



Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Committee

**Tuesday, November 27, 2012 • 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Room 104 A, Long Beach Convention Center - 300 E. Ocean Blvd.**

AGENDA

Supervisor, Richard Forster, Amador County, Chair
Supervisor Kim Vann, Colusa County, Vice-Chair

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| 10:00 a.m. | I. Welcome and Introductions
<i>Supervisor Richard Forster, Amador County, Chair</i> |
| 10:05 – 10:25 | II. California's Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing The State's Flood Risk
<i>Chris Stone, Los Angeles Public Works, CEAC Flood Control and Water Resources Policy Committee Chair</i>
<i>Gary Bardini, DWR Deputy Director for Integrated Water Management</i> |
| 10:25 - 10:45 | III. The Future of Waste Management
<i>Pat Proano, Los Angeles County, Assistant Deputy Director, Environmental Programs, CEAC Conversion Technology Working Group Chair</i> |
| 10:45 - 11:00 | IV. CA Solar Permit Streamlining Guide and Model Ordinance
<i>Tim Snellings, Development Services Director, Butte County</i> |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | V. Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (AB 885) Update
<i>Richard Sanchez, CCDEH President, Orange County</i> |
| 11:15- 12:00 p.m. | VI. California Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen Tool) Overview
<i>Miriam Barcellona Ingenito, Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy and Community Programs, Cal EPA</i>
<i>Allan Hirsch, Chief Deputy Director, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Cal EPA</i> |
| 12:00 p.m. | VII. Closing Comments & Adjournment |

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS: *The following reports are prepared as informational materials, but no presentation is planned. The CSAC ANR Policy Committee will take up the ANR Policy Platform Update at its meeting after the New Year.*

- VIII. County Platform UPDATE: Suggested Changes**
- IX. 2012 Legislative Wrap-Up**

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment One California's Flood Future: Recommendations
for Managing the State's Flood Risk Memo
- Attachment Two..... Solid Waste Management: Conversion
Technology Memo
- Attachment Three.....CA Communities Environmental Health
Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) Memo
- Attachment Four..... CSAC Comment Letter on CalEnviroScreen
- Attachment Five.....County Platform Recommended Changes
- Attachment Six.....CSAC ANR 2012 Legislative Summary
- Attachment Seven.....CSAC ANR 2013 Legislative Priorities

Attachment One

California's Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing the State's Flood Risk Memo

November 13, 2012



1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: CSAC Agriculture & Natural Resources Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Senior Legislative Analyst

RE: California's Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing the State's Flood Risk

In 2006, CSAC staff and members of the County Engineers Association of California (CEAC) initiated discussions with officials from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) regarding the development of a statewide needs assessment for regional flood control infrastructure. A similar report was prepared by DWR in 2005 which highlighted the condition of flood management in the Central Valley and outlined a plan to reduce flood risks (*Flood Warning: Responding to Californians Flood Crisis*). CSAC and CEAC convinced DWR to collaborate with counties in the development of more expansive review of flood risk in other areas of the State.

Since these early discussions, CSAC and CEAC have provided significant input and advice to DWR regarding all aspects their Statewide Flood Management Planning (SFMP) Program. As envisioned by CSAC and CEAC, the key product of the SFMP Program is the *Flood Future: Recommendations for Managing California's Flood Risk Report*, formally referred to as *California's Flood Future Report*. CSAC staff and members of the CEAC Flood Control Needs Assessment Team assisted with the development of the report and a *California Flood Future Highlights* document which is expected to be released to the public this November, with the full report being made available by the end of the year.

The Flood Future Report will present the first-ever, systematic description of California's flood risk management needs and high-level recommendations designed to help guide future federal and state policies and investments related to flood management. The draft report identifies the immediate need for more than \$50 billion to complete flood management improvements and projects. These flood management projects include operations and maintenance and other identified actions. The draft report also estimates that more than \$100 billion of additional investment is needed for flood management projects that are not yet specifically identified.

DWR has requested CSAC and CEAC's involvement in the roll-out of both documents and to remain engaged during the second phase of this project when next steps and implementation measures are formulated.

Attachment Two

Solid Waste Management: Conversion Technology Memo



1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

November 13, 2012

To: CSAC Agriculture & Natural Resources Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Senior Legislative Analyst

RE: Solid Waste Management: Conversion Technology

Over the past year, CSAC staff worked closely with the County Engineers Association of California (CEAC) to advance the timely development of solid waste conversion technology facilities in California in order to reduce dependence on landfill disposal and generate electricity. The topic of solid waste conversion technology has gained considerable traction within the Administration with Governor Brown's focus on renewable energy and job creation. In addition, conversion technology has also been part of the discussion around the State's efforts to develop a plan to divert 75% of solid waste from landfills, as required by AB 341 (Chapter Number 476, Statutes of 2011). The term "conversion technology" refers to a wide array of technologies capable of converting post-recycled or residual solid waste into useful products, green fuels, and renewable energy through non-combustion thermal, chemical, or biological processes.

The use of conversion technologies, including thermal systems such as gasification, has been a controversial subject in California. The State has been reticent to endorse substantial waste-to-energy technologies, primarily due to opposition to conventional incineration. In addition, some groups contend that creating incentives – such as renewable energy and waste diversion credits – to operate conversion technology facilities in California would create a disincentive for waste reduction and recycling programs. To the contrary, CSAC and CEAC see these as complementary efforts. CSAC advocates that conversion technology facilities processing residual solid waste must receive materials from either a source-separated solid waste collection program or be processed at a mixed waste processing facility. Conversion technology facilities must also meet or exceed California's stringent air and water quality standards. We believe that facilities meeting these requirements should be eligible to receive Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) and disposal reduction credits.

Certain provisions in California State law and regulations, including outdated and scientifically inaccurate definitions, have created uncertainty regarding the permitting of these facilities and their ability to receive renewable energy credits. CEAC has created a Working Group dedicated to this issue and advocacy efforts are underway to support legislative changes that will enable the development of these facilities in California.

Attachment Three
CA Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) Memo

November 7, 2012



1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

To: CSAC Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Senior Legislative Analyst

**RE: California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool
(CalEnviroScreen)**

In July, the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA), through the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) released a draft document entitled the "California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool" (CalEnviroScreen). According to Cal EPA, the screening tool uses existing environmental, health and socio-economic data to compare the cumulative impacts of environmental pollution on the State's communities. The directive to create such a tool was borne out of Cal EPA's 2004 Environmental Justice Action Plan, which recommended the development of guidance to analyze, prevent and reduce the cumulative impacts of multiple pollution sources in communities throughout the State.

The CalEnviroScreen Tool evaluates and assesses the cumulative impacts of multiple different pollution sources, including pesticide use, toxic pollutants from facilities, and traffic densities, to name a few, while taking into consideration a community's unique vulnerabilities and characteristics such as environmental, health and socio-economic data (population age, cancer rates, educational attainment, income levels, etc.). According to OEHHA, the draft screening tool is meant to present a broad picture of the burdens and vulnerabilities different areas face from environmental pollutants. According to the draft document, the potential uses of the tool include guidance for grant allocations and prioritizing cleanup and abatement projects to direct resources to the communities with the greatest need. It may also be utilized to prioritize enforcement of environmental laws and inform planning decisions about sustainable economic development investments in heavily impacted communities.

In addition, SB 535 (Chapter Number 830, Statutes of 2012), directs Cal EPA to identify disadvantaged communities for investment of Cap and Trade funds. The bill specifies that these communities shall be identified based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazard criteria. The bill also directs a minimum of 25 percent of the available funds from Cap and Trade revenues to projects that provide benefits to these disadvantaged communities, and directs a minimum of 10 percent of Cap and Trade funds to projects located within these communities.

Thus, the development of the CalEnviroScreen Tool has the potential to impact local governments on several different levels. In addition to helping direct Cap and Trade revenues, the Tool has the potential to impact the local land use approval process. It is unclear from the draft document the intended use for local governments and the intended use of the tool with respect to reviews under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). OEHHA has held several workshops on the draft document for specific groups, including business and industry as well as a specific workshop for local governments. CSAC submitted comments on the draft document (see attachment) and we anticipate a revision of the draft based on the comments received. A copy of the CalEnviroScreen Tool is available on the OEHHA [website](#).

Attachment Four
CSAC Comment Letter on CalEnviroScreen



October 16, 2012

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

John Faust
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1600
Oakland, CA 94612

Sent via email: john.faust@oehha.ca.gov

RE: CalEnviroScreen Tool

Dear Mr. Faust,

On behalf of the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), thank you for the opportunity to comment on the CalEnviroScreen Tool. CSAC is an association that represents county government before the California Legislature, administrative agencies and the federal government. Representing all 58 of California's counties, CSAC has a long history of supporting a wide range of federal, state and local programs critical to healthy and sustainable communities.

While CSAC recognizes the importance of Cal/EPA's environmental justice policies and understands your interest in taking it a step further by developing the screening tool, we share the concerns expressed by our members and other organizations on the potential misuse and misapplication of the tool. We also echo concerns regarding other aspects of the screening tool and the process that has led to its development, including the:

- Lack of outreach to local government during the early development of the screening tool;
- Contradictory statements made in CalEPA/OEHHA documents, including the July 30 memo to the working group and the public review draft, concerning the intended use of the screening tool, particularly with respect to reviews under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- Lack of specific guidance on how this tool is intended to be used by local governments in California;
- Potential use of the screening tool scores to form the basis for further regulatory requirements and controls that exceed current Federal, State and local environmental and regulatory requirements;
- Failure of the tool to distinguish between health effects due to socioeconomic factors or other social stressors and those due to chemical/pollution exposure; and,
- Potential for redlining of communities that result in a disincentive to job creation and economic expansion, contrary to the goal of this tool.

