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Part I: Introduction

California and Global Warming: Bad News, Good News

Global warming has begun to damage California’s public health, our economy, and our spectacularly diverse ecosystems. Without swift action in California and throughout the world, the impacts will be catastrophic. Yet despite these scientific certainties, each day we dig ourselves deeper into this crisis by making development decisions that put us on the path to higher emissions and impede our ability to cope with those impacts that are considered inevitable due to past emissions.

Fortunately, global warming is finally catching the public’s attention. Individuals, communities, and governments across the globe are now taking unprecedented actions to change the forecast for our planet and steer us away from catastrophic climate disruption. Many people have begun to modify their personal behavior, volunteer with civic organizations, or financially support their favorite non-profit groups. Others are organizing to change business culture and government policy. Spread across continents and cultures, these climate-conscious individuals comprise one of the fastest growing social movements in the history of humanity.

The State of California is quickly catching up with its colleagues in the international community. With passage of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32), California has embarked upon a breathtaking endeavor to halt the growth of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions statewide and then reduce annual emissions back to 1990 levels by 2020. This will reduce emissions approximately 25-30 percent below “business as usual” projections. Governor Schwarzenegger has also issued an Executive Order establishing a statewide target of an 80 percent reduction in California’s GHG emissions by 2050. State agencies are now racing to prepare for full implementation of AB 32, which is required to begin no later than 2012, as they contemplate how to achieve the larger reductions needed in subsequent decades.

Many local government agencies across California have also implemented practical policies that will lower the carbon footprint of their region. For example, in November 2007, the County of Marin finalized a new General Plan that mandates GHG emission reductions. At least nine local jurisdictions have adopted their own energy efficiency standards that surpass State requirements. Additionally, the San Francisco Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission has set environmental targets for its 2009 Regional Transportation Plan that include substantially reducing greenhouse gas emissions and cutting the total number of vehicle miles traveled in the region within the next 25 years. However, while trendsetting public agencies develop exciting emission reduction policies, others continue to “dig the hole deeper,” approving new residential, commercial, industrial, and municipal developments that increase GHG emissions. Each time a local government approves a housing development that is...
water and energy inefficient, is located far from necessary amenities like job centers and grocery stores, and lacks transit, biking, or walking opportunities, the new residents are denied the option to live lower-carbon lifestyles.

Many local governments continue to approve projects that substantially increase greenhouse gas emissions, even as the State of California rushes to roll back our emissions.

This has real ramifications for California; if the approval of new developments continues to exacerbate the global warming problem before State efforts begin in earnest in 2012, it will become increasingly difficult for us to meet AB 32’s GHG-reduction mandate.

You can make a difference today by helping your local public agencies make climate-conscious development decisions. Those decisions will save taxpayer money, create new jobs, improve public health, and protect our local environment. Moreover, they will make it easier for us to climb out of the global warming hole we are already in, and into a sustainable, livable tomorrow. The mantra “think globally, act locally” has never been more true. With your help, we can tackle our global warming problem and see the benefits right in our own backyards.

The Local Climate Action Initiative

The Planning and Conservation League (PCL), working with its sister organization, the PCL Foundation, launched the Local Climate Action Initiative in 2007 to help local communities across California adopt and better enforce policies that cut the carbon footprint of new development in their region.

The Initiative is a venue for community organizations that feel a sense of urgency in wanting to address climate change and are seeking the tools to create meaningful local victories.

In addition to the publication of this toolkit, the PCL Foundation is holding a series of workshops across California, providing practical information and campaign strategy consultation to help organizations choose wisely among the plethora of emerging engagement opportunities. In each workshop we share success stories from other communities and help connect individuals working on similar issues.

Together, we can build a powerful grassroots movement that will deliver, at the local level, the same kind of prudent stewardship California’s leaders have displayed at the state level. In addition, we can show the world that reducing our collective carbon footprint begins at home, with the decisions we make about our own communities.
Global Warming in California: The Future Is Now

Global warming is affecting us right now. In 2005, the World Health Organization concluded that global warming currently contributes to 150,000 deaths and five million illnesses worldwide each year. These effects are not limited to poorer countries. For example, researchers have identified global warming as the primary driver behind the increase in the size, severity, and number of forest fires in the American West since the mid-1980s.

As the problem worsens, California will be affected in many ways:

- Air quality in California, already the worst in the United States, with more than 90 percent of residents living in areas that violate state air quality standards, will degrade substantially, causing dramatic declines in public health and major increases in health care costs.
- Heat waves will become more frequent and more intense. Californians will face greater risk of death from dehydration, heat stroke, heart attack, stroke, and respiratory distress.
- Rising sea levels will increase flooding on the coast and in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, accelerate erosion, make coastal communities increasingly vulnerable to storm damage, and threaten water quality in estuaries and groundwater supplies. Sea level rise in the Delta may also have negative impacts on the

California’s $30 billion agricultural industry is particularly at risk from the effects of global warming.
State Water Project and the Federal Central Valley Project, which deliver water to agribusinesses and cities south of the Delta.

- California’s economy will sustain serious damage, particularly to our $30 billion agricultural industry, which produces half of all fruits and vegetables in the United States. Other affected industries include wine, tourism, skiing, forestry, and recreational and commercial fishing.

The impacts of global warming will be particularly grueling for the state’s poorest and most vulnerable residents, many of whom are people of color. In part, these impacts will hit low-income residents hardest because they have fewer resources to draw upon when coping with environmental change. Geography also will play a role, as some of the largest temperature changes in California are projected for the Central Valley, which contains some of California’s poorest areas and worst air quality.

The question now is how severe we allow the impacts to become.

Because of past emissions, some future impacts to California’s environment, economy, and public health are now inevitable.

However, as the chart below demonstrates, the effects of global warming are projected to occur, to greater or lesser degrees, depending on the trajectory of GHG emissions worldwide. It shows that even modest cuts to our collective carbon footprint can help lessen the impacts of global warming.

Nowhere is this lesson more apparent than in California’s water security. The Sierra Nevada snowpack, which provides up to 65 percent of California’s developed water supply, is projected to decline between 30 percent and 90 percent by century’s end, depending on the amount of GHG emissions worldwide. That may be the difference between a damaged state and an uninhabitable one.

---

**Summary of Projected Global Warming Impacts, 2070-2099**
(as compared with 1961-1990)

- **Higher Warming Range (8-10.5°F)**
  - 90% loss in Sierra snowpack
  - 22-30 inches of sea level rise
  - 3-4 times as many heat wave days in major urban centers
  - 4-6 times as many heat-related deaths in major urban centers
  - 2.5 times more critically dry years
  - 20% increase in energy demand

- **Medium Warming Range (5.5-8°F)**
  - 70-80% loss in Sierra snowpack
  - 14-22 inches of sea level rise
  - 2.5-4 times as many heat wave days in major urban centers
  - 2-6 times as many heat-related deaths in major urban centers
  - 2-2.5 times more critically dry years
  - 10% increase in energy demand
  - 30% decrease in forest yields (pine)
  - 55% increase in the expected risk of large wildfires

- **Lower Warming Range (3-5.5°F)**
  - 30-60% loss in Sierra snowpack
  - 6-14 inches of sea level rise
  - 2-2.5 times as many heat wave days in major urban centers
  - 2-3 times as many heat-related deaths in major urban centers
  - 25-35% increase in days conducive to ozone formation*
  - Up to 1.5 times more critically dry years
  - 3-6% increase in electricity demand
  - 7-14% decrease in forest yields (pine)
  - 10-35% increase in the expected risk of large wildfires

* For high ozone locations in the Los Angeles (Riverside) and San Joaquin Valley (Visalia)
How California Contributes to the Problem and the Solution

California is both a major contributor to global warming and an emerging leader in the international movement to implement global warming solutions.

