies that must be addressed in the Conservation element include the following:

- Senate Bill (SB) 221 (Bus. and Prof. Code, §11010 as amended; Gov. Code, §65867.5 as amended; Gov. Code, §66455.3 and 66473.7) prohibits approval of subdivisions consisting of more than 500 dwelling units unless there is verification of sufficient water supplies for the project from the applicable water supplier(s). This requirement also applies to increases of 10 percent or more of service connections for public water systems with less than 500 service connections.
- SB 610 (California Water Code [CWC] §10631, 10656, 10910, 10911, 10912, and 10915 as amended; Public Resources Code [PRC] §21151.9 as amended) and Assembly Bill (AB) 901 (CWC §10610.2 and 10631 as amended; CWC §10634) make changes to the Urban Water Management Planning Act to require additional information in Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) if groundwater is identified as a source available to the supplier. A key provision in Senate Bill (SB) 610 requires that any project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and supplied with water from a public water system be provided a water supply assessment, except as specified in the law.
- State of California General Plan Guidelines (Governor's Office of Planning and Research [OPR] 2003) recommends facilitating SB 610 by having strong water elements in local general plans that incorporate coordination between the land use agency and the water supply agency.

The enactment of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) in 2014 has created additional requirements for improved coordination and consultation between land use planners and local water supply and management agencies for regions that are subject to this legislation (i.e., groundwater basins that are designated as medium or high priority according to the Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118; this includes the Salinas Valley groundwater basin). SGMA provides a framework for long-term sustainable groundwater management across California, with a goal of achieving sustainable management by the year 2042.

¹ This introduction has been excerpted from the Proposition 84/1E IRWM Program Guidelines, p. 62.

According to §65352.5 of the SGMA legislation, upon receiving notification of a city's or a county's proposed action to adopt or substantially amend a general plan, a public water system with 3,000 or more service connections must provide the planning agency with: the current version of its urban water management plan; the current version of its capital improvement program or plan; a description of the source or sources of the total water supply currently available to the water supplier by water right or contract; a description of the quantity of surface water and of groundwater that was purveyed by the water supplier in each of the previous five years; a description of the total number of customers currently served by the water supplier; quantification of the expected reduction in total water demand associated with future implementation of water use reduction measures identified in the water supplier's urban water management plan; and any additional information that is relevant to determining the adequacy of existing and planned future water supplies to meet existing and planned future demands on these water supplies.

Even with advances in policy as described above and with new legislation such as SGMA, efforts to link land use decisions and water management decisions often remains an area of challenge. Land use decisions and water management decisions are frequently under the purview of different agencies, yet the resources each agency manages are inextricably linked. Often, the relationship among these agencies is characterized as reactive in that one agency must act to accommodate a decision the other agency has made. Early communication is vital in changing the relationship from reactive to proactive.

A primary aim of IRWM planning is to solve regional water management issues through diversified water management portfolios and early water management input into, and coordination with those responsible for making, land use decisions. This relationship can significantly influence how both water management decisions and land use decisions are made. The importance of open lines of communication between local land use planners and water resource managers is imperative to a successful IRWM effort.

This chapter describes the current relationship between local land use planning entities and water management entities in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region, and provides suggestions for how that relationship may be improved.

O.1 CURRENT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING ENTITIES AND WATER MANAGEMENT ENTITIES

The effort to link land use decisions and water management decisions remains an area of challenge in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region as it does in many other regions of the state. The level of communication and coordination between land use planners and water resource managers varies quite significantly amongst entities. A higher level of communication and coordination seems to exist between entities that operate on a regional scale than between those that operate more locally. Opinions also vary as to the level of exchange desired, with some water resource managers (typically those in rural areas where development pressures are minimal) preferring to manage their water supplies without "input" (perceived constraints) from outside agencies, and other water managers expressing a strong desire and need for increased coordination with land use planning agencies.