As an attendee to the October 2 workshop for local government I was pleased to hear Secretary Rodriguez indicate that the workshop was a starting point for other discussions with local government. Given his statement and our interest in ensuring an ongoing role for local government in your process, we would be happy to help facilitate future discussions



1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

between CalEPA/OEHHA staff and local officials including county planners. We believe their perspective will help with the development of a usable tool without creating duplicative requirements or disincentives to job creation and economic development.

In conclusion, we respectfully request your serious consideration of the comments and concerns raised. Should you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact me at 916-327-7500, ext. 511, or kkeene@counties.org.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Karen Keene".

Sincerely,
Karen Keene
CSAC Senior Legislative Representative

Attachment Five
County Platform Recommended Changes



1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

November 13, 2012

To: CSAC Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Senior Legislative Analyst

Re: Updates to CSAC Platform: Chapters 3, 4, 15

CSAC is in the process of its biannual update of the CSAC Platform, which consists of fifteen chapters of general principles and policy direction for the Association. The CSAC Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Policy Committee is responsible for Chapters Three, Four, and portions of Chapter Fifteen, which includes the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Statements, the Energy Guidelines, the Climate Change Policy Statements and Principles and the Flood Control Policy Addendum.

The ANR chapters were sent to the ANR Policy Committee in advance of the November 27th meeting, and several suggested edits were recommended. These changes are noted in track changes in the following documents. The Committee will have an opportunity to discuss these recommendations at our first meeting in 2013, date to be determined. Please note that recommendations to the Climate Change Chapter that are related to housing, land use and transportation issues will be discussed in the CSAC Housing, Land Use and Transportation Policy Committee, which will also be meeting after the New Year. Staff only received recommended changes to Chapters Three and Fifteen, which are included in this agenda packet. To view a copy of all of the CSAC ANR Policy documents, please visit the [CSAC website](#). Additional information will be sent out in advance of our 2013 meeting.

The recommendations adopted by the ANR Policy Committee will then go to the CSAC Executive Committee and to the CSAC Board of Directors for final approval at their first official board meeting in 2013.

CHAPTER THREE

Agriculture and Natural Resources

Section 1: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Counties recognize the necessity of balancing the need to develop and utilize resources for the support of our society and the need to protect and preserve the environment. Counties also recognize that climate change and the release of greenhouse gases (GHG) into the atmosphere have the potential to dramatically impact our environment, public health and economy. Due to the overarching nature of the climate change issues, all sections in this chapter should be viewed in conjunction with chapter fifteen.

Counties assert that solutions necessary to achieve this delicate balance can best be formulated at the local level in cooperation with public and private industry and state and federal government.

Over-regulation is not the answer. Processes must be adopted for all federal and state proposed rules and regulations that include a detailed environmental and economic cost/benefit analysis. Additionally, proposed and existing state rules and regulations that exceed federal standards should be evaluated and justified.

Section 2: AGRICULTURE

Counties recognize the importance of agriculture and its contribution to the state's economy. If California is to continue as the leading agriculture state in the nation, the remaining viable agricultural lands must be protected. In order to ensure that agricultural land protection is a statewide priority, the state, in cooperation with local governments, must continue to implement existing policies or adopt new policies which accomplish the following:

1. Provide innovative incentives that will encourage agricultural water conservation and retention of lands in agricultural production;
2. Promote agricultural economic development activities.
3. Support allocation of transportation resources to improvement of important goods movement corridors and farm-to-market routes.
4. Encourage the development of new water resources;
5. Provide research and development for biological control and integrated pest management practices;
6. Ensure water and air quality standards are retained at a level that enables agricultural production to continue without significant lessening in the quantity or quality of production;
7. Support the continuation of statewide public education curricula that address the essential role that agriculture plays in California and world economics;

8. Promote California agriculture, protect it from pests and diseases and ensure the safety and wholesomeness of food and other agricultural products for the consumer;
9. Foster a decision-making environment based upon input from all interested parties and analysis of the best available information, science and technology;
10. Continue to build consumer and business confidence in the marketplace through inspection and testing of all commercial weighing and measuring devices;
11. Encourage low impact/sustainable agricultural practices;
12. Support the elimination of inheritance taxes on agricultural lands; and,
13. Support full funding for UC Cooperative Extension given its vital role in delivering research-based information and educational programs that enhance economic vitality and the quality of life in California counties.

A. Working with other Entities

In addition the University of California's Cooperative Extension Service, County Agriculture Commissioners, Sealers of Weights and Measures, Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs), local farm bureaus, Coordinated Resource Management Planning committees (CRMPs), and Resource Conservation & Development Councils (RC&Ds) are valuable resources that can be relied upon to assist state and local governments with the implementation of the policy directives noted above, as well as other programs supporting agricultural and natural resources. Given the long-standing relationship between local cooperative extension offices, county agricultural departments (i.e. County Farm Advisors and Agricultural Commissioners), RCDs, local farm bureaus, CRMPs, RC&Ds and individual counties, it is imperative that state and county officials develop ongoing support for these programs. Further, state and county officials are encouraged to remind other policy and decision makers of the importance of these entities and their value to agriculture, natural resources, the environment and community development.

B. Williamson Act

Counties support revisions to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act, that provide property owners greater incentives to continue participation under the Act. Additionally, counties are committed to support other reasonable legislative changes which preserve the integrity of the Williamson Act and eliminate abuses resulting in unjustified and premature conversions of contracted land for development.

Fully restore Williamson Act subventions. The state subventions to counties also must be revised to recognize all local tax losses.

Section 3: FORESTS

Counties recognize the importance of forests to the state's economy. California is the second leading timber producing state in the nation. As with agriculture, to remain so, the state must protect and maintain its viable timberland base. Counties also recognize the importance of forestry in the context of climate change. Effectively managed forests have less of a probability of releasing harmful

greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and increase the potential for carbon sequestration. To ensure protection of the viable timberland base, it must become a statewide priority to implement existing policies or adopt new policies that accomplish the following:

1. Continue reimbursement to counties for lost timber related revenues as currently provided under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000;
2. Encourage sustainable forestry practices through the existing regulatory process;
3. Encourage continued reforestation on private timberlands;
4. Provide new and innovative incentives that will encourage good management practices and timberland retention;
5. Support the State Fire Safe Council's mission to preserve California's natural and man made resources by mobilizing all Californians to make their homes, neighborhoods and communities fire safe; and,
6. Oppose any net increase in state or federal land acquisition, unless otherwise supported by the affected local governments and until all of their issues and concerns are addressed or mitigated to their satisfaction.

A. Biomass

Counties recognize the problems and opportunities presented by biomass bi-product and accumulated fuels reduction efforts. The state of California must develop a coherent, integrated biomass policy that will guide regulation and investment for the next 20 years. The state must give highest priority in the near term to the retention of its unique biomass energy industry, which is in danger of disappearing as the result of electric services restructuring and changes in energy markets. By integrating State and local air quality goals, wildfire prevention and waste management strategies into a statewide biomass policy, California will solve several critical environmental problems and create viable private industries, which will serve the public need.

Section 4: MINERAL RESOURCES

The extraction of minerals is essential to the needs and continued economic well being of society. To ensure the viability of this important industry and to protect the quality of the environment, existing and new statewide policies concerning mineral resources must accomplish the following:

1. Encourage conservation and production of known or potential mineral deposits for the economic health and well being of society;
2. Ensure the rehabilitation of mined lands to prevent or minimize adverse effects on the environment and to protect public health and safety;
3. Recognize that the reclamation of mined lands will allow continued mining of minerals and will provide for the protection and subsequent beneficial use of the mined and reclaimed land;

4. Recognize that surface mining takes place in diverse areas where the geologic, topographic, climatic, biological and social conditions are significantly different and that reclamation operations and the specifications thereof may vary accordingly;
5. Oversee surface, pit, in-stream and off-site mining operations so as to prevent or minimize adverse environmental effects;
6. Specify that determination of entitlements to surface mining operations is a local land use issue provided that reclamation plans are obtained and enforced.

Section 5: AIR QUALITY

Counties fully recognize that clean air laws have been enacted to protect the public from the adverse and deleterious health effects of air pollution. However, any rules and regulations aimed at improving California's air quality must not be developed without the input of local government. Rule makers working on air quality issues must ensure a balance between economic advancement, health effects and environmental impacts.

Counties assert that federal and state agencies, in cooperation with local agencies, have the ability to develop rules and regulations that implement clean air laws that are both cost-effective and operationally feasible. In addition, state and federal agencies should be encouraged to accept equivalent air quality programs, thereby allowing for flexibility in implementation without compromising air quality goals.

As it pertains to air quality regulations, distinctions need to be drawn between different types of open burning (i.e. wildland fuel reduction programs using prescribed fire v. agricultural burning). Efforts should continue to find economical alternatives to open burning in general.

Failure to meet air quality standards may jeopardize federal transportation funding statewide. Counties continue to work closely with congestion management agencies, air quality districts, metropolitan organizations and regional transportation agencies to ensure that transportation planning is coordinated with air quality objectives.