As a state, California is the second-highest GHG emitter in the United States. If viewed as an independent nation, California would rank among the top 20 GHG-emitting countries in the world. According to the California Energy Commission, from 1990 to 2004 the state’s total gross GHG emissions rose 14.3 percent. In addition, California’s population is projected to grow from 37 million today to 55 million by 2050, necessitating improved resource management to avoid an increase in demand for energy, water, and other natural resources.

Though California is a major emitter, it has also been one of the states to respond most aggressively to the global warming crisis:

- In 2002, California adopted AB 1493, legislation that will require reductions in GHG emissions from new motor vehicles beginning in model year 2009.
- In 2005, California began enforcing its latest Building Energy Efficiency Standards, some of the most progressive building and appliance efficiency standards in the world.
- In 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger declared, “the debate (about global warming) is over. We know the science, we see the threat and the time for action is now.” That year he issued an Executive Order that set ambitious targets for reductions in statewide GHG emissions and called for an assessment of how to achieve those reductions.
- Several of the strategies from this assessment were codified a year later in the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which requires the California Air Resources Board to ensure that statewide GHG emissions are reduced to 1990 levels by 2020 and calls on all state agencies to take action to lower GHG emissions.
- The California Attorney General has litigated to compel the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to allow California to implement its new automotive GHG emissions standards, force consideration of higher federal vehicle fuel economy standards, and ensure that cities and counties comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when approving plans and projects that would increase California’s GHG emissions.
- In 2008, the California Legislature and Governor Schwarzenegger enacted SB 375, which provides planning tools and incentives to reduce GHG emissions by minimizing sprawl and investing in alternative transportation options.

As Californians, we can continue at the local level the good work that has begun statewide to stem the impacts of global warming. California’s state leaders can and will lead the way. Now we must do our part to make sure their efforts are as successful as possible.
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Part II: Policy Tools for Local GHG Reductions

This section describes practical policies that your local government can either adopt or better enforce to cut the carbon footprint of new developments in your region. It is not meant to be an exhaustive list or provide all the information necessary to launch a campaign, but rather to provide a menu of options for you to consider as you choose how to engage.

We will explain how these policies work, how they can help reduce GHG emissions from new developments, and describe positive actions you can take to promote their adoption or enforcement in your community. We will also highlight successful community organizing efforts led by California’s latest generation of environmental champions.

SECTION 1: ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW POLICIES

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is California’s premier environmental law. It allows both decision makers and the public to understand how governmental decisions may affect the environment and their community’s health and requires avoidance or mitigation of significant adverse impacts where feasible. Most importantly, CEQA provides the legal framework to hold public agencies accountable for their decisions.

CEQA applies to both public sector activities and private sector activities that require approval by either state or local government agencies, including the construction and operation of housing developments, retail and commercial centers, industrial facilities, and large-scale agricultural operations.

To comply with CEQA, public agencies must investigate the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of a proposed project, assess other alternatives that accomplish most of the project’s objectives while limiting environmental impacts, and delineate measures that would avoid or reduce those impacts. The public agency overseeing the environmental review must make this information available to the public for review and provide the opportunity for the public to comment on the documents. In addition, the public agency must respond in writing to each public comment. The agency may not approve a project until it has certified the adequacy of the environmental review and issued a legally-binding statement of its decision regarding the project, including a description of what has been approved, what mitigation measures the project must incorporate, and the agency’s rationale for approval of the project if it will cause unmitigated negative impacts.

If the agency fails to follow the CEQA process correctly, makes erroneous or inaccurate conclusions, or fails to ensure that the mitigation measures are carried out, the public has the right to enforce CEQA’s requirements by challenging the agency’s action in court.

For a more complete explanation of the CEQA process and tips on how to participate effectively, order a copy of PCL Foundation’s popular Community Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (2007).
The Climate Connection

CEQA provides a perfect venue to bring the climate issue home, helping decision makers and the larger community take concrete actions to reduce or avoid GHG emissions.

Here’s how it works:

Under CEQA, public agencies must identify a project’s potential significant adverse environmental impacts, even when the project’s contribution to the problem is small but the problem is already significant. To meet this requirement for global warming, a public agency must determine the baseline emissions of GHGs (the quantity of emissions without the project) and then evaluate the quantity of GHGs that would be emitted above that baseline because of the project and how much would be emitted if other alternatives or mitigation measures were adopted.

The global warming impacts of a development proposal will vary, depending on its type. For example, a sprawling residential development that lacks public transit opportunities will increase the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and therefore create more emissions from cars and trucks. A new dairy operation will likely increase the emission of methane from cow manure, generate new heavy vehicle trips, and increase the emission of GHGs from its use of fertilizers and pesticides.

Even if the proposed project’s contribution is minimal, if this incremental increase is “cumulatively considerable” when considered in combination with existing and proposed projects, the public agency has a duty to reduce or avoid the emission of GHGs where feasible.

For most project types, an array of on-site measures could be included in the project such as compliance with green building standards; clean alternative energy sources; and pedestrian, bike, and transit focused design. Where these measures are insufficient to eliminate the project’s total GHG emissions, the remaining emissions can be eliminated through off-site measures, such as investment in energy conservation projects. Many innovative methods exist to focus those off-site GHG reduction activities on local communities that already suffer disproportionate environmental damage and lack the resources to cope effectively with the effects of global warming, including water and energy efficiency programs in low-income neighborhoods and programs to retrofit high-polluting vehicles like school buses and port facility equipment.

In addition, the public agency conducting the environmental review must address the impacts of global warming on the proposed project itself and the project’s impacts. For example, as global warming increases, a proposed beachfront hotel or hill-slope development may be more vulnerable to flooding and increased erosion, while a new golf course may require increased landscape irrigation, further constraining water supplies. An analysis of these changes in environmental conditions is essential both to protect the public from new risks and to calculate the project’s environmental impacts accurately.
Unfortunately, many public agencies do not currently evaluate the environmental consequences of global warming. This has recently generated attention at the highest levels of state government.

- The California Attorney General’s office has submitted extensive comment letters and has filed litigation to ensure that local agencies address global warming adequately in their CEQA review process. Several environmental organizations are also pursuing legal challenges and the first decisions have emphasized the need to address GHG emissions.

- In 2007, the California Legislature passed and Governor Schwarzenegger signed SB 97, which requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research to develop new CEQA Guidelines establishing criteria for evaluating global warming.

- Many regional air quality control districts are examining methods for addressing global warming in CEQA and considering setting “thresholds” that would establish the smallest quantities of GHG emissions that the districts would regulate in addition to any local regulations.

## Success in the Making

CEQA Helps Local Environmentalists and Attorney General Force San Bernardino County to Reduce Greenhouse Gases

Facing intense pressure from developers and plagued by several recent corruption scandals, San Bernardino County officials were not paying much attention to global warming when approving the latest update to the county-wide General Plan in March 2007.

Fortunately, others were. When the General Plan underwent its environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), several environmental organizations submitted public comments regarding the inadequate assessment of the greenhouse gas emissions that would be generated by implementing the plan, along with other shortcomings. (The plan proposed accommodating a 25 percent increase in population by 2030 without strengthening density requirements, energy efficiency standards, and other policies that would mitigate the increase in emissions and protect the region’s natural resources.) The plan also caught the attention of the California Attorney General, who submitted a comment letter on the poor treatment of global warming and air quality in the environmental review.

When the County ignored these comments and approved the environmental review, both the local environmental organizations and the Attorney General sued San Bernardino County for failing to comply with CEQA, particularly for its failure to analyze increased greenhouse gas emissions that would result from the proposed plan.

