

2023 Annual Planning Survey Report



GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH

NOVEMBER 2023



State of California
Gavin Newsom, Governor
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
Samuel Assefa, Director

Agency Information

Address

1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone

(916) 322-2318

Website

www.opr.ca.gov

OPR Project Manager

Parker Friederich

OPR Report Contributors

Nikki Caravelli
Ernest Echeveste
Leila Hakimzadeh
Mark Hedlund
Jennifer Holman
Rachel Ozer-Bearson
Sloane Viola
Michael Wilson

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Letter from the Director.....	3
Introduction to the Survey	5
Section 1: General Plan Updates.....	10
Section 2: Staff and Technological Assistance	12
Section 3: Regional Planning	16
Section 4: Community Engagement, Equity, and Accessibility	17
Section 5: Transportation.....	22
Section 6: Land Use, Housing, and Conservation.....	24
Section 7: Climate Adaptation and Resilience	27
Section 8: Health and Environmental Justice.....	30
Section 9: Air Quality and Emission Reduction	33
Conclusion	35

Letter from the Director

Dear Reader:

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is pleased to announce the release of the 2023 Annual Planning Survey results. OPR's Annual Planning Survey is distributed to all cities and counties across California and provides the latest information on local planning activities, the status of city and county General Plans, and other issues of statewide concern.

We very much appreciate the time and effort that each local jurisdiction put into completing their survey. OPR, as well as many other organizations in the planning community, benefit from the results that are posted each year. Responses to the survey allow us to gain perspective on policies and planning at the local level and evaluate trends over time. Moreover, it allows us to identify implementation challenges, develop more informed tools and guidance for local jurisdictions, and recognize areas of local leadership.

We are grateful that many jurisdictions have continued to participate in this statewide effort, and we hope that the survey will continue to be a valuable tool for our local partners. We would also like to thank city and county staff for the amazing work they do every day to ensure a more sustainable, resilient, and inclusive California for all. To this end, OPR welcomes comments and suggestions on how the survey can be more effective and informative in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Samuel Assefa', written in a cursive style.

Samuel Assefa

Director of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Disclaimer

This publication may reference complex and specific laws and regulations. Any such reference is provided merely for the convenience of the reader. Always refer to the actual text of applicable laws and regulations and consult with an attorney when applying them.

As with all Governor's Office of Planning and Research publications, you may print all or part of this document. You do not need to secure permission; just copy it accurately and give credit to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research.

For further information on this or other OPR documents, please visit www.opr.ca.gov or contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Introduction to the Survey

Each year, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) distributes the Annual Planning Survey (APS) to every jurisdiction in the state of California to gain information about the status of each jurisdiction’s planning efforts and explore, in greater depth, the policies that jurisdictions are implementing to address issues of statewide concern. These public survey responses allow OPR and the larger planning community to identify areas of local leadership and develop tools and guidance for jurisdictions.

OPR distributed the APS electronically in the spring and early summer of 2023. During the survey period, staff followed up with jurisdictions through direct phone and email outreach to ensure a higher response rate. This report provides an overview of the results and highlights key themes and insights.

2023 Survey Responses

The following sections provide an overview of the answers that cities and counties provided in this year’s Annual Planning Survey.

Jurisdiction Information

This year, 327 of the 539 cities and counties in California (61%) responded to the 2023 Annual Planning Survey. This includes 294 out of 482 cities (61%) and 34 out of 58 counties (59%). Please note that the City and County of San Francisco is only counted once among the total number of jurisdictions. Approximately 68 percent of California’s population is represented by the jurisdictions who responded to the 2023 survey.¹

The response rate was 59% in 2020, during the COVID-19 pandemic, when the last survey was conducted. The slightly higher rate of response this year compared to the 2020 APS can be attributed to a combination of email, LinkedIn, and newsletter outreach and more consistent outreach during the last two weeks of the survey period.

¹ This figure is based on the 2023 population estimates released by the California Department of Finance demographic research unit on May 1, 2023. [Source](https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates-e1): <https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates-e1>.