Many portions of the state, including the broader Sacramento area and mountain counties air basin, have been formally identified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as receptors of ozone-related air pollution transported from the San Francisco Bay Area and the San Joaquin Valley. Although the California Air Resources Board is considering actions that will help mitigate air pollution transport, the receptor counties are still potentially subject to sanctions if they do not take sufficient steps to achieve and maintain healthy air quality. Sanctions can take many forms, including lowered New Source Review thresholds in the receptor districts as compared to transporting districts and through transportation conformity. Given the potential impacts on the receptor counties, legislation and/or policy measures must be enacted that provide reasonable sanction protection for counties impacted by air pollution transport from upwind areas. Other legislative or policy measures that would require the upwind areas to implement air pollution mitigation measures should also be considered.

Given its longstanding support of local autonomy, CSAC opposes the addition of state appointees to local air districts. Such an action would result in a loss of local control without perceived improvements to the public process and clean air efforts. However, technical support services at the state level such as research, data processing and specialized staff support should be maintained and expanded to assist local air quality management efforts.

Section 6: WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

A. Water Resources Development

Counties recognize the complexities of water use and distribution throughout the state, and therefore should be officially represented geographically on all federal, state, and/or regional water policy bodies and decision-making authorities. A comprehensive statewide water resource management plan – one that includes the upper watershed areas – is essential to the future of California. Such a plan should include a full assessment of needs for all users.

In relation to any specific water project, counties support statutory protection of counties of origin and watershed areas. These protections provide that only water that is surplus to the reasonable ultimate human and natural system needs of the area of origin should be made available for beneficial uses in other areas. A natural system includes the ecosystem, meaning a recognizable, relatively homogeneous unit that includes organisms, their environment, and all interactions among them. Additionally, the cost of water development to users within the areas of origin should not be increased by affecting a water export plan. Furthermore, in all federal and state legislation, county of origin protections should be reaffirmed and related feasibility studies should clearly identify and quantify all reasonable future needs of the counties of origin to permit the inclusion of specific guarantees. Existing water rights should be recognized and protected.

Counties must be compensated for any third party impacts, including, but not limited to, curtailed tax revenues and increases in costs of local services occasioned by an export project.

There currently exists a need for the development of new solutions to expand water resources to meet the growing needs of the state. The increased demand for water is due to the rapid population growth, agricultural needs and industrial development. Projects should be considered that will create new water supplies through a variety of means such as recycling, water neutral developments, storm water capture, desalinization, waste water reclamation, watershed management, development of additional storage and conservation. In building any new water projects, the state must take into account and mitigate any negative socio-economic impacts on the affected counties.

Counties support the incorporation of appropriate recreational facilities into all water conservation and development projects to the extent feasible.

B. Water Rationing

Counties oppose statewide mandatory water rationing programs that would establish unrealistic and unnecessary restrictions on some areas of the state and which establish inadequate goals for other areas. Instead, counties support a voluntary approach to water conservation that promotes a permanent "conservation ethic" in California. If water rationing does become necessary in certain areas of the state, counties will need statutory authorization to impose water rationing decisions at the county government level.

C. Water Conservation

The Legislature has recognized the need for water conservation. Counties recognize the need for local programs that promote water conservation and water storage. Water conservation may include reuse of domestic and industrial wastewater, reuse of agriculture water, groundwater recharge, or

economic incentives to invest in equipment that promotes efficiency. No conservation of water shall be recognized if the conservation arises from the fallowing of agricultural land for compensation, unless the board of supervisors of the county in which the water has been devoted to agricultural use consents to the fallowing.

The Regional Water Quality Control Boards need to direct staff to issue permits for direct discharge of properly treated wastewater to promote reuse.

D. Ground Water Management

It is CSAC's position that ground water management is necessary in California and that the authority for ground water management resides at the county level. Adequate management of water supply cannot be accomplished without effective administration of both surface and ground water resources within counties. Ground water management boundaries should recognize natural basins and responsibilities for administration should be vested in organizations of locally elected officials. Private property rights shall be addressed in any ground water management decisions.

Ground water management programs should maintain the flexibility to expeditiously address critical localized and basin-wide problems. Studies necessary to design ground water programs should be directed by local agencies with technical or economic support from state and federal programs.

E. Financing of Water Conservation and Ground Water Management

Area-wide water conservation and ground water management programs are costly. Those benefiting should pay a fair share of these costs. Local agencies should have the discretion to recover those costs.

F. Flood Control

The following policy guidance on flood control shall be followed in conjunction with CSAC's Flood Management Principles and Policy Guidelines.

Long-term flood control improvements are necessary in order to provide improved flood protection and minimize future damages. Local, state and federal agencies should work to improve communications, coordination and consistency prior to and following a flood disaster. Counties are encouraged to look for funding opportunities to move structures out of flood plains.

CSAC supports and encourages the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, through the Waterways Experiment Stations, to adopt innovative geo-technical (high-tech) inspections systems to identify unexpected voids and saturated sand lenses in government-authorized levees. CSAC further supports follow up by the Army Corps with a recommendation for non-federal sponsors to add these techniques to their annual levee inspection programs.

Counties continue to experience frustration when applying for the state and federal permits that are required to repair, restore and maintain flood control facilities. Counties support streamlining of such permits or any other efforts that would allow expeditious implementation of such activities.

Counties recognize the need for environmental mitigation measures to protect endangered species. The unique need for ongoing and routine levee maintenance must be reconciled with reasonable

mitigation requirements. Solutions could include a blanket "take permit" exempting levee maintenance from compliance and a more efficient process for routine maintenance.

Counties further recognize that providing habitat and flood control may not be mutually achievable goals within river, stream or ditch channels. However, ecosystem restoration projects may provide flood control benefits and will require detailed hydraulic and other engineering studies to assess the individual and cumulative hydraulic impacts in floodways. Counties also recognize that habitat areas shall be maintained in such a manner as to not obstruct the flow of water through the channel. Further, the river, stream and ditch channels should also have blanket "take permits" issued to allow for proper cleaning of obstructions to the water flow and/or carrying capacity.

Federal and state agencies that have the expertise and have been funded to identify, protect and are responsible for species that would be harmed in the course of flood control projects – such as levee reconstruction, maintenance or repairs – must be charged with the rescue of these species and not the local government performing such activities. These local governments have little, if any, expertise in the identification and rescue procedures of threatened and endangered species. This identification and rescue should be accomplished in the most expedient time frame practicable. The federal agencies should be required to consult with the local action agencies within thirty days of any species rescue determination.

In respect to locally sponsored flood control projects, CSAC shall continue to urge the administration and the legislature to fully fund the State Flood Control Subvention Program.

G. Delta

CSAC believes that any proposed Delta solutions be implemented in a manner that:

- Respects the affected counties' land use authority, revenues, public health and safety, economic development, water rights, and agricultural viability.
- Promotes recreation and environmental protection.
- Ensures Delta counties' status as voting members of any proposed Delta governance structure.
- Improves flood protection for delta residents, property, and infrastructure.
- Improves and protects the Delta ecosystem, water quality, flows and supply.
- Ensures consistency with affected counties adopted policies and plans.
- Secures financial support for flood management, improved emergency response, preservation of agriculture, protection of water resources, and enhancement and restoration of habitat.
- Accords special recognition, and advances the economic vitality of "heritage" or "legacy" communities in the Delta.

- Demonstrates a clearly evidenced public benefit to any proposed changes to the boundaries of the Delta.
- Support development of adequate water supply, utilizing the concept of "Regional Self Sufficiency" whereby each region maximizes conservation and recycled water use, implements storage (surface and groundwater) and considers desalination, as necessary.

Section 7: PARKS AND RECREATION

Counties are encouraged to consider supporting the efforts of the California Association of Regional Park and Open Space Administrators to provide for the health, safety and quality of life for all Californians by protecting parkland and open space.

Section 8: SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

1. CSAC supports policies and legislation that aim to promote improved markets for recyclable materials, and encourages:
 - The use of recycled content in products sold in California;
 - The creation of economic incentives for the use of recycled materials; and,
 - The expansion of the Beverage Container Recycling Program.
2. CSAC shall oppose legislation that:
 - Preempts local planning decisions regarding solid waste facility siting;
 - Preempts local solid waste and AB 939 fee-setting authority; and,
 - Requires burdensome changes to locally adopted plans.
3. CSAC shall support legislation that:
 - Protects local solid waste franchising and fee-setting authority;
 - Provides for the use of performance standards and alternative daily cover for landfills; and,
 - Requires state facility cooperation with local jurisdictions on waste reduction to meet AB 939 goals.
 - [Promotes the development of conversion technologies as an alternative to land filling, and provides state funding to local jurisdictions for such projects; provides full diversion credit and greenhouse gas emission reduction credits under applicable State law; and, provides that all energy produced by these conversion technology facilities be designated as renewable energy \(CSAC Staff suggested edits\).](#)

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 1" + Tab after: 1.25" + Indent at: 1.25"

CSAC does not oppose legislation that assesses fees on solid waste that is disposed of out of state, as long as the fees reflect the pro-rata share of California Integrated Waste Management Board services used.

In order to comply with the diversion requirements of the California Integrated Waste Management Act, local governments must continue to have the ability to direct the flow of waste. Given Federal and State court decisions which restrict this ability, counties are encouraged to consider supporting legislation which ensures local governments' authority to direct the flow of waste.