Those cases resulted in a settlement agreement in which the County agreed to adopt a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan to ensure an overall reduction in the emissions associated with the County’s discretionary land use decisions and the County’s internal government operations.

Drew Feldmann, President of the San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society, says the suit that his organization co-filed can serve as an example for other communities. “If there’s something to be learned from this, it’s that you should watch your local agencies. When they review a project under CEQA make sure it includes all environmental issues including global warming. It’s a public process. You need to send in letters, testify at hearings, in essence, make your voice heard. If the public agency does not incorporate the necessary changes you may need to gather resources and litigate.”
**- What You Can Do -**

1. Participate in the CEQA process and make sure the lead public agency sufficiently addresses global warming in each project it reviews.

CEQA’s public review process gives local residents and community organizations many opportunities to flag global warming issues for new projects and to hold agencies legally accountable if they fail to respond appropriately. Don’t forget the law of supply and demand; if many people request that an agency calculates a project’s emissions and includes measures to avoid or reduce those emissions, the agency is much more likely to provide what the community requests.

Here are some helpful tips:

- Educate yourself. Find out what projects have been proposed for your area and how the project proponents plan to address their projects’ contributions to global warming and the impacts of global warming on their projects. Find out how various public agencies in your area are treating global warming in the CEQA review process.
- Make sure the public agency staff and each of the decision makers has a copy of the latest information on CEQA and global warming. This should include guidance documents from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, comment letters and legal briefs from the California Attorney General’s office, and legal memos from the Planning and Conservation League and the Center for Biological Diversity.
- Carefully review and comment on each project’s environmental analysis to ensure that it correctly lists the emissions from the project and those of each alternative as well as the emission reduction potential of each mitigation measure. Provide cost estimates of various GHG emission reduction measures to help demonstrate their feasibility.
- Build a public campaign highlighting CEQA’s environmental review process as both an excellent opportunity for our decision makers to take real action on global warming and a critical legal obligation.
- Be an advocate for the sort of growth that you would like to see, such as projects that are resource efficient and help reduce an area’s GHG emissions, such as transit, bike, and pedestrian oriented developments that increase an area’s density and generate opportunities for low-carbon lifestyles. Help ensure that local governments embrace environmentally preferable projects to demonstrate that alternatives to “business as usual” are economically feasible and publicly popular.

2. Request that your local CEQA Guidelines be revised to address global warming.

The California Resources Agency maintains a set of official guidelines to help facilitate the implementation of CEQA. In addition to these state-level CEQA Guidelines, many communities in California have local CEQA guidelines that provide information about how local public agencies customarily address certain environmental impacts.

Encourage your local officials to revise the community’s local guidelines so that they do the following:

- Require each project to inventory its GHG emissions and to reduce or avoid GHG emissions where feasible;
- Establish a list of GHG mitigation measures that should be considered with all project applications.

Your local government can also pass a resolution establishing a uniform policy for the GHG emissions of new development. For example, a local ordinance could require that all development proposals demonstrate how the project proponent will eliminate the GHG emissions associated with the construction and operation of the project.
Encourage your regional air quality control district to establish a “zero emission” threshold for greenhouse gases.

Because many regional air quality control districts are considering setting thresholds for the minimum quantity of GHG emissions that would require evaluation and mitigation, you may need to get involved and advocate for as low a GHG threshold as possible, preferably zero.

Here’s how you might want to make your case:
California’s GHG emissions must be reduced by at least 80 percent over the coming decades to avoid the most catastrophic effects of global warming. That means we’re clearly “out of attainment” with healthy levels of GHGs. When a region is out of attainment with federal air pollution standards, there are strong repercussions including restrictions in federal funding and initiation of regional efforts to reduce the air quality impacts of new development. The regional air districts should require the same attention when addressing GHGs as they do with our worst air pollution problems.

Speak to your regional air quality control district staff regarding our “lack of attainment” for GHG emissions and encourage them to reject thresholds that allow certain projects to slip under the wire, thereby increasing our GHG emissions while the State races to decrease them.

Work with the local water agency to ensure that the project’s Water Supply Assessment addresses global warming.

For certain large-scale projects, including developments with 500 or more dwelling units, the public agency that would provide water to the project must prepare a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) that demonstrates that there is enough water to satisfy both the needs of the project under review and other planned growth in the area.

The CEQA analysis of a project must analyze the environmental impacts of delivering that water to the project.

Since global warming will have profound effects on California’s water supplies, water agencies will need to make pragmatic reviews of future development to be sure that they can supply enough water for current and future customers under these new environmental conditions. In addition, the public agency conducting the CEQA review will need to analyze the GHG emissions associated with pumping water to the development.

Community organizations can perform a valuable public service by making sure that proposed developments commit to minimizing new water demand and that the water agency’s estimates factor in the effects of global warming on all parts of the water-delivery process.

Talk to your local water agency about its WSA process. Make sure WSAs thoroughly examine both water supply and energy-use issues, including:

- The total energy the water agency will need, over 20 years, to pump water to the project, and the GHG emissions from that energy source;
- An analysis of on-site and off-site options to reduce GHG emissions from water use, such as water conservation and water recycling; and,
- An assessment of the agency’s ability to deliver water to future projects that incorporates potential impacts of global warming, including any potential losses or disruptions of water supplies.
Certain projects carried out by federal agencies or which receive federal funds must also comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Similar to CEQA in many ways, NEPA also informs decision makers and the public about a proposed project’s potential impacts to the environment and public health. In California, when a project must comply with NEPA and CEQA, a single agency usually conducts one analysis to meet both sets of requirements and presents its conclusions in a single document.

Several recent legal decisions have concluded that NEPA analysis requires the consideration of global warming, including an analysis of a project’s GHG emissions. For example, on November 15, 2007, the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco threw out the Bush Administration’s new fuel-economy standards for sport-utility vehicles, minivans, and pick up trucks, ruling that the standards violated NEPA and other laws for failure to analyze GHG emissions.

For more information on NEPA, or to download the court’s opinion, see the Appendix.

- What You Can Do -

Participate in the NEPA process for federal projects that will affect your region; make sure the lead agency sufficiently addresses global warming in each project it reviews.

Because the NEPA process closely resembles the CEQA process, many of the opportunities for community engagement are similar as well. Educate yourself about the NEPA process and any upcoming NEPA reviews in your region. Notify your decision makers about the latest NEPA cases that address global warming. Participate at every stage in the environmental review process to ensure that our public agencies adequately address global warming. If necessary, the courts may need to hold agencies accountable for violations of NEPA.
The California Coastal Act of 1976 is one of the state's strongest regionally specific environmental laws. It establishes policies on issues such as terrestrial and marine habitat, agricultural lands, commercial fisheries, industrial uses, water quality, offshore oil and gas development, transportation, development design, power plants, ports, and public works.

The California Coastal Commission plans and regulates the use of land and water in the coastal zone in partnership with coastal cities and counties. To determine whether a proposed project would be consistent with the Coastal Act and other local, state, and national policies, the Coastal Commission reviews the proposed project’s permit application. This application describes any mitigation and monitoring measures necessary to achieve conformity with coastal policies. Generally, development within the coastal zone may not commence until a coastal development permit has been issued.

The California Coastal Commission has begun to require assessment of GHG emissions for some proposed projects.

In April 2007, the California Coastal Commission unanimously rejected a permit application for the Cabrillo Port coastal liquefied natural gas facility, in part because the project proponents had not committed to mitigate the GHG emissions from the construction and operation of the facility.

For more information on the California Coastal Act or to download the Coastal Commission staff report on the Cabrillo Port LNG project, see the Appendix.