List of Respondents


The following is a list of jurisdictions that responded to the 2023 Annual Planning Survey:

Alameda County	Buena Park	Crescent City	Fresno
Albany	Butte County	Cupertino	Fullerton
Aliso Viejo	Calistoga	Cypress	Gardena
Alturas	Camarillo	Dana Point	Gilroy
Amador County	Campbell	Danville	Glendale
American Canyon	Canyon Lake	Davis	Glendora
Angels Camp	Carpinteria	Del Norte County	Glenn County
Arcata	Cathedral City	Delano	Goleta
Artesia	Cerritos	Desert Hot Springs	Gonzales
Atherton	Chico	Dinuba	Grand Terrace
Atwater	Chino	Dixon	Grass Valley
Auburn	Chula Vista	Dorris	Greenfield
Avalon	Citrus Heights	Duarte	Half Moon Bay
Avenal	Claremont	East Palo Alto	Hawaiian Gardens
Bakersfield	Clearlake	Eastvale	Hawthorne
Baldwin Park	Cloverdale	El Cerrito	Hayward
Beaumont	Coalinga	El Monte	Healdsburg
Bell	Colma	El Segundo	Hercules
Bell Gardens	Colton	Emeryville	Hermosa Beach
Bellflower	Colusa	Encinitas	Highland
Belmont	Commerce	Escondido	Hollister
Berkeley	Concord	Eureka	Hughson
Big Bear Lake	Contra Costa County	Fairfield	Huntington Park
Bishop	Corona	Ferndale	Huron
Blythe	Coronado	Fillmore	Indian Wells
Brea	Corte Madera	Folsom	Inglewood
Brentwood	Cotati	Foster City	Ione
Brisbane	Covina	Fountain Valley	Irwindale
Buellton			Jackson

Jurupa Valley	Los Angeles	Moorpark	Paramount
Kerman	Los Angeles	Moreno Valley	Pasadena
Kern County	County	Morgan Hill	Paso Robles
King City	Los Banos	Morro Bay	Piedmont
Kings County	Los Gatos	Mountain View	Pismo Beach
La Canada	Madera	Murrieta	Pittsburg
Flintridge	Madera County	Napa	Placentia
La Habra	Mammoth Lakes	Napa County	Placer County
La Mesa	Manhattan Beach	National City	Placerville
La Palma	Manteca	Needles	Pleasant Hill
La Puente	Mariposa County	Nevada County	Pleasanton
La Quinta	Martinez	Newark	Plumas County
Laguna Hills	Marysville	Newport Beach	Port Hueneme
Lake Elsinore	Maywood	Norco	Porterville
Lake Forest	McFarland	Norwalk	Poway
Larkspur	Mendocino	Oakdale	Rancho Mirage
Lathrop	County	Oakley	Rancho Santa
Lawndale	Menifee	Orange	Margarita
Lemon Grove	Merced	Orange County	Red Bluff
Lemoore	Merced County	Orinda	Redding
Lindsay	Millbrae	Orland	Redlands
Live Oak	Milpitas	Oroville	Redondo Beach
Livingston	Modesto	Oxnard	Redwood City
Lodi	Mono County	Pacific Grove	Rialto
Loma Linda	Monrovia	Pacifica	Richmond
Lomita	Montague	Palm Desert	Rio Vista
Lompoc	Montclair	Palm Springs	Riverbank
Loomis	Monte Sereno	Palo Alto	Riverside
Los Alamitos	Montebello	Palos Verdes	Rocklin
Los Altos	Monterey	Estates	Rohnert Park
Los Altos Hills	Monterey County	Paradise	