Section 9: ENDANGERED SPECIES

Because of widespread impacts of the state and federal endangered species acts on public projects, agriculture, timber and other industries in California, including the resulting impact on county revenues, both acts should be amended to provide for the following:

1. Recognition and protection of private property rights and local government's land use authority;
2. All those who benefit should pay the costs. It should be recognized that inequity exists concerning the implementation of the existing acts in that the cost of species protection on private property is borne by a few property owners for the benefit of all;
3. If Congress and the state legislature deem the protection of certain species is of national interest, then the responsibility for that protection, including the costs, should be assumed by all who benefit through federal and/or state funding, and a process should be adopted which is consistent with other public projects of national interest;
4. Applications for a listing should be required to include a map of critical habitat, a recovery plan and an economic and environmental analysis of costs and benefits;
5. The development of a delisting process that is as aggressively adhered to as the listing process;
6. The creation of a scientifically based and efficient process for delistings;
7. Include independent scientific peer review, local public hearings, and equal access to judicial review;
8. Delegation of implementation of the Federal Endangered Species Act to the state;
9. Full compensation to property owners when historical or future use of their land is diminished;
10. Use of public lands first for multi-species protection;
11. Prohibit the distribution of public grant funds to private entities for the primary purpose of supporting or opposing listings or delistings of endangered species;
12. Control of protected species that prey upon and reduce either the adult or juvenile population of any listed species;
13. Protection of current land uses;
14. Support recovery efforts of endangered species;
15. The ability to produce food, fiber, and all other agricultural products is not abridged;

16. Agricultural producers should not be held liable for any “take” that occurs during normal agricultural operations.

Section 10: PUBLIC LANDS

Plans for state and federal public lands shall be coordinated and compatible with local general plans and zoning. Private uses on public federal lands, exclusive of Native American lands, should be required to comply with applicable state and local laws. In addition, counties should be reimbursed for lost tax revenues when land is transferred for non-profit or public uses.

Counties should have an opportunity to review and comment on management decisions affecting their economies, general plans and resources. Public participation, including public hearings, should be required in land use planning on public lands to ensure that economic or environmental concerns are addressed.

Counties encourage the operation and ownership of land resources under private rather than governmental control. Lands acquired by government or utilities for particular purposes which are no longer essential should be returned to private ownership – with preference to previous owners where possible – and without reservation of water and mineral rights. Small isolated units of publicly held property should be offered for sale to private operators, with preference to adjacent owners.

Government should be required to demonstrate, using reliable data, an integrated program of land use and the need for the acquisition before being permitted to purchase, further expand or transfer land from one governmental agency to another. Management plans and budgetary information should be required on all lands proposed for acquisition by governmental agencies prior to such acquisition, so that they can be made part of the public hearing process.

The practice of government funding through grants or other means to organizations and foundations in order to purchase private land that will be resold or donated to some governmental entity threatens to diminish the tax base of local units of government. As a result, counties' tax base should be kept whole in the event of federal or state purchase of land.

Counties support the multiple use of public lands. Uses of these lands include grazing, mining, timber, wildlife and recreation. Lands under governmental control should be actively managed in concert with private activities to encourage the greatest use and improvement. Counties believe that timber harvest, mining, and grazing activities are a valuable component of ecosystem management in some instances and that recreational activities, impacts on wildlife and natural events like fires and floods must be considered. Properly managed land results in higher sustained yields of water, forage, timber, minerals, and energy. Grazing and logging are important elements of the multiple-use concept. Therefore, counties support efforts to minimize additional acreage designated as wilderness, unless otherwise supported by the affected local governments, and all of their issues and concerns are addressed or mitigated to their satisfaction.

Reforestation and continued management of public lands with suitable soils for producing forest crops are essential to maintaining a viable forest industry in California. Timber stand improvement is needed and required for producing maximum yields both for quality and quantity of timber products. Additionally, comprehensive fuels management programs are encouraged for the protection and sustainability of timber producing lands. Counties support economically and environmentally sound management of public forests for the production of forest products, which support local industry and, in the case of National Forests, maximize federal payments for support of local government.

A. Federal and State Compensation

Adequate compensation must be made available to local governments to offset the costs of providing services to public lands. Current federal compensation programs, such as PL 106-393, should be retained with respect to land where harvesting is severely limited or no longer occurs. Counties continue to support a per acre charge for any land which has historically received revenue timber receipts.

Information regarding county revenues generated from federal lands indicates that receipts are down, will continue to go down, and are not likely to change direction in the near future. In order to ensure that a system is in place that is fair and equitable, a revenue sharing and/or payment in-lieu of taxes system must meet three criteria:

1. Equitable - The federal government must compensate the state and counties at a level that is consistent with revenues that would be expected to be generated if such lands were not in federal ownership and management.
2. Predictable – The system in place must provide some assurance and predictability of the level and timing of revenues; and,
3. Sustainable - Revenues should be maintained over time; and changes in federal policies in the future should not adversely affect local communities.

CSAC shall continue to pressure the state and the federal government to meet its statutory obligation to annually pay local agencies full in-lieu fees and payments in-lieu of taxes for state and federal purchased properties. CSAC supports the premise that no new state or federal acquisitions of private property shall occur until state in-lieu fees and federal payments in-lieu of taxes are fully funded. Federal legislation is needed to provide additional compensation for those public land counties that meet specified hardship criteria.

B. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Exchanges

Counties recognize that efficient management of public lands requires land adjustments to ensure manageable units and prevent conflicts with adjacent private land uses.

Land exchanges and purchases are the usual means available to the two federal agencies. Tripartite and direct timber for land exchange are permitted under federal law.

Counties will support the federal agencies in these exchange and consolidation efforts when:

1. Better and more productive management of public land will result;
2. Counties affected are consulted and given opportunity to help determine acquisition of local lands in exchange process and negative effects are fully mitigated;
3. County revenues, including PL 106-393 and payment in lieu of taxes (PILT) are protected or enhanced;
4. Areas slated for disposal in exchanges are included in the county general plan and classified as to probable use (e.g. residential, TPZ, commercial); and

5. Land-for-land exchanges enhance the counties and result in no net loss of value.

Counties support efforts to streamline and shorten the federal land exchange procedure so mutually beneficial consolidations will be more attractive and expeditious.

C. Local Use of Public Lands

Counties support legislation and land management policies to enable local agencies to acquire state and federal lands for public purposes.

D. Waste Disposal on Public Lands

Counties experience considerable difficulty locating and maintaining facilities to dispose of solid waste. Counties with large areas of state and federal lands used for recreation are required to assume the responsibility of disposing solid waste generated by these recreational activities. The entities that administer these public lands should assume responsibility for providing sites for solid waste disposal and funds for development, maintenance and operation of such sites.

E. Predator Control

Counties benefit from the established federal-state Cooperative Animal Damage control program through reduced livestock depredation, and property damage as well as public health protection.

Counties support predator control and promoting program efficiency through cooperative federal-state-county programs.

Changes in state law have removed many tools previously utilized by landowners and Animal Damage Control professionals for use in predator control. The result is an increased need for additional Animal Damage Control professionals.

Counties support expanded program funding through the current Federal-State Cooperative Animal Damage Control program and strongly support equal cost sharing between counties and cooperative agencies.

F. Fire Protection

Fires are best prevented and fought through long-term fuels management and other anticipatory actions. Such fire protection efforts must be integrated and supported by other natural resource programs and policies. Counties support the achievement of a sustainable ecosystem and the maintenance of healthy forests while providing defensible space for protection of life and property. Governmental agencies alone cannot achieve fire safe communities; private property owners are also obligated to take necessary actions to reduce their fire risk.

Counties further support an increase in state and federal funding for fuels management. However, given existing concerns expressed by counties regarding the allocation of fire protection resources, it is imperative that local governments be included in any effort to develop appropriate allocation of these resources between pre-fire management and fire suppression.

Fires are best fought by rapid response from trained firefighters. Counties support CDF's reconnaissance and rapid response systems. Counties support state funding of local fire agencies – both paid and volunteer – and local Fire Safe Councils for wildland fire response.

G. Prescribed Fire

The state of California should pursue alternate methods of biomass disposal that conserves energy in order to reduce the wildland fuel volumes consumed by prescribed fire.

Where alternative methods are not available, the state of California should assume greater responsibility in the development of a less restrictive program of prescribed fire for forest and range improvement, enhancement of wildlife, watershed management and reduction of major wildfire hazards.

Solutions must be found to the problems of liability when a county maintains a controlled burning program.

The State Department of Forestry and the State Air Resources Board should arrive at a joint policy concerning controlled burning so that counties will be dealing with one state government policy, rather than with two conflicting state agency policies.

H. Invasive Species Control

Counties support aggressive action by federal, state, and local agencies to limit the spread, and to enhance the eradication of, identified invasive plants and animal species, and support prioritizing the efforts that are most attainable and cost-effective.

Section 11: ENERGY

This section should be viewed in conjunction with Chapter 4, which includes CSAC's Energy Policy Guidelines.

It is CSAC's policy that the state and the 58 counties should seek to promote energy conservation and energy efficiency. Counties are encouraged to undertake vigorous energy action programs that are tailored to the specific needs of each county. When developing such action programs counties should: (1) assess available conservation and renewable energy options and take action to implement conservation, energy efficiency and renewable energy development when feasible; (2) consider the incorporation of energy policies as an optional element in the county general plan; and, (3) consider energy concerns when making land use decisions and encourage development patterns which result in energy efficiency.

In order to meet the state's energy needs, counties fully recognize the importance of establishing a cooperative relationship between other levels of government and the private sector. This includes working with public and private utilities that serve their areas to develop energy transmission corridors and to minimize delays in approvals and land use conflicts.