- What You Can Do -

1. Make sure that all projects sufficiently address global warming before receiving a coastal development permit.

   Talk to the Coastal Commission staff, submit comment letters, and speak at Coastal Commission hearings to advocate for the proper treatment of global warming in all coastal development permits. Make sure any GHG mitigation proposals accurately assess the project’s impact and provide real, quantifiable, verifiable, and permanent emission reductions.
California’s Building Energy Efficiency Standards, also known as Title 24, apply to new and major renovation building projects. They cover the building envelope, mechanical systems such as air conditioning systems and water heaters, signs, and lighting. They do not address the source of energy for the building (coal, natural gas, clean alternative energy, etc.) or other issues such as proximity to necessary amenities or expected vehicle miles traveled to and from the building.

The California Energy Commission adopted the Title 24 standards in 1978 and has since updated them several times.

On July 17, 2008, the California Building Standards Commission adopted the first statewide green building code in the nation. The new code is currently voluntary and becomes mandatory in 2010. Following 2010, evaluation of the code will occur annually to ensure that it features the latest technology and construction practices.

Local building permit jurisdictions are required to withhold permits until the building satisfies the latest Title 24 standards.

Many local governments in California have implemented additional energy efficiency and green building standards. For example, the City of Cotati has adopted a Sustainable Building Program that requires all new residential and commercial construction and all large commercial renovations to meet the following conditions:

- Be at least 15 percent more energy efficient overall than Title 24 standards;
- Earn at least 90 points on the Build It Green “GreenPoints Checklist” rating scale (see below);
- Use 50 percent native plants, 80 percent drought-tolerant plants and 80 percent drip irrigation for exterior landscaping;
- Pre-plumb for solar energy use;
- Use 30 percent fly ash (a coal-fired power plant by-product and concrete additive) in appropriate construction materials.

In addition, some project proponents choose to exceed existing minimum building standards and achieve “green” certification for their building projects. The two most popular programs that provide such certification in California are “Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design” (LEED) and “GreenPoint Rated” (GPR). The LEED Green Building Rating System, a program of the U.S. Green Building Council, focuses on commercial development projects and has recently launched a Neighborhood Development (ND) certification program that measures compliance with smart growth principles. Berkeley-based non-profit Build It Green administers the GreenPoint program, rating the environmental impacts of residential housing projects. Both are independent non-profit organizations whose credibility comes from their impartial analysis, their rigorous review of standards and materials, and the broad range of community, government, and industry stakeholders who participate in their decision making processes.
The 1978 Building Energy Efficiency Standards were created in part due to rising energy costs and the OPEC oil crisis. Since then, extensive research has demonstrated a wide range of environmental and community benefits, including reduced costs for building owners, increased comfort and improved indoor air quality for occupants, reduced construction and demolition waste, and greater reliability of California’s energy infrastructure.

Increasing the energy efficiency of buildings has also been recognized as one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce energy demand and related GHG emissions. Some innovative building designs have actually eliminated the need for expensive heating and cooling systems. Others have reduced projected water demand by more than 50 percent, particularly relevant in California where 19 percent of all our electricity is used to move, treat, or heat water.

Many tools exist to estimate the GHG reduction benefits of various building design techniques and building efficiency standards. Efforts are underway to more precisely quantify the GHG emission reduction potential for both the LEED and Build It Green standards.

For more information on Title 24, progressive local building codes, LEED, and Build It Green, see the Appendix.
In 2006, the City of Santa Rosa embarked on a revitalization plan for its moribund downtown, hoping to rebuild the Railroad Square area. However, the city’s initial design, called the Station Area Plan, which included major retail and office construction, did not include green building standards for commercial projects. Furthermore, there was no low or moderate-income housing in the plan, and little consideration of bicycle-friendly planning as an alternative to vehicle-based transportation.

Indeed, there was not much precedent for green building in Santa Rosa. The city’s 2004 voluntary “Build It Green” program for new home construction, while progressive, had resulted in certification of only about two percent of all new dwelling units built since its implementation.

When the city announced the Station Area Plan process, the Accountable Development Coalition, a Sonoma County community organization made up of 14 grassroots organizations representing environment, labor, affordable housing, student, and social justice groups, started to make plans of its own to make sure the city addressed the issues that mattered most to its members. Together, they formed a critical mass of community interests that became a powerful, organized constituency in the Station Area Plan process.

Coalition members identified components they wanted to see in the plan and galvanized community support with a comprehensive outreach effort:

- Canvassing neighborhoods with a multilingual campaign to raise awareness of the planning process and spark community involvement;
- Organizing public information meetings for local government agency officials and the Santa Rosa community;
- Generating reports that evaluated the city plan and submitting detailed proposals for modifications;
- Attending every city government public meeting on the plan and articulating these proposals; and,
- Publicizing their proposals through a multi-faceted communications program that included community relations, media relations, and neighborhood outreach.

The revised Station Area Plan adopted by the City in October 2007 includes policy goals for low and moderate-income housing, bike paths, bike lockers and showers for commercial construction, and voluntary “Build It Green” standards for both commercial and residential construction.

During the campaign, both supporters and opponents of the plan’s green building component questioned why the city should impose standards only on the downtown area. The Coalition took that opportunity to advocate for a mandatory citywide green building ordinance. The idea caught hold and in October 2007, the City Council voted to establish a task force made up of builders, coalition members, and other community constituencies to hammer out the details of the proposed ordinance. In April 2008, the city adopted a new mandatory citywide green building ordinance for all new and major renovation construction projects, addressing both residential and commercial developments.

The Coalition has received funding from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to produce a report on green building policy “best practices” and advocate for adoption of model green building policies by all cities in Sonoma County.
- What You Can Do -

1. **Educate yourself on green building and energy efficiency standards.**

   Learn more about how green building standards can help reduce your community’s carbon footprint. Contact your local planning and building departments to see if they require additional energy efficiency or green building measures beyond the existing state standards and if they have quantified the GHG reduction potential of additional measures.

2. **Make the case that strengthening your community’s green building standards will help fight global warming.**

   Organize an informational meeting on green building standards and hold it in a centrally located public building, such as city hall or the main library. Invite your local government agency’s elected officials and administrators, building industry representatives, and the public. Have experts explain the local and global benefits of strengthened standards. Meet with local elected officials to discuss how to implement local green building standards.

3. **Engage elected officials in the process.**

   Local elected officials are more likely to support new standards if they feel engaged in the process. Ask a receptive elected official to make a motion at the next public meeting to create a “Green Building and Global Warming” task force to develop policy recommendations. Keep local officials apprised of your progress. If local elected officials are unresponsive, consider other approaches such as running a local voter initiative.
A city or county’s General Plan establishes policies and goals for future actions regarding growth and government operations. This overarching document is particularly powerful because all project-level decisions made by the city or county government must be consistent with General Plan policies.

Each General Plan is divided into thematic chapters called “elements.” The seven mandatory elements are land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. Cities and counties have the authority to adopt other elements, such as energy, cultural/historical resources, and environmental justice. The General Plan must also include a land use map showing where residential, commercial, and industrial development should be located and where open space should be protected or new park space created.

The California courts have called the General Plan the “constitution for all future development” of an area. However, some local governments will readily amend the General Plan to allow approval of inconsistent projects. In addition, while state law requires that cities and counties keep their General Plans up to date, many include elements that are several decades old, usually due to lack of funding.

There are several variants of the General Plan. These variants usually cover a defined portion of a jurisdiction (e.g. Waterfront Specific Plan, Downtown Redevelopment Plan) and are generally prepared in the same manner as the General Plan.

