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Background

- Greenprint – A Blueprint Implementation Strategy
- Focused on agricultural, other resource and open space lands
- SGC $1 million round 1 award January 6, 2011 ($280,000 for Greenprint Phase I)
- Grant Agreement between DOC and Fresno COG executed September 6, 2011
- Contract between Fresno COG and UC Davis executed April 27, 2012
- SGC $1 million round 2 award May 10, 2012 ($400,000 for Greenprint Phase II)
Purpose

• Provide a San Joaquin Valley-wide perspective on open space/natural resource issues
• Deepen understanding of land, water and living resources in region and their relation to economic and human sustainability
• Identify significant resource management opportunities and challenges in region
• Reinforce local efforts and provide strategies and tools to decision-makers, businesses and communities
• Not to establish public policy or override local land use authority. Respect private property rights
Phase 1 Approach

- Email survey – Determine aspirations, challenges, priorities and opportunities, project awareness
- Determine regional mapping priorities and compile (existing/available) spatial (and other) data - trends and public benefits
- Develop region-wide thematic maps visualizing natural resource and stewardship priorities
- The view from 30,000 feet – not parcel specific
- Compile and analyze existing resource preservation programs, polices and regulations
- Publish and disseminate State of Valley report
- Need for ongoing flexibility
Phase II Approach

- Ongoing public engagement – presentation of data
- Potential Valley-wide scientific survey to identify shared values and a vision for resource management
- Identify regional principles and goals to guide resource management options and strategies
- Identify and evaluate resource management strategies and tools
- Recommend consensus strategies for resource management
- Identify potential pilot projects
- Publish a guide for resource management – specific policies and implementation tools for self-selection
Organization and Outreach

• Steering Committee – small, focused and flexible, to oversee the basic management of the project
• Potential technical committees – focused on specific resource management issues
• Special outreach to agriculture and EJ interests
• Utilize Valley COGs committee structures
• Partner with other Valley regional and subregional programs
• Facilitator
• Report writer/editor
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Big Picture – Examples of Greenprints in Other Regions
Regions Moving Ahead with Greenprints

• Six county Southern California Association of Governments included a conservation and advance mitigation strategy as part of its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
• Six county Sacramento Area Council of Governments committed to moving ahead on an “open space strategy” to be incorporated into its next RTP.
• Most robust effort is in the nine county Bay Area region, where partners and the Association of Bay Area Governments are working to incorporate a greenprint into the 2013 RTP to support focused growth land use patterns.
Bay Area Region Greenprint Vision

Preserve, restore and develop a network of lands and waters for people and nature to increase parks and recreational opportunities, sustain the natural diversity, enhance the agricultural productivity, and cultivate livable communities and the vibrant economy of the San Francisco Bay Area, from urban core to rural landscapes.
Bay Area values and benefits

- **Bay Area Residents**
  - Need
  - Clean water
  - Clean air
  - Outdoor recreation
- **Value**
  - Local food
  - Parks and open space
  - Connected habitats
  - Stewardship
- **Depend on**
  - Ecological diversity
  - Smart growth
  - Intact watersheds
  - Productive soil
  - Vibrant rural economies

---

- Smart growth
- Scenic landscapes
- Ecological diversity
- Intact watersheds
- Productive soil
- Vibrant rural economies
Livable cities
- Connected communities
- Strong economies, stable jobs
- Healthy residents
- Green infrastructure

Working lands
- Important farmlands
- Grazing lands
- Timberlands
- Vibrant rural economies

Parks & Open space
- City, county and State parks and open space
- Regional Trails
- Federal parks and multi-use lands

Habitat
- Aquatic habitats
- Widespread habitats
- Restricted habitats

Ecosystem Goods and Services:
- Water filtration
- Flood attenuation
- Freshwater supply
- Carbon storage

Market for goods
Fresh, healthy food
Wildlife connectivity
Recreation Refuge
Wildlife viewing, fishing, hunting
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Mapping Bay Area Values & Benefits
Farmland, Grazing Land, Parks and Habitat
Examples of Policies Considered by the Bay Area

• Consider impacts/benefits to natural resources, working lands and parks in project development and make trade-off decisions
• Adopt agricultural districts with minimum densities
• Adopt, protect and extend the time frame for Urban Growth Boundaries and Urban Limit Lines
• Require voter approval for changes in zoning for lands zoned agricultural or open space
• Pass a regional funding measure to support and protect Bay lands, uplands, water and working landscapes
• Consider green infrastructure solutions to infrastructure problems
Lessons Learned

• Important to stay very flexible in our thinking as the Bay Area’s needs are rapidly evolving

• The cross-functional nature of stakeholder collaboration (environment, agricultural, and urban groups) working on the greenprint has been very productive with many opportunities for complementary work
OBSERVATIONS / EXPECTATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL GREENPRINT PLANNING BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT

- Purpose and Relationship to other Farmland/Rangeland/Natural Resource Conservation Programs (Federal, State, Private)
- Steering Committee Composition and its Importance for Positive Planning Outcome
- Stakeholder Expectations and Implementation Challenges
- Greenprint Mapping: Valleywide Perspective vs. Local Understanding
OBSERVATIONS / EXPECTATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL GREENPRINT PLANNING
BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT

- Greenprint Survey and the Effective Conveyance of Farmland and Natural Resource Perceptions
- Local Conservation Planning Programs that Promote Greenprint Objectives
- Importance of Incentive-Based Conservation Programs and the “Tool Box” Approach for Addressing Greenprint Objectives
GREENPRINT PLANNING: VALLEYWIDE VS. LOCAL PLANNING EFFORTS

The Powerstrip Analogy
From “Blue” to “Green”

Water, the “Blueprint” and the “Greenprint”
“Water and Planning Activities”? 

- The “Blueprint” did not directly address water
- Do general plans?
- Does the CA Water Plan help?
- Are there any other strategic efforts that merge land and water into a comprehensive, integrated effort?
- ANSWER: no but the “Greenprint” will help by creating an inventory of the human and natural landscapes
- The current water planning effort is “Integrated Regional Water Management Plans”
Integrated Regional Water Management Planning

- IRWMP is the preferred tool to integrate water management
- Regional collaborations needed because watersheds and supplies are predominately local
- Future integration will likely involve not only land use included in Blueprint and Greenprint efforts but air and energy
Valley IRWMP’s