With respect to alternative and renewable energy sources, the state and counties should encourage use of agricultural, forestry and non-recyclable urban wastes for generating usable energy. They should also take into consideration the other benefits of waste-to-energy production. Additionally, the state should encourage, and counties should explore, the development of cogeneration projects at

the local level. In respect to public power options, counties support efforts that enhance local governments' ability to become community aggregators of electricity.

Counties support the encouragement of new generation facilities by the provision of increased incentives and a streamlined permitting process. However, state government needs to maintain regulatory oversight of these facilities. Lastly, counties oppose state acquisition and/or management of electric generating or transmission facilities.

Chapter Fourteen

CSAC Sustainability & Climate Change Policy Guidelines

Section 1: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- CSAC recognizes that sustainable development and climate change share strong complementary tendencies.
- CSAC recognizes that mitigation and adaptation to climate change – such as promoting sustainable energy, improved access and increased walkability, transit oriented development, and improved agricultural methods – have the potential to bolster sustainable development.
- CSAC recognizes that climate change will have a harmful effect on our environment, public health and economy. Although there remains uncertainty on the pace, distribution and magnitude of the effects of climate change, CSAC also recognizes the need for immediate actions to mitigate the sources of greenhouse gases.
- CSAC recognizes the need for sustained leadership and commitment at the federal, state, regional and local levels to develop strategies to combat the effects of climate change.
- CSAC recognizes the complexity involved with reducing greenhouse gases and the need for a variety of approaches and strategies to reduce GHG emissions.
- CSAC supports a flexible approach to addressing climate change, recognizing that a one size fits all approach is not appropriate for California's large number of diverse communities.
- CSAC supports special consideration for environmental justice issues, disadvantaged communities, and rural areas that do not have the ability to address these initiatives without adequate support and assistance.
- CSAC supports cost-effective strategies to reduce GHG emissions and encourages the use of grants, loans and incentives to assist local governments in the implementation of GHG reduction programs.
- CSAC recognizes that adaptation and mitigation are necessary and complementary strategies for responding to climate change impacts. CSAC

Comment [KB1]: Sacramento County

Comment [KB2]: There should be a more specific focus on climate change adaptation in this section. Adaptation is becoming at least as important as GHG reduction in planning efforts. CSAC should support efforts to address climate change impacts at the programmatic level rather than at the individual project level. The new CEQA guidelines provide a roadmap for this, but it means supporting local and subregional Climate Action Plans to actually implement those principles - Sonoma County

Comment [KB3]: Sacramento County

Comment [KB4]: Sacramento County

encourages the state to develop guidance materials for assessing climate impacts that includes adaptation options.

- CSAC finds it critical that the state develop protocols and GHG emissions inventory mechanisms, providing the necessary tools to track and monitor GHG emissions at the local level. The state, in cooperation with local government, must determine the portfolio of solutions that will best minimize its potential risks and maximize its potential benefits. CSAC also supports the establishment of a state climate change technical assistance program for local governments.
- CSAC believes that in order to achieve projected emission reduction targets cooperation and coordination between federal, state and local entities to address the role public lands play in the context of climate change must occur.
- CSAC recognizes that many counties are in the process of developing, or have already initiated climate change-related programs. CSAC supports the inclusion of these programs into the larger GHG reduction framework and supports acknowledgement and credit given for these local efforts.
- CSAC acknowledges its role to provide educational forums, informational resources and communication opportunities for counties in relation to climate change.
- CSAC recognizes that collaboration between cities, counties, special districts and the private sector is necessary to ensure the success of a GHG reduction strategy at the local level.
- CSAC encourages counties to take active measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and create energy efficiency strategies that are appropriate for their respective communities.

Section 2: FISCAL

The effects of climate change and the implementation of GHG reduction strategies will have fiscal implications for county government.

- CSAC recognizes the potential for fiscal impacts on all levels of government as a result of climate change, i.e. sea level rise, flooding, water shortages and other varied and numerous consequences. CSAC encourages the state and counties to plan for the fiscal impacts of climate change adaptation, mitigation and strategy implementation.
- CSAC supports the use of grants, loans, incentives and revenue raising authority to assist local governments with the implementation of climate change response activities and GHG reduction strategies.

Comment [KB5]: The last bullet in this section seems redundant with the 5th and 6th bullet in the next section, so there's an opportunity to consolidate. Also, "GHG reduction strategies that focus on city-oriented growth and require conservation ..." is the reality now as part of SB 375 implementation. The language should be updated to reflect that - Sonoma County

- CSAC continues to support its state mandate principles in the context of climate change. CSAC advocates that new GHG emissions reduction programs must be technically feasible for counties to implement and help to offset the long-term costs of GHG emission reduction strategies.
- CSAC advocates that any new GHG reduction strategies that focus on city-oriented growth and require conservation of critical resource and agricultural lands within the unincorporated area should include a mechanism to compensate county governments for the loss of property taxes and other fees and taxes.

Section 3: LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

CSAC recognizes that population growth in the state is inevitable, thus any climate change strategies that affect land use must focus on how and where to accommodate and mitigate the expected growth in California. Land use planning and development plays a direct role in transportation patterns, affecting travel demands and in return vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and fuel consumption. It is recognized that in addition to reducing VMTs, investing in a seamless and efficient transportation system to address congestion also contributes to the reduction of GHG emissions. Smart land use planning and growth remain critical components to achieve the reduction targets pursuant to AB 32 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006), particularly to address the emissions from the transportation sector (i.e. vehicle, air and train). In order to better understand the link between land use planning, transportation and climate change further modeling and consideration of alternative growth scenarios is required to determine the relationship and benefits at both the local and regional levels.

- CSAC supports measures to achieve reductions in GHG emissions by promoting housing/jobs proximity and transit-oriented development, and encouraging high density residential development along transit corridors. CSAC supports these strategies through its existing smart growth policy for strategic growth. That policy also supports encouraging new growth that results in compact development within cities, existing urban communities and rural towns that have the largest potential for increasing densities, providing a variety of housing types and affordability, efficiently utilizing existing, considering social equity as part of community development and new infrastructure investment and scarce resources, and strives towards achieving a jobs-housing balance.
- CSAC existing policy also supports the protection of critical lands when it comes to development, recognizing the need to protect agricultural lands, encourage the continued operations and expansion of agricultural businesses, and protect natural resources, wildlife habitat and open space.
- CSAC policy also acknowledges that growth outside existing urban areas and growth that is non-contiguous to urban areas may be necessary to avoid the

Comment [KB6]: This entire section should be updated in light of SB 375 implementation that is now well underway. A number of the bullets in this section reflect things that are actually happening now as a result of SB 375. For instance, the last bullet in this section is exactly what SB 375 is about. So the section could probably be condensed. Ensuring support for "rural sustainability" is very important here - Sonoma County.

Comment [KB7]: Sacramento County

impacts on critical resource and agricultural lands that are adjacent to existing urban areas.

- CSAC policy supports providing incentives for regional blueprint and countywide plans to ensure that rural, suburban and urban communities have the ability to plan for more strategic growth and have equitable access to revenues available for infrastructure investment purposes. It is CSAC's intent to secure regional and countywide blueprint funding for all areas.
- CSAC supports new fiscal incentives for the development of countywide plans to deal with growth, adaptation and mitigation through collaboration between a county and its cities to address housing needs, protection of resources and agricultural lands, and compatible general plans and revenue and tax sharing agreements for countywide services.
- CSAC recognizes that counties and cities must strive to promote efficient development in designated urban areas in a manner that evaluates all costs associated with development on both the city and the county. Support for growth patterns that encourage urbanization to occur within cities must also result in revenue agreements that consider all revenues generated from such growth in order to reflect the service demands placed on county government. As an alternative, agreements could be entered into requiring cities to assume portions of county service delivery obligations resulting from urban growth.
- ~~Strategic growth plans at the regional level, whether land use or transportation, must be reconciled with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and the obligation for cities and counties to zone for housing. The allocation of resources to cities and counties must be consistent with the RHNA obligation as well.~~
- A means for simultaneously achieving strategic growth and reduction of greenhouse gases is expected to occur at the regional level through the current blueprint and transportation planning processes. CSAC supports this method rather than a statewide "one size fits all" approach to addressing growth and climate change issues. Further, CSAC supports countywide approaches to strategic growth, resource and agricultural protection, targeting scarce infrastructure investments and tax sharing for countywide services.
- CSAC supports inclusion of recommendations and technical advice for local governments and regional agencies in the CEQA Guidelines to address acceptable methodologies for climate change analysis, significance thresholds and mitigation measures for long-range plans and project level review.
- CSAC finds it critical that state and federal assistance is provided for data and standardized methodologies for quantifying GHG emissions for determining and quantifying GHG emission sources and levels, vehicle miles traveled and other important data to assist both local governments and regional agencies in addressing climate change in environmental documents for long-range plans.

Comment [KBB]: Sonoma County - already accomplished

- ~~CSAC supports efforts to minimize the risk to counties and lead agencies until the CEQA Guidelines are established as required by law in 2010.~~

Comment [KB9]: Napa County

- While local governments individually have a role in the reduction of GHG emissions, CSAC also supports regional, interregional, interjurisdictional and cross border efforts to achieve the ARB targets, including reliance on regional data and long-range plans that relate to air quality, transportation and regional growth strategies.

Section 4: ENERGY

Reducing energy consumption is an important way to reduce GHG emissions and conserve. Additionally, the capture and reuse of certain GHGs can lead to additional sources of energy. For example, methane gas emissions, a mixture of methane, carbon dioxide and various toxic organic and mercuric pollutants, from landfills and dairies have been identified as potent GHGs. Effective collection and treatment of these gases is not only important to the reduction of GHG emissions, but can also result in an additional source of green power.