Six of the mandatory General Plan elements have a direct connection with global warming: land use, housing, circulation, conservation, open space, and safety. Policies in each of these elements may affect efforts to reduce GHG-emissions and improve the community’s resilience to global warming. The location and density of proposed dwelling units in the housing element may lead to an increase in the number and length of vehicle miles traveled in the region. Circulation policies that prioritize unencumbered motorized vehicle travel such as the Level of Service (LOS) may compromise the viability of less GHG-intensive forms of mobility. The safety element may not take into account future global warming impacts, for example, allowing development in areas that may become less safe in the future because of sea level rise.

Fortunately, some cities and counties in California have begun to address these barriers. For example, in November 2007, Marin County adopted a groundbreaking new General Plan that includes concrete policies regarding the carbon footprint of new development.

In addition, because a General Plan update must undergo CEQA analysis before adoption, some individuals and organizations have challenged proposed General Plans that do not meet all of the legal requirements regarding global warming discussed above.

For more information on General Plans, to download Marin County’s new General Plan, or to purchase Land Use and the General Plan, authored by PCL’s General Counsel Gary Patton, see the Appendix.
In November 2007, the Marin County Board of Supervisors unanimously adopted one of the nation’s most ambitious general plans to fight global warming. And the plan isn’t just talk; the Supervisors enshrined their commitment in a board resolution in 2003 that establishes local emission reduction targets.

The new General Plan establishes policies and programs to minimize local emissions of greenhouse gases. The County has already established new green building standards, is developing a program to assess emissions from new proposed projects, promotes correcting the jobs-housing imbalance that perpetuates long commute patterns, and will be providing programs to respond to projected increases in sea level.

As Roger Roberts of the Marin Conservation League notes, the plan was the result of more than four years of hard work. “Many local environmental groups came together in 2003 and prepared a 50-page white paper on various land use and environmental policies that the county should adopt. Through our subsequent ‘Campaign for Marin,’ many of the policies that were supported in the white paper were eventually incorporated into the county’s General Plan.”

Roberts credits the plan’s success on a convergence of factors. “The main challenge was getting people who were sympathetic to our positions but not participating to become active, and getting volunteers that would be able to speak intelligently on particular issues of concern. But the Campaign for Marin group always made sure that we had a position paper to present at each of the hearings for the various issues presented and we met at least once a month and frequently more often in order to discuss our progress. We were fortunate that the county staff was sympathetic to principles of sustainability. Also, when the county hired Clem Shute as its legal counsel that was a great help, as well as when they hired an outside consultant, Terry Watt.”

For Roberts and the other ‘Campaign for Marin’ participants, the work is far from over. Local activists are now focused on making sure the plan is properly implemented and helping to update other local plans and programs for consistency with the new county-wide document. They are also supporting the Marin Clean Energy Plan to acquire more control over their energy sources and increase the use of renewable power in Marin.
- What You Can Do -

1. Participate in the update to the General Plan; Make sure each element clearly outlines how the local government will respond to global warming.

Because the General Plan is a policy document that is meant to guide future development, the update process usually involves considerable opportunities for public participation. Individuals and stakeholder groups often use the General Plan update as a chance to advance their cause or protect it from encroachment by others. In addition, local media often cover the update process as a community visioning activity. Make sure that the final document includes clear policies to reduce GHG emissions by using the techniques described throughout this toolkit.

2. Make sure that the General Plan is not amended in ways that would increase GHG emissions.

Although a full update of the General Plan generally takes years to complete, once approved, it may be amended up to four times every year. Every few months, proposed amendments are usually compiled into one document, which is then reviewed and voted upon by the City Council or County Board of Supervisors.

Make sure that your local officials, the public, and the media understand what is at stake if a General Plan amendment results in an increase of GHG emissions. Remind them of the public input that went into creating the General Plan in the first place and propose alternative methods for achieving the desired effect without damaging the climate.

Regional Transportation Plans

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long-term plan for a region’s transportation system. Typically prepared every four years by a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) or a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), RTPs look 20 or more years into the future to identify and analyze the transportation needs of a region and create a framework for project priorities.

No transportation project can qualify for state or federal money unless it is found to be consistent with regional goals, and thus included in the RTP. Directives contained in federal transportation and clean air legislation require that the RTP include only those projects that the region can afford, and that, taken as a whole, help improve air quality. In addition, when developing RTPs, planning agencies are required to consider the protection and enhancement of the environment, promotion of energy conservation, and improvement of the quality of life.

In 2008, the California Legislature and Governor Schwarzenegger enacted SB 375 (Steinberg), which links many of the state’s RTPs more closely with smart growth priorities and GHG reductions. The law

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) determines which projects receive state and federal funding. Changing the priorities in an RTP can dramatically alter travel choices and land use patterns.
charges the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with establishing GHG emission reduction targets for the 18 regions of California covered by an MPO by 2010 and requires the RTPs for those regions to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that achieves the region’s GHG target to the extent feasible. If CARB determines that an SCS will not achieve the regional reduction targets, the planning agency must identify further measures that would be needed to reach the targets in an Alternate Planning Strategy (APS). Transportation projects inconsistent with the SCS would not qualify for transportation funding. In addition, residential and mixed use residential development projects that conform to a SCS or APS, certified by CARB as capable of achieving the GHG reduction targets for the region, would be exempted from certain portions of the environmental review process.

SB 375 increases the stakes for regional planning. It also challenges concerned individuals to learn how MPOs work and how to ensure the best possible outcomes. As a public body, each MPO is required to make the RTP development a public process with many opportunities for public input and participation. An MPO governance structure typically includes a variety of committees as well as a professional staff. In most MPOs, the top-level decision making body is the Policy Committee, which includes elected and/or appointed officials from local municipalities; representatives of different transportation modes (e.g., public transit, freight, bicycle/pedestrian); and state agency officials (e.g., California Department of Transportation). Some members of the Policy Committee may not be elected officials and may feel less accountable to members of the public, creating a unique challenge for those working with MPOs to improve RTPs. In addition, it may be difficult to convince elected officials from local jurisdictions to look beyond their own area’s interests and act in the interest of the broader region. Each MPO’s website should include a timeline for the current round of regional transportation planning and a list of public meeting times.

See Regional Transportation Plans in the Appendix for more information about the RTP process, MPO and RTPA boundaries, and SB 375.

Transportation accounts for more than 40 percent of GHG emissions in California. Therefore, decisions about how to spend transportation dollars can have an enormous effect on the trajectory of a region’s emissions. Will your region choose to subsidize highways or will it prioritize investment in bicycle and pedestrian amenities and public transportation? The RTP helps determine if residents have the opportunity to choose more sustainable transportation alternatives for their daily activities.

Transportation funding decisions also influence the GHG emissions of new development. For example, expanding roads and highways to more far-flung areas encourages local governments to approve GHG-intensive sprawl development while infrastructure investments in the urban core can guide local governments to direct growth to dense, less auto-dependent areas. The RTP can also direct transportation funds toward those jurisdictions that have committed to making smart land use decisions or distribute funds widely regardless of land use standards and policies.

The Climate Connection

Transportation accounts for more than 40 percent of GHG emissions in California. Therefore, decisions about how to spend transportation dollars can have an enormous effect on the trajectory of a region’s emissions. Will your region choose to subsidize highways or will it prioritize investment in bicycle and pedestrian amenities and public transportation? The RTP helps determine if residents have the opportunity to choose more sustainable transportation alternatives for their daily activities.
TransForm, formerly TALC (Transportation and Land Use Coalition) leads the grassroots activist community working on RTPs in the San Francisco Bay Area. With encouragement from TransForm, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (the Bay Area’s MPO) has set broad goals and concrete targets for its 2009 RTP in the areas of Economy, Environment, and Equity. The Environment targets for 2035 include reducing CO₂ to 40 percent below 1990 levels, reducing fine particulate matter to 10 percent below 2006 levels, reducing coarse particulate matter to 45 percent below 2006 levels, and reducing the number of vehicle miles traveled per capita to 10 percent below 2006 levels.