This section provides some examples of how water resource managers currently communicate with land use planners in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region. Since communication patterns seem to be similar amongst entities with similar jurisdictions, this section has been organized, solely for the purpose of structuring this discussion, according to the following general categories:

- Municipalities that supply their own water services
- Municipalities and large communities that do not supply their own water services
- Smaller, more rural communities
- Agencies with regional jurisdiction

A note on terminology: The term “water manager” is used in a general sense in this section to refer both to regulatory water management entities—including those that manage water supply (such as the Monterey County Water Resources Agency [MCWRA], which is responsible for long-term management of the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin) and those that regulate water quality (e.g., the Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB] and Monterey County Department of Environmental Health)—as well as to those that “manage” water delivery (i.e., the water purveyors, such as California Water Service Company (Cal Water), Alco Water Company, Marina Coast Water District, Castroville Community Services District, and several municipalities that supply water within their city boundaries).

O.1.1 Municipalities that Supply Their Own Water

Several of the municipalities in the region—specifically, Gonzales, Greenfield, King City, and Soledad—supply their own water and provide their own wastewater treatment services. The water source for all of these cities is the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, which as noted above, is managed by the MCWRA. The water purveyor function is managed and implemented by the public works department in each of these municipalities.

Where water resource management and land use planning occur “in house,” coordination tends to occur naturally through ongoing interdepartmental communications. Discussions are initiated, for example, whenever a developer inquires about a land use project or files an application. Development projects over a certain threshold must prepare a SB 610 Water Supply Assessment (WSA); during the preparation of an assessment an exchange of information will occur between the planning and public works departments. Additionally, when a City updates its General Plan, the City planners will consider water sources and the expansion of the urban area. Interagency coordination (e.g., between a City and the MCWRA) typically occurs in conjunction with major subdivisions, or annexation proposals. Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) and, more recently, WSAs, typically provide the instrument for disclosure of information and potential impacts to concerned members of the public and other agencies.²

O.1.2 Municipalities and Large Communities that Do Not Supply Their Own Water

Other municipalities and large communities in the region receive their water supply from water districts, such as the Marina Coast Water District or Castroville Community Services District, or from water companies, including privately owned water companies such as Coastlands Mutual Water Company in Big Sur, or investor-owned water companies such as Cal Water, which serves the cities of Salinas and King City. Where inherent separation exists between the utility (water manager) and the City or unincorporated community (land use planner) that it serves, coordination between the two is somewhat more challenged than in the situation where land use planning and water resource planning occur “in house.”

For example, according to a water resource planner at Cal Water, the only type of “formal” coordination that exists between the water purveyor and land use jurisdictions is limited to efforts such as developing Urban Water Management Plans, or developing WSAs. Some examples of Cal Water’s typical interactions with land use planners include:

² Sources for information in this paragraph are from email communications with: City of Gonzales Community Development Director, January 30, 2012; City of Greenfield Community Development Director, February 6, 2012; Senior Planner, City of Soledad Community Development Department, February 6, 2012; Assistant Planner, King City Community Development Department, February 7, 2012.

- Cal Water staff work with City staff to develop growth projections (population, service counts, water demand) for Urban Water Management Plans.
- To develop Cal Water's Water Supply and Facilities Master Plan, Cal Water staff used General Plan data and interviewed City planning personnel to project future growth and water use.
- Cal Water District Management attends City Council meetings.

In addition, for large development projects that require a WSA, Cal Water will conduct the WSA and submit it to the City prior to development approval. Coordination between Cal Water and a City or the County is more limited for smaller projects. In those cases Cal Water deals directly with the developers after their plans have already been approved by the City or County. Cal Water staff will review the project to make sure that adequate water supply exists in that part of the system and then will issue a will-serve letter. The Cal Water District Manager notes that oftentimes developers spend significant time and energy creating water system plans that do not meet Cal Water's specifications. This could be avoided if more coordination existed between the utility and the City, specifically, if a sign-off from the water company were required as a part of the development approval process.³