Rolling Hills Estates	San Ramon	South San Francisco	Vacaville
Roseville	Sand City	St. Helena	Vallejo
Ross	Sanger	Stanislaus County	Ventura
Sacramento	Santa Ana	Stanton	Ventura County
Salinas	Santa Barbara	Stockton	Villa Park
San Anselmo	Santa Clarita	Suisun City	Walnut
San Bernardino	Santa Cruz	Sunnyvale	Wasco
San Bernardino County	Santa Cruz County	Sutter County	Watsonville
San Bruno	Santa Monica	Sutter Creek	West Covina
San Clemente	Santa Paula	Taft	West Hollywood
San Diego	Santa Rosa	Tehama	West Sacramento
San Fernando	Saratoga	Tehama County	Westlake Village
San Francisco	Seaside	Temecula	Westmorland
San Gabriel	Sebastopol	Temple City	Wheatland
San Jacinto	Shafter	Tiburon	Wildomar
San Jose	Sierra Madre	Torrance	Williams
San Juan Capistrano	Simi Valley	Trinidad	Willits
San Leandro	Siskiyou County	Truckee	Willows
San Luis Obispo	Solana Beach	Tulare County	Winters
San Marcos	Solano County	Tulelake	Woodside
San Mateo	Soledad	Turlock	Yolo County
San Mateo County	Solvang	Twentynine Palms	Yountville
	Sonoma County	Ukiah	Yuba County
	South El Monte	Union City	
	South Lake Tahoe		

Figure 1: Geographic distribution of survey responses



Agency Information

Questions and answers from this section are general information questions that are used to update the Directory of Planning Agencies. The most recent directory may be found on [OPR's website](https://opr.ca.gov/planning/general-plan) (<https://opr.ca.gov/planning/general-plan>).

Section 1: General Plan Updates

1.1 When did your jurisdiction last update the following required elements?

On average, jurisdictions updated the housing and environmental justice elements of their general plans most recently while the conservation, noise, and open space elements were updated less recently. Table 1 provides summary statistics highlighting when cities and counties reported that they last updated the required elements of their general plan.

Table 1: Time Since Last General Plan Element Update (in years)

Required Element	Average (years)	Median (years)	Mode (years)
Land Use	11.6	10.0	1.0
Circulation	12.0	11.0	11.0
Housing	3.2	1.0	0.0
Conservation	14.2	12.0	11.0
Open Space	14.2	13.0	16.0
Noise	14.4	13.0	16.0
Safety	10.2	8.0	1.0
Environmental Justice*	5.3	2.0	1.0
Air Quality**	13.1	13.0	16.0

* Environmental justice elements became a requirement in 2018 under SB 1000 (Leyva, Chapter 587, Statutes of 2016). The legislation amended Government Code section 65302, subdivision (h), to require that all jurisdictions with disadvantaged communities include this element upon the next general plan update or revision of two or more elements concurrently.

** An air quality element is mandatory for jurisdictions within the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), though several jurisdictions outside of the district had air quality elements as well. Thirty-two jurisdictions (26 cities and 6 counties) responded to this question.

1.2 When does your jurisdiction plan to update the following required elements?

In response to new legislation and other factors, many jurisdictions are preparing to update the housing, safety, and environmental justice elements of their general plans. [Government Code section 65588](#) mandates that jurisdictions update their housing element at least once every five to eight years. Additional legislation requires that jurisdictions update their safety elements to address [climate vulnerability and adaptation](#), [flooding and wildfire hazard mitigation](#), and [evacuation](#).

Moreover, [SB 1000](#) (Leyva, Chapter 587, Statutes of 2016) requires all jurisdictions with disadvantaged communities to address environmental justice within their general plan upon the next update of two or more general plan elements concurrently. Table 2 provides summary statistics highlighting when cities and counties plan to update certain general plan elements.

Table 2: Time Until Next General Plan Element Update (in years)

Required Element	Average (years)	Median (years)	Mode (years)
Land Use	3.8	2.0	1.0
Circulation	4.5	2.0	1.0
Housing	3.8	4.0	0.0
Conservation	4.8	2.0	1.0
Open Space	4.9	3.0	1.0
Noise	4.8	3.0	1.0
Safety	3.4	1.0	1.0
Environmental Justice*	4.0	2.0	1.0
Air Quality**	4.0	2.0	1.0

* Government Code section 65302, subdivision (h) requires jurisdictions with disadvantaged communities to include this element upon the next general plan update or revision of two or more elements concurrently.

** An air quality element is only mandatory for jurisdictions in the San Joaquin Valley, though other jurisdictions had air quality elements as well. Twenty-seven jurisdictions (22 cities and 5 counties) stated that they had determined when they would adopt a new air quality element or update their current air quality element.