- CSAC supports incentive based green building programs that encourage the use of green building practices, incorporating energy efficiency and conservation technologies into state and local facilities. A green building is a term used to describe structures that are designed, built, renovated, operated or reused in an ecological and resource-efficient manner. Green buildings are designed to meet certain objectives using energy, water and other resources more efficiently and reducing the overall impact to the environment.
- CSAC supports the state's development of green building protocols sustainable building standards, including guidelines for jails, hospitals and other such public buildings.
- CSAC supports the use of grants, loans and incentives to encourage and enable counties to incorporate green building practices into their local facilities.
- CSAC supports the use of procurement practices that promote the use of energy efficient products and equipment.
- CSAC supports state efforts to develop a dairy digester protocol to document GHG emissions reductions from dairy farms. CSAC supports funding mechanisms that support the use of dairy digesters to capture methane gas and convert it to energy.
- CSAC supports state efforts to capture methane gases from landfills; and supports its development of a reasonable regulatory measure with a feasible timeline, that will require landfill gas recovery systems on landfills that can support a self-sustaining collection system. CSAC supports the development of a guidance

Comment [KB10]: Add new language that: 1) strongly supports the incorporation of an Energy Element within the General Plan, 2) supports counties pursuing CCA and other opportunities for local communities to provide customer choice and gain opportunity to expand local renewable energy generation, 3) support PACE programs by encouraging other counties to adopt and implement these programs - Sonoma County

Comment [KB11]: This section should recognize that the state has now adopted its own green building code that most cities and counties are using. Some have incentive-based programs that go beyond, but the CA green building code has set the "floor" for this issue. I'd like to see more emphasis in this section on renewable energy generation (perhaps acknowledgement of the state's renewable portfolio standard), including both distributed generation and utility-scale projects that occur in the southern counties. State and local government should be doing what they can to facilitate these new generation projects in a way that's appropriate to the community context. This may be a hot-button topic but I would also like to see support for community choice aggregation efforts as a way for communities to take their own initiative to increase renewable energy - Sonoma County

document for landfill operators and regulators that will recommend technologies and best management practices for improving landfill design, construction, operation and closure for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. CSAC also supports funding mechanisms, including grants, loans and incentives to landfill operators to help implement these programs.

- CSAC continues to support its existing energy policy, which states that counties should seek to promote energy conservation and energy efficiency and broader use of renewable energy resources. Counties are encouraged to undertake vigorous energy action programs that are tailored to the specific needs of each county. When developing such action programs counties should: (1) assess available conservation and renewable and alternative energy options and take action to implement conservation, energy efficiency and renewable energy development when feasible; (2) consider the incorporation of energy policies as an optional element in the county general plan; and, (3) consider energy concerns when making land use decisions and encourage development patterns which result in energy efficiency.
- CSAC continues to support efforts to ensure that California has an adequate supply of safe and reliable energy through a combination of conservation, renewables, new generation and new transmission efforts.

Section 5: WATER

According to the Department of Water Resources, projected increases in air temperature may lead to changes in the timing, amount and form of precipitation – (rain or snow), changes in runoff timing and volume, effects of sea level rise and changes in the amount of irrigation water needed. CSAC has an existing policy that recognizes the need for state and local programs that promote water conservation and water storage development.

- CSAC supports the incorporation of projections of climate change into state water planning and flood control efforts.
- CSAC recognizes that climate change has the potential to seriously impact California's water supply. CSAC continues to assert that adequate management of water supply cannot be accomplished without effective administration of both surface and ground water resources within counties, including the effective management of forestlands and watershed basins.
- CSAC supports water conservation efforts, including reuse of domestic and industrial wastewater, reuse of agriculture water, groundwater recharge, and economic incentives to invest in equipment that promotes efficiency.
- CSAC continues to support the study and development of alternate methods of meeting water needs such as desalinization, wastewater reclamation, watershed

management, the development of additional storage, and water conservation measures.

Section 6: FORESTRY

With a significant percentage of California covered in forest land, counties recognize the importance of forestry in the context of climate change. Effectively managed forests have less of a probability of releasing large amounts of harmful GHG emissions into the atmosphere in the form of catastrophic wildfires. Furthermore, as a result of natural absorption, forests reduce the effects of GHG emissions and climate change by removing carbon from the air through the process of carbon sequestration. CSAC also recognizes the benefits of biomass energy as an alternative to the burning of traditional fossil fuels, as well as the benefits of carbon sequestration through the use of wood products.

- CSAC continues to support its existing policy on sustainable forestry, encouraging sustainable forestry practices through the existing regulatory process, and encouraging continued reforestation and active forest management on both public and private timberlands.
- CSAC supports responsible optimum forest management practices that ensure continued carbon sequestration in the forest, provide wood fiber for biomass-based products and carbon-neutral biomass fuels, and protect the ecological values of the forest in a balanced way.
- CSAC supports the state's development of general forestry protocols that encourage private landowners to participate in voluntary emission reduction programs and encourage National Forest lands to contribute to the state's climate change efforts.
- It is imperative that adequate funding be provided to support the management of forest land owned and managed by the federal government in California in order to ensure the reduction of catastrophic wildfires.
- CSAC supports additional research and analysis of carbon sequestration opportunities within forestry.

Section 7: AGRICULTURE

The potential impacts of climate change on agriculture may not only alter the types and locations of commodities produced, but also the factors influencing their production, including resource availability. Rising temperatures, changes to our water supply and soil composition all could have significant impacts on California's crop and livestock management. Additionally, agriculture is a contributor to GHG emissions in form of fuel consumption, cultivation and fertilization of soils and management of livestock manure. At the same time, agriculture has the potential to provide offsets in the form of carbon

Comment [KB12]: How about adding a policy that supports actual reduction of GHG emissions from agricultural activities? The intro paragraph acknowledges it's an issue, so let's take it on. I'd like CSAC to support state and local efforts to help the agricultural community adapt to climate change impacts through technical assistance and regulatory flexibility - Sonoma County

sequestration in soil and permanent crops, and the production of biomass crops for energy purposes.

- CSAC supports State efforts to develop guidelines through a public process to improve and identify cost effective strategies for nitrous oxide emissions reductions.
- CSAC continues to support incentives that will encourage agricultural water conservation and retention of lands in agricultural production.
- CSAC continues to support full funding for UC Cooperative Extension given its vital role in delivering research-based information and educational programs that enhance economic vitality and the quality of life in California counties.
- CSAC supports additional research and analysis of carbon sequestration opportunities within agriculture.

Section 8: AIR QUALITY

CSAC encourages the research and development and use of alternative, cleaner fuels. Further, air quality issues reach beyond personal vehicle use and affect diesel equipment used in development and construction for both the public and private sector.

- CSAC supports state efforts to create standards and protocols for all new passenger cars and light-duty trucks that are purchased by the state and local governments that conform to the California Strategy to Reduce Petroleum Dependency. CSAC supports state efforts to revise its purchasing methodology to be consistent with the new vehicle standards.
- CSAC supports efforts that will enable counties to purchase new vehicles for local fleets that conform to state purchasing standards, are fuel efficient, low emission, or use alternative fuels. CSAC supports flexibility at the local level, allowing counties to purchase fuel efficient vehicles on or off the state plan.
- CSAC supports identifying a funding source for the local retrofit and replacement of county on and off road diesel powered vehicles and equipment.
- CSAC opposes federal standards that supercede California's ability to adopt stricter vehicle standards.
- Counties continue to assert that federal and state agencies, in cooperation with local agencies, have the ability to develop rules and regulations that implement clean air laws that are both cost-effective and operationally feasible. In addition, state and federal agencies should be encouraged to accept equivalent air quality programs, thereby allowing for flexibility in implementation without compromising air quality goals.

Comment [KB13]: Support policies that encourage local organic agriculture, and the use of public lands for gardens and farms where appropriate - Sonoma County

Comment [KB14]: The County agrees with this point and suggests that further emphasis be placed here. In addition, education and outreach to the agricultural community on carbon sequestration within agriculture is needed - Santa Barbara County

- CSAC also recognizes the importance of the Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) to provide technical assistance and guidance to achieve the reduction of GHG emissions.
- CSAC supports the development of tools and incentives to encourage patterns of product distribution and goods movement that minimize transit impacts and GHG emissions.
- CSAC supports further analysis of the GHG emission contribution from goods movement through shipping channels and ports.

Section 9: SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING

The consumption of materials is related to climate change because it requires energy to mine, extract, harvest, process and transport raw materials, and more energy to manufacture, transport and, after use, dispose of products. Recycling and waste prevention can reduce GHG emissions by reducing the amount of energy needed to process materials, and reducing the amount of natural resources needed to make products, and decreasing landfill-bound materials, which through decomposition, create methane gas (Ventura County).

- CSAC continues to support policies and legislation that aim to promote improved markets for recyclable materials, and encourages:
 - The use of recycled content in products sold in California;
 - The creation of economic incentives for the use of recycled materials;
 - Development of local recycling markets to avoid increased emissions from transporting recyclables long distances to current markets;
 - The expansion of the Electronic Waste Recycling Act of 2003 and the Beverage Container Recycling Program;
 - The use of materials that are biodegradable;
 - Greater manufacturer responsibility and product stewardship.