Because project recommendations come from the city and county level, the trick now is to ensure that these concrete regional targets determine which projects and programs receive funding in the final RTP.

Success in the Making
Bay Area Group Helps Shift Focus of Regional Transportation Plan, Praises Concrete GHG Reduction Targets

TransForm, formerly TALC (Transportation and Land Use Coalition) leads the grassroots activist community working on RTPs in the San Francisco Bay Area. With encouragement from TransForm, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (the Bay Area’s MPO) has set broad goals and concrete targets for its 2009 RTP in the areas of Economy, Environment, and Equity. The Environment targets for 2035 include reducing CO₂ to 40 percent below 1990 levels, reducing fine particulate matter to 10 percent below 2006 levels, reducing coarse particulate matter to 45 percent below 2006 levels, and reducing the number of vehicle miles traveled per capita to 10 percent below 2006 levels.

Because project recommendations come from the city and county level, the trick now is to ensure that these concrete regional targets determine which projects and programs receive funding in the final RTP.

To learn more about TransForm’s efforts, see the Appendix.

- What You Can Do -

1. Reduce the GHG emissions generated from vehicle trips to and from new developments by helping to prioritize those infrastructure projects in the Regional Transportation Plan that will direct growth to existing urban cores.

Traditionally, RTP processes have focused on securing funding for a pre-determined collection of infrastructure projects. Each jurisdiction in the region is given a funding allocation and provides a list of preferred projects to the Congestion Management Agency (CMA). The CMAs then create a consolidated list and provide that to the MPO, which makes the final evaluation of which projects to include in the RTP.

Get involved with the infrastructure project funding selection process at the city and CMA level to advocate for prioritization of projects that will decrease GHG emissions, such as transit, bike, and pedestrian oriented programs.

2. Make sure your MPO adopts a strong Sustainable Communities Strategy that meets or exceeds the region’s GHG emission reduction target.

The new requirement to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) provides an opportunity to fundamentally change the way the RTP process is structured. Get involved very early in the process to educate MPO members about what can be achieved through smart land use and transportation infrastructure decisions in your region. Build public support for a bold and ambitious SCS. Follow up after the plan’s adoption to ensure that the right projects receive the incentives outlined in SB 375.
Administered by the California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), the Regional Blueprint Planning Program aims to foster more efficient land use patterns by helping regional governmental agencies create a preferred growth scenario or “blueprint” for the area.

The Council of Governments (COG) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) are the principal regional governmental agencies involved in the blueprint planning process. Other participants include rural regional transportation planning agencies, regional air quality districts, local governments, and non-governmental stakeholders.

These regional blueprints face a number of unique challenges. The decision making body of a COG consists of elected officials from various jurisdictions who are appointed to represent their jurisdiction on the COG. Therefore, as with MPOs, members of COG boards are frequently reluctant to support regional land use plans that minimize GHG emissions if doing so would contradict the wishes of the local governments they represent. COGs also lack general governmental authority in that they are not directly elected; they do not have direct taxation powers, police powers, or regulatory authority; and do not generally have funds at their disposal. In addition, new requirements to prepare Sustainable Communities Strategies as part of Regional Transportation Plans may cause confusion about how to best integrate these similar regional planning processes.

See Regional Blueprints in the Appendix for more information about COGs and blueprints.

**The Climate Connection**

Addressing issues of growth and development at a regional level can help reduce the GHG emissions associated with new development in a variety of ways. For example, by identifying regional commute patterns, adjacent jurisdictions may determine that their congestion management strategies provide local benefits but increase the number and length of vehicle trips in another area. Likewise, if job opportunities are concentrated in one jurisdiction while homes and municipal services are located elsewhere, regional planning can identify how best to transform both areas into mixed-use communities with shops and amenities close to home, allowing residents to walk or bike to their favorite destinations. Finally, local government officials may be able to learn from their neighbors about successful smart growth and low impact development policies.
Success in the Making

*Focus Our Vision establishes funding priorities*

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Bay Area’s COG, is undertaking a Blueprint Planning Process called Focusing Our Vision (FOCUS) in conjunction with three other regional agencies.

ABAG invited local jurisdictions to submit applications for areas that they would like to see designated as “Priority Development Areas” (PDA) and “Priority Conservation Areas” (PCA). The Association also convened working groups for both PDAs and PCAs with representatives from local government, local and regional agencies, and the non-profit sector to help determine proper criteria for PDA and PCA designations.

Regional agencies have pledged to support local governments’ commitment to these goals by directing resources, including financial incentives and technical assistance, to the designated priority areas. For example, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay Area’s MPO, recently voted to allow jurisdictions with designated PDAs to apply for funding from MTC’s Station Area Planning program to develop Specific Plans for their PDAs.

Bay Area activists, including Greenbelt Alliance, are participating in the FOCUS process, helping ensure that appropriate areas receive priority designations and developing criteria to determine which areas should receive funding.

- **What You Can Do** -

1. **Participate in the Blueprint planning process.**

   COGs throughout the state are conducting Blueprint Planning Processes. Educate yourself about blueprint planning and study successful examples like the Sacramento Area Council of Government’s Preferred Blueprint Scenario for 2050. Contact your COG to find out more about its efforts and how to add your voice.

2. **Link the Blueprint to other enforceable policies.**

   Because the nature of COG membership may weaken the quality of the blueprint and the COG’s lack of authority may make it difficult to convince cities to follow regional blueprint plans, it is best to link the outcomes of the blueprint to other enforceable policies. Ask your local government officials to incorporate the best of the blueprint into existing funding sources like the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or to policy documents with legal enforceability, such as the General Plan.
Each year the California Legislature debates bills that would reduce the carbon footprint of new development. The success or failure of these bills frequently depends on the ability of local activists to sway popular opinion and convince their elected representatives to take action. Legislators who hear frequently from their constituents are much more likely to resist the pressure of lobbyists from polluting industries and support strong environmental legislation. In the best of circumstances, elected officials listen to the demands of voters. If voters don’t demand action, they won’t get it.

- What You Can Do -

1. Contact the Planning and Conservation League (PCL) to find out how to build local support for strong state environmental legislation.

Visit [www.PCL.org](http://www.PCL.org) to sign up for the *PCL Insider*, our weekly e-newsletter, bringing you environmental news from the Capitol and around the state. Call our staff at (916) 444-8726 to find out which bills are most important this year.
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Part III: Campaign Strategy Tips

In this section, we will help you map out a successful campaign to engage your local government agencies in reducing the GHG emissions from new developments. If you don’t find what you’re looking for here, feel free to contact PCL for strategic counsel and referrals to other technical resources.