Section 2: Staff and Technological Assistance

2.1 What level of staff capacity does your agency currently have to address the following planning topics?

Jurisdictions generally reported higher staff capacity to apply for and manage grants as well as address housing affordability and production. Jurisdictions reported having less capacity to address climate change mitigation and adaptation and environmental justice. Jurisdictions had the least amount of capacity to address health and racial equity related planning topics.

Table 3: Staffing capacity within cities and counties


	Adequate capacity	Some capacity - with consultants	Some capacity - no consultants	Very little capacity - with consultants	Very little capacity - no consultants	No staff capacity
GHG Emission Reduction	4.53%	17.42%	4.88%	34.49%	24.39%	14.29%
CAP Preparation	4.86%	21.18%	2.78%	33.68%	22.57%	14.93%
Climate Adaptation and Resilience	3.81%	18.34%	4.15%	33.56%	23.88%	16.26%
Racial Equity	4.20%	14.34%	10.84%	24.48%	26.22%	19.93%
Health Equity	3.14%	13.59%	7.67%	24.39%	28.92%	22.30%
Environmental Justice	3.16%	16.49%	10.88%	29.12%	23.86%	16.49%
Housing Production	10.07%	30.21%	13.54%	23.61%	15.63%	6.94%
Housing Affordability	9.06%	31.71%	13.59%	27.53%	13.24%	4.88%
Applying for Grants	9.72%	21.88%	17.71%	21.53%	24.65%	4.51%
Managing Grants	9.41%	21.60%	19.16%	19.16%	25.44%	5.23%

2.2 Within the past five years, has your agency received technical assistance from the State to address the following planning topics?

(Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, Climate Action Plan Preparation, Climate Adaptation and Resilience, Racial Equity, Health Equity, Environmental Justice, Housing Production, Housing Affordability, Applying for Grants, Managing Grants)

Within the past five years, jurisdictions received the most technical assistance from state agencies for housing production (45 percent), housing affordability (42 percent), and applying for grants (33 percent). Jurisdictions were less likely to have received technical assistance for topics such as greenhouse gas emission reduction (8 percent), racial equity (5 percent), and health equity (4 percent). These trends show that there is room to increase opportunities for technical assistance on these topics in the future.

Figure 2: Technical assistance received by jurisdictions for the following topics in the past five years




2.3 For which of the following topics would your agency like to receive technical assistance from the State? This includes technical assistance from agencies such as OPR, the Strategic Growth Council (SGC), the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), and the Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES).

(Check all that apply: Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, Climate Action Plan Preparation, Climate Adaptation and Resilience, Racial Equity, Health Equity, Environmental Justice, Housing Production, Housing Affordability, Applying for Grants, Managing Grants)

There is strong demand for technical assistance on all the above topics. Nearly 75 percent of jurisdictions requested additional technical assistance for applying for grants, and 65 percent requested technical assistance for managing grants. Over half of all jurisdictions desired more technical assistance for environmental justice, and over 45 percent of jurisdictions desired more technical assistance for both racial equity and health equity.

Figure 3: Topics of interest for technical assistance among all jurisdictions.



Additional Technical Assistance Need

Several jurisdictions requested technical assistance for additional topics and programs not listed as answer choices. These include economic development, accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and SB 9 management and other aspects of housing element implementation, sea level rise management, public facilities and other critical infrastructure, development in high-fire zones, state highway resiliency and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), septic system regulation, and electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure development and implementation, and any state laws that jurisdictions do not have the resources to implement themselves. Jurisdictions also shared concerns about the lack of funding available for these programs.


Section 3: Regional Planning

3.1 Is your agency aligning the following topics with larger regional plans or efforts (such as regional sustainable community strategies and the regional housing needs assessment)?

(Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction, Climate Adaptation and Resilience, Racial Equity, Health Equity, Environmental Justice, Housing Production, Housing Affordability)

Jurisdictions commonly reported aligning their housing plans with larger efforts (such as the regional housing needs assessment, or RHNA), with over 85 percent stating that they had aligned (or were planning to align) housing production and housing affordability with larger regional plans or efforts. Jurisdictions were less likely to say the same of racial equity and health equity, with less than half of jurisdictions stating that they had aligned (or were aligning) those topics with regional plans or efforts.