From the City of Salinas's perspective (i.e., from the land use planning perspective), communication and coordination with water managers is generally adequate though there is "much room for improvement."⁴ Examples of communication "working" include distribution of the City's General Plan to all water managers for early review and discussion.⁵ The City's General Plan stipulates that the City must consult with local and regional water agencies to assess whether the water demand associated with a development project is included in the agency's most recent Urban Water Management Plan and whether existing supplies can meet the project's demand for water (City of Salinas 2002, p. COS-5). In addition, Goal COS-1, "Create a safe and adequate supply of water for community uses," includes the following policies:

- *Policy COS-1.1:* Work with regional and local water providers to ensure that adequate supplies of water are available to meet existing and future demand.
- *Policy COS-1.3:* Work with local and regional water providers to increase the production, distribution, and use of recycled water.
- *Policy COS-1.4:* Maintain and restore natural watersheds to recharge the aquifers and ensure the viability of ground water resources.
- *Policy COS-1.5:* Cooperate with the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Regional Quality Control Board to implement programs that address two primary causes of poor water quality in the planning area: salt water intrusion and nitrate contamination.
- *Policy COS-1.6:* Enforce national (NPDES) requirements and participate in regional efforts to protect and enhance water quality.

Coordination between the City of Salinas and the MCWRA exists on a project-by-project basis, usually through a CEQA process or project review for projects adjoining the County's drainage ditch (the Salinas Reclamation Ditch). Another way in which information is exchanged between the City and water managers—in this case, water regulators—is in regards to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit issued by the RWQCB.

³ Email communication with Cal Water Project Engineer, January 30, 2012.

⁴ Email communication with the City's Community and Economic Development Department Assistant Director February 6, 2012.

⁵ Telephone conversation with City of Salinas Principal Planner, February 8, 2012.

Formalized City-County meetings do take place on a monthly basis between the City (usually Planning staff and sometimes a Public Works representative) and the County's Resources Agency (usually County Planning and Public Works staff); however, Water Resources Agency staff do not tend to participate in these meetings, nor do the water purveyors such as Cal Water and Alco. The conclusion offered by the City's Community and Economic Development Department Assistant Director is that there is "much room for improvement, particularly for long-term water resources planning and coordination of all water-related development issues."⁶

A similar situation exists—and similar conclusions might be drawn—for the relationship between the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD, water purveyor) and the land use planning entities for the areas it serves, including the City of Marina. For large development projects, MCWD will prepare the WSA, and the WSA will invariably be included in the EIR. Potential problems may arise, however, when MCWD and the City (or another land use jurisdiction) disagree on the amount of water that will be required by a project (i.e., when MCWD estimates a project will use more water than the City does). If the City approves the project based on its lower water use projections, and the higher projections prove to be more accurate, the City may be faced with a serious water shortage and MCWD will be in the position of needing to identify additional water supply. One water manager at MCWD is concerned that precisely this situation may occur as the economy picks up and those "last units," which received prior approval by the City but have not yet been built because of the economic downturn, finally get built. Upfront coordination between water managers and land use jurisdictions would help prevent this situation.⁷

From MCWD's perspective, increased coordination and communication needs to occur with small development projects as well. For most land use jurisdictions, water supply is not directly allocated to particular parcels. If business development on the small parcels is being promoted without adequate (or accurate) consideration of the potential water use by those businesses (e.g., a hotel, a laundry facility), a potential "accounting" problem may occur. One suggestion is that water management staff and land use planners work together to develop a parcel map of a region, allocating water to each parcel in some sort of flexible—but quantifiable—manner. Specific allocations of water for small as well as large projects will remove some of the ambiguity and uncertainty regarding future water use and will help improve long-term water supply security.

A regular forum does exist between the MCWD and the City of Marina to discuss upcoming projects and potential conflicts: the Joint City/District meeting, attended by MCWD Board and Marina City Council members, takes place once/month (providing there is a quorum). The Joint City/District meeting provides a good example of similar forums that could be set up between water management districts/companies and land use jurisdictions in the region.

O.1.3 Rural Communities

Other water district and water company managers in the region have reported even less coordination with land use planners than that described thus far—and many of them would prefer it to remain that way.