Step 1: Know the Territory

Your campaign has the greatest likelihood of success if you know the lay of the land before you begin. Here are some areas that you want to make sure to cover:

- Identify groups that are working on global warming or related issues such as public health advocacy, natural resource protection, and promotion of clean alternative energy sources. Do they already have a campaign focused on the carbon footprint of new development? Would they be interested in collaborating to create one?
- Collect detailed information on local elected officials and staff. What are their perspectives on global warming? Have they taken positions on any related issues such as energy conservation, open space protection, or public health? Is there a gatekeeper or a logjam breaker who you can approach informally as you develop your plan?
- Find out whether any of your local governments have already made GHG emission reduction commitments (e.g. “Cool Mayors Campaign” or “Cool Counties Campaign”) and if they are already engaged in an implementation process to follow through on those commitments. For example, many California cities are participating in the International Cities for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) Cities for Climate Protection program in which ICLEI staff help local governments create a GHG inventory, establish emission reduction targets, and identify actions to achieve those reductions. These goal-setting activities can provide a venue for introducing specific policy proposals, expanding the range of issues under consideration, and helping to turn good ideas into legally binding policies. If there are no such programs in your community, establishing one can be an effective way to build coalitions and set the stage for future campaigns. For examples of existing community initiatives, see the Appendix.
• Assess other potential opportunities. Is there a General Plan update in progress? Are there major development proposals about to go through the CEQA process that will capture the public’s attention? Are there voluntary green building programs in place? Your search doesn’t need to be exhaustive but the more information that you have available, the more strategic you can be when deciding how to engage.

• Take the pulse of your community. What sorts of campaigns are they likely to support? Which voices in the community are seen as trustworthy? Are there issues that are particularly resonant such as agricultural preservation, public health, job growth, or international security that could serve as an entrée to global warming?

Here are some positive trends to consider when assessing your local landscape:

• California has reached a “tipping point” of acceptance of global warming as a credible scientific issue that requires action by governments and individuals. According to a nationwide survey in September 2007 by the GfK Roper Yale Survey on Environmental Issues, 74 percent of respondents said that in general, they want their own local governments to do more to reduce GHGs. In addition, the survey found that substantial majorities favor a number of specific, local GHG-reducing policies that would include tax increases. See the Appendix for a link to the full report.

• Broad new alliances are developing around the issue of global warming; traditional environmental organizations, local government officials, faith communities, social justice advocates, urban communities of color, public health organizations, even business owners, ranchers, farmers, and rural landowners are making common cause to fight this global problem.

• In California, the impacts of global warming are becoming increasingly clear, particularly for the state’s water supplies. This makes the threat more tangible and the solutions more pressing.

However, major political and policy change is never simple or easy. These are some likely obstacles to consider:

• Local officials may react negatively to proposals that they perceive as requiring substantial changes to existing policies and processes. This includes both elected representatives, such as city council members, and administrators, such as city managers and planning directors.

• Local officials may not be aware of the impact their decision making can have on GHG emissions, and may react defensively when presented with information about how their decisions contribute to global warming. They may also view GHG emission reducing policies as potential deal-killers for local development projects, which they rely on for tax revenues and positive campaign donor relations.

• Opponents may point to the struggling economy and the mortgage industry woes as reasons that California communities can’t afford GHG-reducing policies. (Nothing could be farther from the truth. The cost of inaction is far greater and many policies discussed in this toolkit would reduce costs for businesses and consumers.)
Discipline yourself. Chart out a plan to create meaningful change and stick to it. Your campaign should bring together a surprisingly broad constituency. Invite potential partners in early and create the campaign together. Identify your grudges and work past them. Talk with those individuals and groups most directly affected by your campaign before taking action.

Establish what your values are (protecting the environment, safeguarding our health) and your broad goal (fighting global warming, reducing the GHG emissions of new development) and then choose a series of concrete, achievable outcomes as the objectives of your campaign. Develop several strategies that, when carried out together, will accomplish your objectives. Outline the individual tactics that comprise each strategy, ensuring that they can be accomplished with the resources and time you have available. Plan some easy, early successes to build momentum.

Incorporate carrots and sticks throughout your planning. For example, think about how to promote environmentally preferable developments while making it harder to continue with “business as usual” development patterns.

Develop a range of volunteer activities that include education, organizing, and advocacy. Pair up volunteers with tasks that leave them more enthused and committed. Create opportunities to let new leaders emerge. If there are any paid staff available to help, establish clear ground rules regarding decision making authority and campaign ownership.

Run your plan by partners and revise it based upon their feedback.

Carry out your campaign with gusto, chutzpah, audacity, resolve, humor, and confidence. Here are some campaign activities you won’t want to overlook:

**Outreach with Pizzazz**

Stick to a simple, clear message that is both catchy and factual. Remember to explain what values are stake, what the threats are, why the threats are urgent, and what solutions are available.

Think of a name for the campaign that communicates what you want to accomplish (e.g. “Lighter Carbon Footprint Campaign,” “Climate Champions Campaign,” or “Carbon Neutral Now”).

Choose campaign themes that engage community members as potential partners in protecting our collective future. Consider framing your GHG emission reduction campaign as a practical community-wide solution to the global problem:
“A healthy future is our collective responsibility. With a practical GHG-emission reduction plan we can safeguard our region’s natural resources as well as its economic vitality and well-being.”

Ask the public to view the situation from the perspective of prudent stewards of valuable public resources, a system in which we all have a stake. Highlight global warming impacts to all area residents and show how your policy proposals would protect the entire community. Present your proposals as part of a responsible, mainstream response to deal with a serious problem before it’s too late.

For more information on this issue, see Prudent Stewardship in the Appendix.

✔ Teach ‘Em the Facts

As with any new piece of information, it will take a while for your campaign to become widely understood. Expect your audience to have to hear your central messages many times over from many different voices before it finally sinks in.

Use a variety of methods to reach the public from emails and websites to announcements at public events and living room gatherings. Get yourself invited to the local Rotary and Kiwanis meetings to report on your efforts. Plan a conference or forum where trusted community leaders and other experts can present the problem and outline potential solutions. Choose neutral locations where potentially hostile local officials can come without feeling threatened or attacked. Buy an advertisement in the local paper. Speak about the campaign at local hearings, even when it is not on the agenda. Soon your issue will become everyone’s issue.

✔ Lobby Effectively

Lobbying visits are surprisingly easy once you get the hang of them.

When calling to set up an appointment, remind the scheduler that you are a local constituent and identify any other individuals who would like to participate. Group visits are usually more influential than individual visits and the scheduler will likely be more attentive to a request for a group visit.

Prepare in advance for your conversation with the local government officials or their staff. Make an agenda outlining which topics each participant will cover. Clearly define what concrete action you want the official to take and which issues are “out of bounds” during the visit. Make sure you can get your message across in the time allotted for your meeting; it could be as little as five minutes or as long as an hour.

During your visit, be polite and friendly but firm. Feel free to ask where the official stands on your issue and don’t forget to ask for what you want. If the official is not supportive or has concerns, leave the door open for a change of heart. Offer to answer any outstanding questions. If you don’t know an answer, promise to report back with the requested information and follow through on that promise.

After the visit, follow up with the office to either thank them for their support or to express your continued interest and availability for follow-up questions.

✔ Help the Media Help You

The media is trying to tell a good story to an audience with a short attention span. Help them do their job by thinking about your campaign from their perspective. Who are the main characters? What is the central conflict? What would happen if the story didn’t turn out well?

Help contextualize your activities as part of a larger story about the international response to global warming. Get local reporters in the loop on global warming news stories by connecting them with public policy and communication strategy firm Cater Communications (Christina@catercommunications.com), which provides journalists with an email summary of recent global warming articles.
Convert complex information into terms and anecdotes that the general public can clearly understand and will find compelling. Avoid using jargon, complex sentence structures, and lists. Choose a few key statistics to help tell your story but don’t rely upon them to carry your message.

Write out the one sentence you would like to see as your quote in the paper or on the radio. Practice saying it aloud. Say it very early during your interview and pause to let the interviewer write it down.

Don’t forget to check back in with the media to update them on the status of your efforts.

✔ Say What Needs to be Said

Keep these two fundamental questions in mind throughout your campaign:

Who do you want to do what?
What do they need to know or believe in order to do it?