Figure 4: Overall alignment of planning topics with larger regional plans or efforts




Section 4: Community Engagement, Equity, and Accessibility

4.1 What is your jurisdiction doing to build relationships with and empower residents to meaningfully engage in the planning process?

(Check all that apply: Working with citizen advisory committees/workgroups on planning topics; Partnering with community-based organizations to foster deeper public engagement; Conducting trainings or educational events; Increasing translational services at planning meetings; Elevating community-based planning into the formal planning process; Working with disadvantaged communities to create/implement an engagement plan; Assessing the effectiveness of engagement efforts using standardized metrics; Hosting a planning academy for residents; Other)

Nearly 70 percent of jurisdictions are working with citizen advisory committees to engage more deeply in planning topics. More than 60 percent are also partnering with community-based organizations to foster deeper public engagement, and nearly half are conducting trainings or educational events. Additional strategies include issuing text notification surveys, establishing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) commissions, increasing both in-person and online engagement, and conducting surveys.

Figure 5: Frequency of strategies used to meaningfully engage residents in the planning process




4.2 How is your jurisdiction integrating equity into the general plan and other planning processes?

(Check all that apply: Prioritizing meaningful engagement with specific populations (including Black, Indigenous, and other communities of color); Incorporating an equity lens into each step of all planning processes; Providing equity trainings to staff; Using tools and/or data to identify and address race-based disparities in your jurisdiction; Using local input to identify and address race-based disparities in your jurisdiction; Centering accessibility; Adopting a racial equity strategic plan; Adopting a racial equity resolution; Other)

At least 55 percent of jurisdictions are either prioritizing meaningful engagement with specific populations (including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) or using local input to identify and address race-based disparities. Fewer than 10 percent of jurisdictions are adopting a racial equity resolution or strategic plan. Jurisdictions also mentioned other strategies, including implementing an environmental justice element or emphasizing equity through transportation.

Figure 6: Frequency of strategies that jurisdictions are using to integrate equity into the general plan and other planning processes




4.3 How is your jurisdiction engaging with tribal governments?

(Check all that apply: Consulting with tribal governments regarding a General Plan and/or Specific Plan amendment or adoption; Developing protocols for consulting with tribal governments in their areas; Designating specific responsible persons or representatives to conduct engagement with tribal governments; Incorporating text in the General Plan dealing with the preservation of Native American cultural resources; Utilizing conservation easements to help protect Native American cultural resources; Meeting regularly with tribal governments, outside of specific requirements for notice and consultation, when adopting or amending a General Plan or Specific Plan; Other)

Over 94 percent of jurisdictions are consulting with tribal governments regarding the development or amendment of a general or specific plan, and nearly half stated that they were incorporating text into their general plans dealing specifically with the preservation of Native American resources. Other ways that jurisdictions are engaging with tribal communities include employing a memorandum of understanding (MOU), distributing development plans to tribal communities for comments, consulting with tribal cultural districts, and including appropriate approval conditions and mitigation strategies in environmental documents for projects.

Figure 7: Strategies that jurisdictions are using to engage with tribal governments




4.4 In your jurisdiction, which of the following documents contain policies to accommodate individuals with access and functional needs (AFN)?

(Check all that apply: General Plan, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, Climate Action Plan, Climate Adaptation Plan; Other)

Nearly 82 percent of jurisdictions stated that their general plans contained policies for individuals with access and functional needs, which was significantly more than the number of jurisdictions who had comparable policies in their local hazard mitigation plans (43 percent), climate action plan (11 percent), or climate adaptation plan (7 percent). Jurisdictions noted several other documents that contained policies for those with access and functional needs, including ADA transition plans, zoning ordinances, building codes, noticing, and council policies, as well as websites.

Figure 8: Percentage of jurisdictions that have documents addressing individuals with access and functional needs (AFN)



4.5 In your jurisdiction, are any of the following documents available in languages other than English? If so, which languages?

(General Plan, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, Climate Action Plan, Climate Adaptation Plan; Other (please specify))

Few jurisdictions responded to this question. Of the jurisdictions who responded, most had made their general plan or climate action plan available in at least one other language such as Spanish. Other languages included Chinese, Vietnamese, and Tagalog, and several jurisdictions noted that they were also utilizing web-based translation services for documents and translating portions of their development codes into other languages.