The General Manager at the Castroville Community Services District (CCSD) explains that CCSD makes decisions based on a five-member Board in the community of Castroville. Three of the five board members sit on the Castroville Advisory Committee, which advises the County Board of Supervisors through the office of Housing and Redevelopment. Through this connection, some collaboration exists

⁶ Email communication February 6, 2012.

⁷ Information regarding MCWD was obtained via telephone conversations with the MCWD Capital Projects Manager, February 8 and February 16, 2012.

with land use planners but there is no direct oversight of how CCSD allots their water and sewer capacity. For permitting, CCSD determines the water and wastewater connections without any input at all from land use planners. The General Manager noted, “My goal is to simplify. Anytime I can reduce the number of layers on a project, I do.” It is not that the District is averse to accepting input from other entities. The CCSD does not have much direct interaction with land use planners at the County of Monterey, but the General Manager is also quick to point out that the District has not yet had the kind of growth that would require a WSA.⁸

Similar sentiments have been expressed by other water managers, particularly those in rural areas. For example, Butch Kronlund, the President of Coastlands Mutual Water Company, a small, private water company in Big Sur, reports that “communication and coordination” between small water company managers and Monterey County land use planners in that region tends to be limited only to water quality testing and permitting requirements (e.g., avoiding fines and taking advantage of state and federal grants to reach compliance). Like the water managers at the CCSD, he prefers to keep the “coordination” effort to a minimum in favor of having more autonomy in managing the water resources (“less is more”).⁹

O.1.4 Regional Agencies

While communication and coordination between land use planners and water resource managers appears to be lower—and least desired by water managers—on the local level in the more rural areas of the region, at the regional level, communication and coordination appear to be actively pursued and desired. For example, the MCWRA—which is responsible for managing, protecting, and enhancing water supply and water quality as well as providing flood protection in the County of Monterey—appears to be thoroughly involved in all levels of land use planning throughout the county. The following provides some examples of MCWRA’s interactions with land use planners.¹⁰

The MCWRA works in close coordination with the Monterey County Planning Department, Building Department, and several other departments/agencies throughout the land use permitting process. MCWRA is primarily responsible for administering Monterey County floodplain, drainage, water conservation, water supply, and well construction regulations. The MCWRA reviews discretionary permits, ministerial permits, and well construction permits. Written comments and recommendations are provided in accordance with established departmental protocols. The MCWRA also participates in the development of various CEQA documents including initial studies, negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, and EIRs. As requested, the MCWRA reviews CEQA documents in other jurisdictions and written comments are provided to the lead agency.

The MCWRA also participates in several regularly scheduled meetings, including public hearings to provide clarification as necessary. Examples include:

Regularly scheduled meetings:

- Inter-Agency Review Meeting
- Inter-Departmental Review Meeting
- Inter-Departmental Coordination Meeting
- General Plan Implementation

⁸ Email communications with CCSD General Manager, February 7 - 13, 2012.

⁹ Email communications with Coastlands Mutual Water Company President, January 30 and 31, 2012.

¹⁰ The examples of MCWRA’s involvement with land use planning are from an email communication with the Senior Water Resources Hydrologist at MCWRA, February 17, 2012.

Regularly scheduled public hearings:

- Zoning Administrator
- Planning Commission
- Subdivision and Minor Subdivision Committees
- Board of Supervisors

Other planning related meetings:

- Permit Streamlining Task Force
- Code Enforcement Task Force
- Carmel River Task Force
- Carmel River Advisory Committee
- Monterey Peninsula IRWMP Technical Advisory Committee
- Monterey Peninsula Water Management Technical Advisory Committee
- Floodplain Management Plan Working Group
- Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Working Group
- County Service Area 50 Citizens Advisory Committee – Technical Support

Note, the MCWRA is not fully funded to participate in some land use activities (e.g., general plan implementation), which limits communication and coordination in those areas. Essentially there is more demand for services than there is funding.