Comment [KB15]: Support curbside, restaurant, and public facility composting programs – Sonoma County

Section 10: HEALTH

CSAC recognizes the potential impacts of land uses, transportation, and climate change on human health. As administrators of planning, public works, parks, and a variety of public health services and providers of health care services, California's counties have significant health, administrative and cost concerns related to our existing and future built environment and a changing climate. Lack of properly designed active transportation facilities have made it difficult and in some cases created barriers for pedestrians and bicyclists. Lack of walk ability in many communities contributes to numerous chronic health related issues, particularly obesity which is an epidemic in this country. Heat-related illnesses, air pollution, wild fire, water pollution and supply issues, mental health impact and infectious disease all relate to the health and well-being of county residents,

and to the range and cost of services provided by county governments. CSAC recognizes that there are direct human health benefits associated with improving our built environment and mitigating greenhouse gas emissions, such as lowering rates of obesity, injuries, and asthma. Counties believe that prevention, planning, research, education/training, and preparation are the keys to coping with the public health issues brought about by our built environment and climate change, ~~and that any p~~ Public policies/policy related to land uses, public works, climate change and public health should be considered so as to work together to improve the public's health within ~~must take into account~~ the existing roles and resources of county government.

Comment [KB16]: Sacramento County

- CSAC supports efforts to provide communities that are designed, built and maintained so as to promote health, safety and livability through leadership, education, and funding augmentations.

Comment [KB17]: Sacramento County

- CSAC supports efforts to improve the public health and human services infrastructure to better prevent and cope with the health effects of climate change through leadership, planning and funding augmentations.
- CSAC supports state funding for mandated local efforts to coordinate monitoring of heat-related illnesses and responses to heat emergencies.
- CSAC supports efforts to improve emergency prediction, warning, and response systems and enhanced disease surveillance strategies.

Glossary of Terms

Climate change

A change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Carbon Sequestration

Carbon sequestration refers to the provision of long-term storage of carbon in the terrestrial biosphere, underground, or the oceans so that the buildup of carbon dioxide (the principal greenhouse gas) concentration in the atmosphere will reduce or slow. In some cases, this is accomplished by maintaining or enhancing natural processes; in other cases, novel techniques are developed to dispose of carbon.

US Department of Energy

Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

US Environmental Protection Agency

Greenhouse gas

A gas that absorbs radiation at specific wavelengths within the spectrum of radiation (infrared radiation) emitted by the Earth's surface and by clouds. The gas in turn emits infrared radiation from a level where the temperature is colder than the surface. The net effect is a local trapping of part of the absorbed energy and a tendency to warm the planetary surface. Water vapour (H₂O), carbon dioxide (CO₂), nitrous oxide (N₂O), methane (CH₄) and ozone (O₃) are the primary greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere.

United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Attachment Six
CSAC ANR 2012 Legislative Summary

November 13, 2012



To: CSAC Agriculture & Natural Resources (ANR) Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Senior Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Senior Legislative Analyst

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500

Facsimile
916.441.5507

RE: **2012 Agriculture & Natural Resources Legislative & Regulatory Summary**

LEGISLATION

The following is a brief summary of key pieces of legislation staff worked on throughout the year.

Fire & Land Use

SB 1241 (Kehoe) Chapter 311, Statutes of 2012 – CSAC and the Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC) were successful in obtaining amendments to SB 1241, by Senator Christine Kehoe, that allowed us to remove our opposition. This bill, which was signed by the Governor in September, requires cities and counties to review and update their General Plan's Safety Element to address fire risks on land classified as State Responsibility Area (SRA) and very high fire hazard severity zones. The Senator agreed to amendments that addressed our concerns with the costs associated with its implementation, linkage with the housing element update, and duplicative requirements.

Flood Control

SB 1278 (Wolk) Chapter Number 553, Statutes of 2012 – CSAC staff worked to pass critical technical clean-up language to SB 5 (Machado, Chapter 364, Statutes of 2007) one of a six-bill flood protection package signed into law in 2007. The original legislation, SB 5, requires each city and county in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley to comprehensively address flood management and flood risk issues within their general plans and zoning ordinances following the adoption of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). CSAC and other local government stakeholders were successful in negotiating amendments to SB 1278, by Senator Lois Wolk, that address significant implementation challenges associated with SB 5. The bill would allow for additional time to amend general plans, establishes a process for addressing areas outside of the State Plan of Flood Control, and clarifies that "urban level of flood protection" does not mean shallow flooding or flooding from local drainage.

Renewable Energy

SB 1222 (Leno) Chapter Number 614, Statutes of 2012 – With the Governor's push to increase renewable energy production, there has been tremendous pressure on local governments to expedite the permitting and siting of renewable energy facilities. SB 1222, by Senator Mark Leno, places a cap on solar permitting fees. CSAC was successful in negotiating amendments to SB 1222 that lessen the impact of the bill by allowing for a process to adopt higher permitting fees outside of the cap. Despite these amendments, CSAC remained opposed to the bill due to its precedent setting nature.

Climate Change

AB 1532 (Perez) Chapter Number 807, Statutes of 2012 – The fight for Cap and Trade dollars was at a fever pitch this year. Out of the myriad of bills introduced that would have allocated Cap and Trade funds, two bills emerged as the lead vehicles for this topic: AB 1532, by Assembly Speaker John Perez and SB 1572 by Senator Fran Pavley. CSAC was successful in including language in both of these bills that would allow local

governments to be eligible recipients of Cap and Trade funding for the purposes of engaging in activities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. While ultimately only AB 1532 was signed by the Governor, CSAC took an active role in negotiations and was able to secure public agency eligibility for these funds – a big success considering the number of groups vying for these dollars.

Fish and Game

AB 2443 (Williams) Chapter Number 485, Statutes of 2012 – CSAC staff worked closely with Santa Barbara County and other local governments and stakeholders to support AB 2443, which imposes a Quagga and Zebra mussel infestation prevention fee on boater registrations. This fee will fund a grant program for implementation of dreissenid mussel infestation inspection and prevention programs. CSAC took an active role in supporting this bill because it will help to offset local government and state agency costs by establishing a new source of revenue to help protect California's vulnerable waters from Quagga and Zebra mussel infestation.

Solid Waste Management

AB 1634 (Chesbro) – In the last month of the legislative session, a proposal emerged that would have mandated separate hauling and recycling for organic waste such as food waste or green material by businesses, multi-family dwellings of five or more units and public entities. CSAC worked closely with the proponents, author's staff and the legislative consultants to express our concerns with AB 1634, authored by Assembly Member Wesley Chesbro. CSAC and other opponents felt that the bill would have usurped the AB 341 (Chesbro, Chapter 476, Statutes of 2011) process, which established a new statewide policy goal of 75 percent diversion of solid waste. AB 341 also created a process that committed the Department of Resources, Recycling and Recovery (Cal Recycle) to working with stakeholders over an 18-month process to vet suggestions and ideas relative to increased diversion. Given the concerns expressed by CSAC and other local government stakeholders, the bill stalled in the Senate.

STATE REGULATION

The following is a brief summary of regulatory activities staff worked on throughout the year.

Storm Water Permits

CSAC remains engaged in the State Water Resources Control Board's (Water Board) update of the Phase II Small MS4 General Permit and the Industrial Storm Water General Permit (IGP). Regarding the MS4 Permit, CSAC continues to have serious concerns with a number of the requirements included in the redrafted permit and the excessive costs associated with its implementation. This summer, CSAC, the League of California Cities and the Regional Council of Rural Counties reiterated these concerns to the Water Board, and raised additional concerns over new language in the redrafted permit that prescribes specific updates of local planning and building requirements. It is our understanding that a third draft will be available for public review and comment before the end of the year. CSAC will continue to advocate for a more flexible, measured permit.

As for the IGP, the most current draft addresses several issues of concern raised by CSAC and others regarding the 2011 draft. Unfortunately, outstanding concerns remain, including the permit's inappropriate receiving waters limitations, excessive pre-storm inspection requirements, mandatory pH meters, and lack of guidance with respect to landfills. Naturally, the costs associated with the draft permit also remain a significant concern to all affected stakeholders. CSAC joined with RCRC in conveying these concerns to the Water Board.

Wetland Area Protection Policy and Dredge and Fill Regulations

Earlier this year the Water Board released a preliminary draft of their Wetland Area Protection and Dredge and Fill Permitting policies (Preliminary Draft). Unfortunately, this latest attempt by the State to develop a statewide policy on wetlands would, similar to prior drafts, impose a costly, expansive and complicated new regulatory program. Given the potential impact on public and private projects, CSAC is partnering with public and private sector representatives to express strong opposition to the Preliminary Draft. The outcome of this group's written communications and meetings with officials from the Brown Administration was unknown at the time of this report's preparation. However, it is our understanding that Water Board staff is working on a revised draft that is expected to be released by the end of the year.

Delta/Sacramento-San Joaquin Flood Protection Plan

CSAC also submitted comments on the Delta Stewardship Council's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Delta Plan and the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP). CSAC expressed several broad policy concerns with the DEIR, including: its lack of critical detail, especially with respect to the finding that the Delta Plan is environmentally superior to other alternatives, or combinations thereof; questionable reliance on comparative analyses as oppose to specific project-level qualitative analysis when determining potential for impacts on local communities; and, establishment of a process that would fail to preserve and advance the economic vitality of "heritage" or "legacy" communities in the Delta.