Section 5: Transportation

5.1 Has your jurisdiction adopted any of the following active transportation-focused plans?

(Bicycle Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, Combined Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan, Complete Streets Plan)

Approximately 57 percent of jurisdictions had adopted, were adopting, or were planning to adopt a bicycle master plan. Only 37 percent of jurisdictions had adopted or were going to adopt a pedestrian master plan. Meanwhile, 58 percent of jurisdictions stated that they were adopting or going to adopt a combined bicycle and pedestrian master plan, and 57 percent of jurisdictions stated that they had adopted or were going to adopt a complete streets plan.

Table 4: Implementation status of jurisdictions' active transportation plans


	Completely adopted	Adoption in progress	Adoption planned	Not at this time	Unsure
Bicycle Master Plan	46.86%	6.76%	2.90%	35.75%	7.73%
Pedestrian Master Plan	25.65%	7.33%	4.19%	49.74%	13.09%
Combined Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan	42.56%	9.09%	6.20%	31.82%	10.33%
Complete Streets Plan	36.17%	8.51%	11.91%	29.36%	14.04%

5.2 In transportation disadvantaged areas, what projects has your jurisdiction undertaken in the past five years to increase transportation safety?

(Check all that apply: Constructing sidewalks/pedestrian paths; Constructing bicycle lanes/paths; Reducing speed limits; Implementing traffic calming features (e.g. road diets); Increasing street lighting; Adding roadway signage; Implementing traffic control devices (e.g. traffic signals or stop signs); Utilizing data (e.g. collision rates) to identify safety needs in disadvantaged areas; Other)

Most jurisdictions cited expanding spaces and opportunities for active mobility as a strategy to increase safety in transportation disadvantaged communities, with 83 percent of jurisdictions constructing new sidewalks or pedestrian paths and 76 percent of jurisdictions constructing new bicycle lanes or facilities. Sixty-five percent of jurisdictions employed traffic control devices (such as traffic signals or stop signs), 60 percent added new roadway signage, and 59 percent implemented new traffic calming designs. Other strategies include conducting safety studies, allocating funding for new projects and applying for grants, adopting “Safe Roads to Schools” plans, adopting livable corridor plans, and implementing ADA-friendly design features.

Figure 9: Percentage of jurisdictions employing strategies to improve safety in transportation disadvantaged areas within the past five years



Section 6: Land Use, Housing, and Conservation


6.1 Is your jurisdiction using any of the following tools to promote infill development?

(Check all that apply: Form-based zoning codes; Density bonus ordinance that expands on state requirements; Reduced parking requirements; Expedited permit processing; Improvements of infrastructure and/or utilities in infill areas; Financial incentives for pre-development or development costs; CEQA streamlining tools such as tiering or use of exemptions; Partnerships with school districts; Land conservation strategies (including urban growth boundaries); Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinances; Transfer of development rights; Public land donations for housing development; Ministerial approval processes; Other)

The most popular strategies that jurisdictions employed to promote infill development included accessory dwelling unit ordinances (which 93 percent of jurisdictions stated they had used), CEQA streamlining tools including use of exemptions (which were used by 77 percent of jurisdictions), ministerial approval processes (used by 64 percent of jurisdictions), and reduced parking requirements (used by 56 percent of jurisdictions). Jurisdictions were far less likely to introduce transfer of development rights as an infill strategy, with only 13 percent of jurisdictions stating that they had done this. Figure 10 on the following page shows the full range of infill strategies utilized by jurisdictions throughout California.

Other strategies used for infill development not listed as answer choices include offering low- and no-cost review for development projects prior to approval, introducing mixed-use and affordable housing overlays, selling surplus land for housing development, updating the zoning code to increase opportunities for infill development, and removing constraints from development permits.

Figure 10: Strategies that jurisdictions are employing to promote infill development




6.2 Does your general plan (or other local strategy) include any of the following policies related to conservation and open space?