On the “land use planner” side, the Monterey County Resource Management Agency (RMA) participates in several water resource planning activities throughout the county, including¹¹:

- RMA participates as Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) member in the Integrated Watershed Restoration Program with the Resource Conservation District (RCD) of Monterey County and other partners;
- RMA provides input to Central Coast Wetlands Group regarding wetland planning efforts in the region;
- RMA provides input to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (MBNMS) regarding climate change adaptation planning efforts (including the potential impacts of climate change on the Monterey Bay area coastline).

RMA consults with MCWRA on water supply and flood/drainage matters in all parts of Monterey County; part of the permit application goes to the MCWRA for that service. RMA consults with the Monterey County Environmental Health Bureau regarding water quality issues. In addition, the 2010 Monterey County General Plan is set up such that MCWRA provides advice on water supply, which the RMA Board has the discretion to accept or not.

In Elkhorn Slough, the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research Reserve (ESNERR) staff (i.e., land managers) collaborate with RWQCB staff on data sharing, and with the Moss Landing Harbor District (a water manager) on navigation and access. ESNERR is itself a collaborative partnership between the California Department of Fish and Game and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The Elkhorn Slough Foundation, a community non-profit, is also highly engaged in that partnership. Less frequent and less formal communication, consisting of the sharing of reports and occasional meetings, occurs between local land management staff and the MCWRA and the Pajaro Valley Water Management

¹¹ Email communication with Acting Deputy Director, MCRMA, June 9, 2011 and March 12, 2012.

Agency, which oversee surface and groundwater management and groundwater management respectively in portions of the Elkhorn Slough Watershed.¹²

In addition, several forums exist throughout the region to bring together land use planners, water managers, natural resource managers, landowners, and other stakeholders for the purposes of planning or conflict resolution related to certain geographic areas or features. These include, for example, forums related to the Salinas Reclamation Ditch, the Salinas River Lagoon, and the Salinas River Channel. These forums do not exist in any formal way, but are initiated on an as-needed basis by various agencies and organizations; and while the forums may serve an important function in relaying information and promoting communication, they do not tend to lead to interagency coordination per se. Regional planning entities such as the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) conduct workshops from time to time where interdisciplinary professionals, including land use planners and water managers, come together.

One current forum that brings together land use planners, water managers, and natural resource managers along with other stakeholders is provided by the Ford Ord Reuse Authority (FORA). FORA is responsible for the planning, financing, and implementation of the conversion of the former Fort Ord to civilian activities. The approved Base Reuse Plan calls for significant commercial economic development, supportive housing, visitor serving facilities, and related institutional activities to replace the contribution to the local economy of the 15,000 soldiers and thousands of civilian employees when Fort Ord was active. Nearly two-thirds of the former base will be preserved and maintained as habitat for endangered species and recreational open space.¹³ Working groups have been formed to focus on particular issues related to the Base Reuse Plan, including the Habitat Conservation Plan and Coordinated Resources Management and Planning. A Water and Wastewater Oversight Committee also meets on a regular basis to implement the delivery of water and wastewater services on the former Fort Ord, and by meeting regularly it provides a forum for the discussion of water and land use jurisdiction interactions.

It is clear that while the level of coordination between land use planners and water managers varies considerably in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region from entity to entity, and from the local level to the regional level, there is much room for improvement.

O.2 CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES IN LOCAL LAND USE PLANS

Many land use planners in the region are in the process of updating their plans to include climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies. Developing strategies for climate change adaptation is one area in particular where land use planning and water use planning are inextricably linked. Chapter R of this IRWM Plan, Climate Change, describes efforts being made in the region to address climate change impacts. Leading the charge is a Climate Task Force comprised of local scientists, land use managers, water resource managers, and coastal policy experts. Participating entities on the Climate Task Force include: Central Coast Wetlands Group at Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (CCWG), Stanford University Center for Ocean Solutions, Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Santa Cruz County, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Monterey County Planning, California Water Company, Monterey County Water Resources Agency, Stanford University Natural Capital Project, California Department of Water Resources, Santa Cruz County Resource Conservation District, and The Nature Conservancy.