For example, suppose you want a city council member to propose that the council creates a task force to study methods to reduce the carbon footprint of new development through the CEQA process. The council member may need to know that other communities in California have taken similar actions and that the California Attorney General has recently litigated on this issue. The council member may need to believe that there is sufficient community interest and expertise to make the task force an effective solution. Stay focused on what you want them to do, not simply what you want them to know or believe. (e.g. “This is a very important issue for the council to consider” vs. “We’d like you to make a motion at the next city council meeting to create a task force to…”).

Keep in mind that people usually remember most clearly what they say, not what you tell them. Guide the conversation so that they say what you want them to remember. (“Council member Jones, I’d like to hear which of the local impacts of global warming you are most concerned about.”) The more times they say it, the more they’ll feel compelled to take action.

Remember to distinguish your tactics and strategies from your goals. Are you really fighting for “10 percent less GHG in the MPO’s RTP” or are you “campaigning to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that are putting the health of our children at risk from runaway global warming?” Both statements are important to make; the context of the conversation should determine which you choose.

Step 4: Reflect and Give Thanks!

The political and policy landscape is shifting rapidly and new tools are becoming available all the time. That means you will have to evaluate your campaign strategy constantly. Be attentive to emerging leverage opportunities and be willing to say “no” if a new opportunity would steer you away from your core mission.

As you carry out each phase of your campaign plan, make note of what has worked and what needs to be improved. Revisit your campaign plan periodically to see how it should be revised or updated. In addition, hold events to address the emotional components of your campaign. What have people learned during this experience? What has the campaign made them feel? These reflection experiences can be particularly reinvigorating after suffering campaign setbacks.

Be a booster for your team. Use every opportunity to thank those individuals who have helped you be successful. Let them know when they have been particularly effective and provide encouragement if they seem disheartened or burned out. Tie your praise to future challenges; when a phase of the campaign concludes successfully, announce your next set of goals or activities.

In addition, don’t forget to tell PCL about your successes so that your story can serve as an example to other groups across California!
Appendix: Additional Resources

Web Resources

This section offers web links to items referenced in the toolkit. It is not an exhaustive list of tools and resources.

Global Warming Impacts
Global warming and the increase of forest fires in the American West since the 1980s:
http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/313/5789/927

World Health Organization study linking global warming to 150,000 deaths annually worldwide:
http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/11/16/AR2005111602197.html

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
http://www.ceqanet.ca.gov/

CEQA Resources at the Planning and Conservation League Foundation:
http://www.PCLFoundation.org/projects/ceqaworkshops.html

The Center for Biological Diversity Legal Memo on CEQA & Global Warming:

Example of Local CEQA Guidelines:
www.co.napa.ca.us/GOV/Departments/DeptPage.asp?DID=29000&LID=981

Activist-oriented Information on Water Supply Assessments:

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
http://www.nepa.gov/nepa/nepanet.htm

The Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals’ 2007 opinion on fuel economy standards:

California Coastal Act
http://www.coastal.ca.gov/ccatc.html

The Coastal Commission staff report on the Cabrillo Port LNG project:
**Building Standards**

California State Building Energy Efficiency Standards:
www.energy.ca.gov/title24/index.html

Build It Green:
www.builditgreen.org

U.S. Green Building Council (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Program):
www.usgbc.org/Default.aspx

List of local and state governments with incentive-based or mandatory efficiency measures:

**Local Building Codes**
The local government agencies listed below have mandatory energy standards and/or resource conservation requirements in their building codes. The codes vary in what they cover and what they require.

City of Cotati:
www.ci.cotati.ca.us/sections/departments/lu-2005-06-01x05.pdf

City of Mill Valley:

City of Palm Desert:
www.cityofpalmdesert.org/content/Energy%20Efficiency%20Requirements%20package.pdf

City of Rohnert Park:
http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/rohnert/ (See Title 14 Sustainability)

City/County of San Francisco:
http://www.sfenvironment.org/our_programs/topics.html?ssi=8&ti=19

City of Santa Monica:
http://smgreen.org/

City of Sebastopol:
http://www.ci.sebastopol.ca.us/greenbuildingprogram.shtml

City of West Hollywood:
http://www.weho.org/media/File/GreenbuildingOrdinance.pdf

City of Windsor:
http://ordlink.com/codes/windsor/index.htm (See Title VII Building and Housing, Ch. 3)

County of Marin:
http://municipalcodes.lexisnexis.com/codes/marincounty/_DATA/TITLE19/Chapter_19_04_BUILDING_REGULAT.html#26
**General Plans, Redevelopment Plans, etc.**


To order *Land Use and the General Plan* by PCL’s General Counsel, Gary Patton, visit:

http://www.landwatch.org/pages/publications.htm

Marin County’s General Plan (2007):

http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/cd/main/fm/TOC.cfm

**Regional Transportation Plans**

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/rtp/

TransForm, formerly Transportation and Land Use Coalition:

http://www.transcoalition.org

**Regional Blueprints**

http://calblueprint.dot.ca.gov/

San Francisco Bay Area’s Regional Blueprint:

http://www.bayareavision.org/

SB 375 (Steinberg):

To read the full text of SB 375, visit www.leginfo.ca.gov, go to the “bill information” section, and search for SB 375 (Steinberg) under the 2007-08 session.

Map of MPO and RTPA boundaries:


**Local GHG Emission Reduction Plan Processes**

International Cities for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI):

http://www.iclei.org/index.php?id=800

**Local Agency Climate Change Plans and Initiatives**

City of Arcata - Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan:


City of Berkeley - Energy & Sustainable Development:

http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/sustainable/default.html

City of Chula Vista - CO₂ Reduction Plan:

www.chulavistaca.gov/city_services/Administrative_Services/City_Admin_Manager/Recycling/CO2.asp

City of Davis - Climate Action Team process:

http://www.city.davis.ca.us/meetings/agenda.cfm?c=32

City of Los Angeles - Green LA:

City of Sacramento - Creating a Sustainable City:
http://www.cityofsacramento.org/generalservices/sustain/

City of San Diego - Climate Protection Action Plan:

City/County of San Francisco - Environment Department:
http://www.sfenvironment.org

City of Santa Monica - Sustainable Santa Monica:
www.smgov.net/epd/scp/

City of Santa Cruz - Environmental Programs:
http://www.ci.santa-cruz.ca.us/ (Click on Environmental Programs)

City of Santa Rosa - Environmental Projects:

City of West Hollywood - 10 Things You Can Do to Combat Global Warming:
http://www.weho.org/download/index.cfm/fuseaction/download/cid/4957/

County of Alameda
Climate Change Leadership Strategy:
http://www.acgov.org/gsa/Alameda%20County%20Climate%20Change%20Resolution%206-06.doc

Cool Counties Climate Stabilization Initiative:
http://www.acgov.org/coolcounties/

County of Marin
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan:

County of Sonoma
Business Environmental Alliance:
http://www.sonoma-county.org/bea/index.htm

Green Business Program:
http://www.sonoma-county.org/sonomagreen/index.htm

Prudent Stewardship
The Frameworks Institute (http://www.frameworksinstitute.org), a well-regarded think tank that conducts a broad range of research in support of non-profit organizations and advocacy campaigns recently conducted research on the U.S. health care reform debate. They found that when the issue was framed as a right or a moral imperative, the policies needed to implement such reforms became highly vulnerable to defeat. The researchers found that respondents’ perception of rights/morals clashed with their perceptions of the importance of choice/freedom/individual responsibility.

However, when health reform was framed as a needed overhaul of a badly broken system, one that, unlike the nation’s electrical grid or interstate highways, had never gotten thoughtful, systemic planning, support for health reform policies soared. The difference? The researchers found that it was because the respondents were now being asked to view the situation from the perspective of prudent stewards of an important service delivery system.
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