(Check all that apply: Policies that prioritize farmland or habitat conservation; Policies that identify performance measures related to habitat or farmland retention or loss; Policies that support the creation of green space buffers from potential environmental hazards; Policies or strategies that support carbon sequestration; Policies that encourage urban greening in developed areas; Policies that promote water quality; Policies that support continuous evaluation of open space availability and needs; Other)

Over 83 percent of jurisdictions had policies that promoted farmland and habitat conservation. Fifty-nine percent had performance measures related to farmland or habitat availability, 58 percent that had policies supporting buffers from environmental hazards, 50 percent that had policies supporting carbon sequestration, 45 percent that had policies encouraging urban greening, 21 percent that had policies promoting water quality, and 18 percent that had policies supporting continuous evaluation of open space availability and needs. Other policies included policies for tree planting and preservation, policies for hillside preservation, policies supporting alignment with regional conservation plans, and policies supporting the preservation of biologic, scenic, cultural, and recreational resources, as well as policies pertaining to air quality, water quality, distance to open space, and waste reduction.

Figure 11: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting various open space and conservation policies




Section 7: Climate Adaptation and Resilience

7.1 What data and/or tools is your jurisdiction using to inform climate adaptation and resiliency planning and action?

(Check all that apply: Cal-Adapt, Cal MyHazards, State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance, California Healthy Places Index (CHPI), Coastal Storm Monitoring System (CoSMoS), Sea the Future, California Heat Assessment Tool (CHAT), California Building Resilience Against Climate Effects (Cal BRACE), Adapting to Rising Tides, Other)

Jurisdictions were most likely to use Cal-Adapt, the State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance, and the California Healthy Places Index (CHPI) as tools for climate adaptation and resiliency planning and action, and least likely to use Sea the Future. Other tools that jurisdictions used include CalEnviroScreen, the Department of Water Resources’ Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD), the American Community Survey, and other plans, tools, and documents.

Figure 12: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting data and tools used for climate adaptation and resiliency planning




7.2 What State guidance documents is your jurisdiction using to inform climate adaptation and resiliency planning and action?

(Check all that apply: OPR General Plan Guidelines, California Adaptation Planning Guide, Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Planning Guidance for California's Coastal Zone, California Resilience Plan Alignment Toolkit, Adaptation Roadmap, Climate Adaptation Finance and Investment in California, State Agency Sea-Level Rise Action Plan for California, Other)

Cities and counties were most likely to use the OPR General Plan Guidelines to inform climate adaptation and resiliency planning and action for their jurisdiction, with over 93 percent of respondents stating that they had done this. Another 40 percent of respondents stated that they had used the California Adaptation Planning Guide. Respondents were less likely to refer to the four other documents listed when initiating climate adaptation and resiliency planning efforts.

Figure 13: Documents used by jurisdictions for climate adaptation and resiliency planning




7.3 What plans and documents is your jurisdiction using to integrate climate vulnerability and adaptation in local planning pursuant to SB 379 (2015) and SB 1035 (2018)?

(Check all that apply: General Plan Safety Element; Climate Action Plan; Local Coastal Program Plan; Local Hazard Mitigation Plan; Disaster Recovery Framework/Plan; One or more impact-specific plans, such as a Sea Level Rise, Wildfire, Extreme Heat, or other Plan; One or more sector-specific plans, such as a Transportation, Forestry, Watershed, or Public Health Adaptation Plan; Other)

Nearly 87 percent of jurisdictions reported that they had used their general plan’s safety element to integrate climate vulnerability and adaptation. Additionally, 67 percent of jurisdictions used their local hazard mitigation plan to integrate climate vulnerability and adaptation, and just over half of respondents used their Climate Action Plan. Jurisdictions were less likely to report using disaster recovery frameworks, local coastal programs or plans, or impact- or sector-specific plans to integrate climate vulnerability and adaptation. Other plans and documents used by jurisdictions include sustainability elements, AB 747 (Levine, Chapter 681, Statutes of 2019) evacuation analysis, urban forestry plans, and regional greenhouse gas emission plans.

Figure 14: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting plans and documents to integrate climate vulnerability and adaptation




Section 8: Health and Environmental Justice

8.1 Does your general plan include any of the following policies that explicitly promote health equity and ensure equal opportunity to resources necessary for healthy living?