¹² Email communication with the Tidal Wetland Project Director, ESNERR, January 30, 2012.

¹³ Source: FORA website: <http://www.fora.org/index.htm>.

Monterey County has made great strides to include climate change mitigation strategies in its recent planning documents. In 2006, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which established a mandate to reduce California's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (approximately 10 to 11% below 2006 state levels). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) developed the state's roadmap for reaching this goal, known as the AB 32 Scoping Plan. The Scoping Plan specifically identifies local governments (counties and cities) as key players in achieving the statewide goal to reduce statewide GHG emissions. The AB 32 Scoping Plan recommends that local governments establish GHG reduction goals for both their municipal operations and the community to be consistent with those of the state. In 2013, in response to the AB 32 Scoping Plan recommendation, the Monterey County Board of Supervisors adopted a Municipal Climate Action Plan (MCAP).

The MCAP: (1) provides a description of the steps being taken by the County to reduce GHG emissions associated with its municipal operations (i.e., the County's day-to-day activities in providing services to Monterey residents and businesses); (2) describes three potential paths towards the County's goal of reducing GHG emissions to a level that is 15% below the 2005 emissions level before 2020; and (3) serves as one component of the County's larger, community-wide climate action plan (CAP), which addresses GHG emissions from the community at large (the CAP is still under development, as of 2018).

In addition, Monterey County adopted a new General Plan on October 26, 2010. The environmental impact report prepared for the 2010 General Plan contains a discussion of potential GHG emissions impacts. Policies were added to the General Plan as mitigation for these potential GHG impacts related to buildout of the General Plan. The MCAP was prepared pursuant to that mitigation and Policy OS-10.15 of the General Plan to address GHG emissions from County operations.

Please see Chapter R, Climate Change, for a full discussion of current climate change efforts in the region.

O.3 EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH A STRONGER RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAND USE PLANNERS AND THE RWMG

As part of the 2017-2018 IRWM Plan update process to comply with 2016 IRWM standards, and in an attempt to facilitate discussion and forge a stronger relationship between local land use and water use planning, the RWMG invited local land use planners to two regularly scheduled RWMG meetings. The first meeting focused on climate change impacts, and the second meeting focused on the County's new requirements for on-site wastewater systems. This section briefly summarizes the outcomes of those meetings.

Local land use planners from Monterey County RMA and the Office of Emergency Services (OES) were invited to the April 18, 2018 RWMG meeting to coordinate with local water managers and planners on addressing potential impacts of climate change. Staff from RMA included the Deputy Director of Land Use and Community Development, a Senior Planner for Current and Long Range Planning, and the Sustainability Coordinator of the Green Program. Staff from OES included the OES Director, the OES Senior Secretary, and the Emergency Services Planner.

Ross Clark, Program Director of the CCWG, began by briefly presenting key findings from CCWG's recent report on coastal climate change impacts in the lower Salinas Valley, entitled *Moss Landing Community Coastal Climate Change Vulnerability Report* (completed June 2017).² Mr. Clark noted that much of CCWG's work on climate change was conducted in partnership with Monterey County, who acted as lead on an Ocean Protection Council (OPC) grant. CCWG had performed a climate risk analysis for the broader region, and also performed a more targeted evaluation of coastal climate change

vulnerabilities, specifically looking at the cumulative risks associated with predicted higher seas, increased storm intensity, and changes in rainfall patterns. The three project goals of the climate change report included:

- Identify what critical coastal infrastructure may be compromised due to sea level rise and estimate when those risks may occur;
- Identify how fluvial processes may increase flooding risk to coastal communities in the face of rising seas; and
- Define appropriate response strategies for these risks and discuss with regional partners the programmatic and policy options that can be adopted within Community Plans, Hazard Mitigation Plans, and Local Coastal Plan (LCP) updates.

Mr. Clark provided an overview of key findings, and then opened the floor for discussion, beginning with the question, “How can the RWMG and other water planners/managers help the County address these hazards?” From the OES perspective, staff responded that OES can utilize CCWG’s data to address climate change in response planning. Other OES staff pointed out that federal governments are requiring Hazard Mitigation Plans to include climate adaptation planning, and suggested that CCWG and other water resource planners could participate in a Working Group that will be convened in 2019.