Regarding the CVFPP, CSAC worked with the County Engineers to develop a comment letter to the Central Valley Flood Protection Board that expressed a wide range of concerns. The comment letter that was jointly submitted by CSAC, RCRC and the League of California Cities, indicated that the CVFPP lacked an articulate discussion/explanation on how it will facilitate compliance with SB 5 by cities and counties within its mandated time frames; failed to include the data needed by cities and counties in order to make the 200-year level of flood protection finding for new development; should address how cities and counties can comply with the Plan given that many of these major system improvements will not be completed by 2015; should recommend the establishment of grant programs for cities and counties to develop 200-year floodplain maps and improvements; needs to evaluate whether the proposed new levee design standards and findings procedures are, from a practical perspective, implementable by cities and counties. The Central Valley Flood Protection Board adopted the 2012 CVFPP on June 29, 2012.

FEDERAL ISSUES

Despite gridlock on several fronts, Congress was able to make progress on a number of issues of importance to CSAC in the area of Agriculture & Natural Resources.

Reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools Act

In a victory for CSAC and California's forest counties, MAP-21 includes a one-year continuation - through fiscal year 2012 - of the *Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act* (SRS). MAP-21 also extends - through fiscal year 2013 - funding for the Payments-in-Lieu-of-Taxes (PILT) program. Under the Act, SRS is funded at 95 percent of fiscal year 2011 levels, while PILT is fully funded.

During consideration of the Senate's transportation bill, CSAC played a key role in garnering support for the amendment that extended SRS and PILT. With the support of Senators Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) and Barbara Boxer (D-CA), the amendment, sponsored by Senator Max Baucus (D-MT), was adopted by a vote of 82 to 16.

In fiscal year 2011, California received a total of \$39.3 million in SRS funding, which was distributed to 32 counties. Accordingly, California's counties can expect to receive approximately \$37.4 million in fiscal year 2012.

Army Corps of Engineers Levee Vegetation Removal Policy

CSAC supported by key members of the California congressional delegation, continued to actively oppose the Army Corps of Engineers' levee vegetation removal policy. Although the Corps' policy is designed to allow for easier inspections and to reduce any potential weakening of levees from root growth and overturned trees, the policy has not been shown to provide tangible benefits to public safety. Additionally, removing vegetation from the state's levees would cost billions of dollars.

Relying on technical input from the counties, CSAC succeeded earlier this year in securing committee report language on levee vegetation as part of the Senate's fiscal year 2013 Energy and Water Appropriations legislation. The language, submitted by Senator Feinstein on behalf of CSAC, states that the Corps' initial research on levee vegetation indicates that minimal data exists on the scientific relationship between woody vegetation and levees. The language also urges the Corps to continue to conduct additional scientific research on the topic and encourages the Corps to clarify how it will apply Endangered Species Act considerations in its final vegetation policy. Similar language was also recently included in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) Discussion Draft bill at the request of Senator Boxer.

In related developments, CSAC worked closely with Representative Doris Matsui (D-CA) on legislation (HR 5831) that would require the Secretary of the Army to undertake a comprehensive review of the Corps' guidelines on vegetation management for levees. The bipartisan bill, entitled the Levee Vegetation Review Act, is currently cosponsored by 30 members of the California congressional delegation.

Attachment Seven
CSAC ANR 2013 Legislative Priorities



1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327.7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

Agriculture & Natural Resources Priorities 2013-14 Legislative Session

The following is a summary of issues the CSAC Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Team anticipates focusing on in 2013.

DWR Flood Futures Report – Continue Partnership with DWR in Roll-Out and Implementation

After roughly five years of collaboration with CSAC and CEAC, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) is in the process of finalizing the statewide flood control needs assessment, formally referred to as *California's Flood Future Report*. CSAC staff and members of the CEAC Flood Control Needs Assessment Team provided significant input into the development of the report and a *California Flood Future Highlight* document which is expected to be released to the public this November, with the full report being made available by the end of the year. This comprehensive report will present the first-ever, systematic description of California's flood risk management needs and high-level recommendations designed to help guide future Federal and State policies and investments related to flood management. The report identifies the immediate need for more than \$50 billion to complete flood management improvements and projects. These flood management projects include operations and maintenance and other identified actions. There is an estimated additional investment need of more than \$100B for flood management projects that are not yet specifically identified. DWR has requested CSAC and CEAC's involvement in the roll-out of both documents and to remain engaged during the second phase of this project when next steps and implementation measures are formulated.

SB 5 Clean-Up (Flood Management/Land Use) – Seek Statutory Changes to Address Outstanding Issues

CSAC staff worked to pass critical technical clean-up language to SB 5 (Machado, Chapter 364, Statutes of 2007) one of a six-bill flood protection package signed into law in 2007. The original legislation, SB 5, requires each city and county in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley to comprehensively address flood management and flood risk issues within local planning documents and to demonstrate a 200 year level of flood protection when approving certain types of development. CSAC and other local government stakeholders were successful in negotiating amendments that address significant implementation challenges associated with SB 5. Additional statutory changes are needed to address outstanding issues. In the coming legislative session, we anticipate engaging in discussions to address these issues, which include the application of SB 5 to all discretionary projects and infill development.

Cap & Trade – Secure Funding for Local Government Programs

CSAC staff was successful in including local governments as eligible recipients of Cap and Trade funds in AB 1532 (Perez, Chapter Number 807, Statutes of 2012), the Speaker's Cap and Trade allocation bill this past session. The bill requires the Department of Finance to develop an investment plan for Cap and Trade revenues that will begin to flow to the State in November 2012, after the first Cap and Trade auction. The auction and ones to follow are expected to generate a multi-billion dollar revenue

stream for the State. By law, local governments are eligible to receive a portion of Cap and Trade auction revenues for greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction and sequestration activities. CSAC is working with a number of partners through several different coalitions to secure a portion of these revenues for local governments for a variety of different purposes, including planning, transportation, energy efficiency and other GHG emissions reductions activities.

Water Board Rulemakings/Policies – Support Revisions that Result in Cost-Effective, Implementable and Non-Prescriptive State Standards

CSAC staff engages in the regulatory process on a number of different fronts with particular focus on proposed rulemakings before the State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board). Permit revisions remain a concern, including the Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit and the Industrial Storm Water General Permit. Staff prepared comments on the latest versions of these permits, and also actively engaged in discussions with the Administration regarding the Water Board's proposed wetland regulations. Given the significant cost implications to counties, it is imperative that CSAC continue to support revisions that result in cost-effective and implementable permits. CSAC also worked closely with the counties of Los Angeles and San Diego in the development of a CSAC comment letter on new Receiving Water Limitations (RWL) language to be included in municipal stormwater permits. CSAC will continue to advocate for revised RWL language that reflects specific goals outlined in our comment letter.

CalEnviroScreen Tool – Ensure County Interests/Concerns Addressed

The California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) has developed a method for evaluating the cumulative impacts of pollution on communities. According to the Public Review Draft the method, referred to as the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen), uses existing environmental, health and socioeconomic data to create a cumulative impacts score for communities across the state. The potential uses of the tool include guidance for grant allocations and prioritizing cleanup and abatement projects; and to prioritize enforcement of environmental laws and inform planning decisions about sustainable economic development investments in heavily impacted communities. CSAC and member counties are very concerned with the potential misuse and misapplication of the tool. CSAC staff is currently in the process of organizing additional meetings/forums between county officials and Cal/EPA and OEHHA staff regarding CalEnviroScreen. CSAC shall remain engaged in the OEHHA process given potential impact on job creation, economic development and the local land use approval process.

Solid Waste – Advancing Waste to Energy Policies and Alternatives to Landfills

CSAC staff works closely with the County Engineers Association of California (CEAC) to advance the development of solid waste conversion technology facilities in California in order to reduce dependence on landfill disposal and generate electricity. CEAC has created a Working Group dedicated to this issue, which CSAC staffs. In addition, CSAC participated in a number of meetings with State Agency Secretaries and Directors this past year to discuss the development of a regulatory path for conversion technology in California. In the next legislative session, we anticipate a legislative proposal moving forward that would change statutory definitions related to conversion technology and

address the associated renewable energy and disposal credits for CT. Staff is actively engaged in the support and development of these proposals and is working in close coordination with CEAC and Cal Recycle. We also anticipate engaging in conversations related to the implementation of AB 341 (Chesbro, 2011), the statewide goal of diverting 75% of our solid waste from landfill disposal.

Delta Solutions – Represent County Interests in the Development of the Delta Plan and any Conveyance Options

CSAC has strong policy to support any proposed solutions to the crisis in the Delta that affected counties' land use authority; effect local government representation in Delta governing structure, including voting status and special recognition of Delta legacy communities; impact flood protection and protect the ecosystem and the development of an adequate water supply. CSAC also has longstanding policy that supports area of origin counties and watershed areas in relation to any specific water project. With respect to the development of new and expanded water resources, CSAC policy states that new projects should be considered; however, the state must take into account and mitigate for any negative socio-economic impacts on the affected counties. CSAC staff remains engaged in the discussions surrounding the Delta Plan using the policy noted above to advocate for county interests. CSAC expressed several broad policy concerns with the Delta Stewardship Council's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Delta Plan. Our concerns included: lack of critical detail, especially with respect to the finding that the Delta Plan is environmentally superior to other alternatives, or combinations thereof; questionable reliance on comparative analyses as oppose to specific project-level qualitative analysis when determining potential for impacts on local communities; and, establishment of a process that would fail to preserve and advance the economic vitality of "heritage" or "legacy" communities in the Delta. As the Delta Plan is finalized and discussions continue regarding conveyance options in the Delta, CSAC staff will remain engaged in the process supporting the Delta Counties Coalition and advocating to ensure that county interests and concerns are adequately addressed.