From the RMA perspective, staff noted that RMA is more focused on climate mitigation rather than climate adaptation, i.e. reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, though added they very much appreciated the opportunity to work together with CCWG, MCWRA, the Monterey County Agricultural Commissioner’s Office, and others in the room. There was also discussion about adaptation response planning, including the possibility of managed retreat actions. RMA staff encouraged RWMG members to attend County Board of Supervisors meetings to help inform the board about coastal impacts, including sea level rise, for the next General Plan update. By the end of the discussion, there was general agreement of the “need to be cognizant of each other’s efforts,” with the added intention of identifying funding opportunities for coordinated planning through IRWM and other funding sources.

On May 16, 2018, Nicki Fowler with the Monterey County Environmental Health Bureau was invited to present to the RWMG on the County’s new Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) for Onsite Wastewater Treatment (septic) Systems. The goals of the LAMP are to reduce potential impacts from onsite wastewater treatment systems on groundwater, surface water, and public health. The purpose of the meeting was both to inform the RWMG about the new LAMP and to seek input from the RWMG on the new program.

Following the informational portion of the presentation, a discussion between Ms. Fowler and the RWMG ensued. One outcome of the discussion was the recognition of potential financial impacts on disadvantaged communities as a result of the new LAMP requirements. This potential issue will be considered as part of the RWMG’s continued efforts to address drinking water and wastewater problems of disadvantaged communities in the region (including its current work under the Proposition 1 IRWM Disadvantaged Community Involvement Grant).

Another suggestion that came out of the discussion was the potential establishment of local management entities to help keep septic systems maintained, for example, providing oversight of ongoing inspection and monitoring for all septic systems within a geographic area. Ms. Fowler noted that this idea had not been specifically addressed by the County, and expressed interest in discussing it further. Staff from the Rural Community Assistance Corporation (a RWMG member) commented that it was an especially good time for the RWMG to be able to support the LAMP through outreach and training to disadvantaged communities via the IRWM Disadvantaged Community Involvement Grant.

Given the perceived success and concrete outcomes that resulted from both of these RWMG meetings targeted at increased coordination between land use and water use planners, the RWMG intends to pursue further opportunities for joint meetings and other means of collaboration with land use planners, including in particular opportunities for coordination on climate change planning. The importance of open lines of communication between local land use planners and water resource managers is imperative to a successful IRWM effort.

O.4 FUTURE EFFORTS: ESTABLISHING A PROACTIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAND USE PLANNING AND WATER MANAGEMENT

This section considers potential opportunities for continuing to improve communication and coordination between water managers and land use decision makers.

Some specific opportunities to improve coordination between land use decision-makers and water managers have already been mentioned. These suggestions were made by those being interviewed for this chapter, and include:

- Involving the water supplier earlier in the development approval process, and requiring a review from the water supplier prior to approval.
- Similarly, ensuring that the water supplier and the land use decision-maker are in agreement about anticipated water use by any project prior to approval (“the optimal time to ‘get into alignment’ is during the WSA and EIR process”).
- If appropriate to the situation, the water supplier and land use planners could work together to create parcel maps, allocating water to each parcel in some sort of flexible—but quantifiable—manner, and thereby ensuring greater certainty in regards to future water use.

While it is not the role or the intention of the RWMG to “force” entities to communicate and coordinate better, the RWMG can serve an important function in providing leadership and opportunities for encouraging and promoting increased communication between land use decision-makers and water managers. Potential opportunities include the following:

Monthly or Quarterly Joint Planning Meetings: The RWMG can encourage local land use jurisdictions and local water managers to hold joint planning meetings at regular intervals to improve communication and efficiencies. Joint planning meetings can be held at the staff level and/or by governing boards. Both options provide value in different ways, and both should be encouraged. A good model is the Joint City/District meeting that is held by the MCWD Board of Directors and the Marina City Council, described above.

Annual Water Resource Planning Forum: One land use planner interviewed for this chapter suggested that part of the “disconnect” between land use and water resource planning entities might be that individuals in those organizations do not fully understand the mission, priorities, and issues of the other organizations and agencies.¹⁴ To help resolve that problem, he suggests the RWMG could host an annual forum of land use and water resource planning agency/organization directors, where staff present their agency or organization’s mission and programmatic priorities and then heads of staff discuss, in a workshop-type forum, overlapping areas of interest, potential conflicts in priorities or objectives, and potential areas for coordination. This type of forum could potentially be conducted as a “retreat,” and led by a professional facilitator.

¹⁴ Email communications with Bryan Largay, Tidal Wetland Project Director, ESNERR, January 30-31, 2012.

Collaboration Workshop: Similarly, a one-time collaboration session could be offered to land use planners and water managers in the region. ESNERR recently hosted a workshop entitled “How to Plan and Run a Collaborative Process,” which laid out an approach to help individuals and organizations with some overlapping interests identify those overlaps and focus in on a meaningful step they could take to move the collaborative process forward. ESNERR, a member of the RWMG, has offered to conduct a “needs assessment” for land use managers and water managers in the region, if desired, to evaluate the needs for increased collaboration. The assessment would determine whether a collaborative process is called for, what topics it would cover, and what entity would be the best host to ensure a successful process. If that assessment demonstrates a need for the collaborative process, and that ESNERR would be a good host, then ESNERR is willing to host such a process for land use managers and water managers in the region.

“A User’s Guide to the Water and Land Management Organizational Landscape”: The RWMG could produce an almanac of the various agencies, organizations and companies that own or have jurisdiction over the land and water. The almanac would contain the entities’ mission statements, authority (“what they do”), and jurisdictions, including a map that clearly shows watersheds and jurisdictional boundaries. The map would enable individuals to understand how land areas and waterways are connected, how their actions may impact land or water resources, and which entities may have an interest in, or a responsibility for, those resources. For example, when a landowner discharges water to a drainage ditch, he or she will be able to see that it goes downstream into a habitat that a particular conservation agency manages. When a conservation organization wants to remove some culverts to improve water quality, they will be able to see which agency is responsible for maintaining that culvert to protect farmland and houses from flooding. Understanding these connections will help individuals and organizations understand the need for increased coordination, and will help facilitate that coordination, in order to achieve mutual benefits.

Greater Use of Websites for Information Dissemination and Education: Websites provide a great vehicle for keeping the public and other land use planners and water managers up to date on plans, policies, regulations, studies, and related developments. Websites can provide access to meeting agendas and meeting minutes, monthly and quarterly status reports on a variety of water supply and water use issues, and other information that might be useful to both land use planners and water resource managers, as well as to the public in general. The RWMG could encourage both water managers and land use planners in the region to take greater advantage of their websites for the purpose of disseminating and sharing information in this way.

Addressing Policy and Regulatory Barriers to IRWM Plan Implementation: If funding becomes available, the RWMG intends to investigate potential policy and regulatory barriers to IRWM Plan implementation. This includes any laws, regulations, or practices that may conflict with the objectives of the IRWM Plan or that may inhibit implementation of any project proposed through the IRWM Plan. The RWMG will work with local land use planners to resolve conflicts and implement changes as appropriate. Increased communication will lead to increased understanding on the part of both the land use planners and the water managers of the other agencies’ objectives and constraints, and will ultimately lead to win-win solutions for both land use management and water resource management.

It should be emphasized that while this chapter has focused on the coordination between land use planners and water managers in the Greater Monterey County IRWM region, the goal of the IRWM planning effort overall is to improve coordination and communication not only between land use planning and water management, but within all aspects of water management—connecting water supply, surface and ground water quality, floodplain issues, stormwater issues, water conservation, municipal and agricultural usage,

ecological conservation, etc.—to more comprehensively coordinate all of the efforts of all the agencies and stakeholders involved.