(Check all that apply: Policies that explicitly promote health equity; Policies that promote active living; Policies that promote lifecycle housing or aging-in-place; Policies that help to mitigate the urban heat island; Zoning that ensures access to grocery stores and/or fruit and vegetable vendors; Zoning that encourages local food production (e.g., urban or front/back yard farming and community gardens); Other)

Over 78 percent of jurisdictions stated that they had implemented policies that promoted active living, and nearly 51 percent stated that they had implemented policies that explicitly promoted health equity. Forty-six percent of jurisdictions had policies for mitigating urban heat island impacts, and 45 percent had policies for lifecycle housing and aging-in-place. Zoning related directly to health equity was less common, but over one-third of jurisdictions stated that they had implemented zoning to ensure access to grocery stores or fruit and vegetable vendors or zoning to encourage local food production through opportunities such as community, urban, or household gardens.

Figure 15: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting policies to promote health equity




8.2 What tools, metrics, and/or criteria does your jurisdiction use to define underserved or historically marginalized communities (also known as disadvantaged communities (DACs)), and to address racial inequities in those communities?

(Check all that apply: CalEnviroScreen - combined score; CalEnviroScreen - individual data layers; Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) income limits; Local median income; Statewide median income; California Tax Credit Allocation Committee/HCD Opportunity Maps; California Healthy Places Index (CHPI); Climate Change and Health Vulnerability Indicators for California (CCHVI); Regional Opportunity Index (ROI); Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) EJScreen; Other)

Nearly 80 percent of jurisdictions used HCD’s income limits to define disadvantaged communities, while 63 percent of jurisdictions used local income limits. In terms of environmental burden, 55 percent of jurisdictions used overall CalEnviroScreen scores to identify disadvantaged communities, whereas 42 percent of jurisdictions used individual CalEnviroScreen layers. To a lesser degree, jurisdictions also used statewide median income, California Tax Credit Allocation Committee and HCD opportunity maps, the California Healthy Places Index (CHPI), EPA EJScreen, Climate Change and Health Vulnerability Indicators for California (CCHVI), and the Regional Opportunity Index (ROI) to identify disadvantaged communities.

Figure 16: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting methods to identify disadvantaged communities




8.3 Which of the following environmental justice planning activities and general plan requirements per Government Code section 65302, subdivision (h), (SB 1000, 2016) apply to your jurisdiction?

(Check all that apply: Identifying the locations of disadvantaged communities (DACs); Practicing community engagement to address environmental justice in DACs; Identifying the nature of environmental health burdens, risks, and/or needs in DACs; Creating an environmental justice element; Integrating environmental justice throughout the General Plan; Implementing environmental justice policies and/or programs; Other)

To satisfy the requirements of SB 1000 (2016), over 64 percent of jurisdictions stated that they were identifying the location of disadvantaged communities. Forty-four percent of jurisdictions stated that they were creating an environmental justice element while 56 percent stated that they would be integrating environmental justice throughout the General Plan. Over 51 percent of jurisdictions stated that they were implementing environmental justice policies or programs, 41 percent stated that they were practicing community engagement with disadvantaged communities to address environmental burdens in those communities, and 42 percent stated that they were working more closely with communities to identify the nature of health burdens.

Figure 17: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting relevant environmental justice activities



Section 9: Air Quality and Emission Reduction

9.1 In your jurisdiction, what is the status of each of the following containing strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

Jurisdictions were most likely to implement local hazard mitigation plans (LHMPs) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, with over 92 percent stating that they had done this or would do this in the future. Seventy-eight percent of jurisdictions said the same of codes and ordinances they had implemented, compared to 73 percent for climate action plans, 66 percent for greenhouse gas emission inventories, and 50 percent for vulnerability assessments. Given the geographic diversity of respondents, jurisdictions were less likely to use a local coastal program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, with 18 percent of jurisdictions stating that they had done this or would do this in the future.

Table 5: Implementation status of any strategies that jurisdictions are using to reduce greenhouse gas emissions


	Completed	In progress	Planned	Not planned	N/A
Climate Action Plan	42.28%	15.85%	16.67%	23.17%	2.03%
Adaptation Plan	14.48%	11.76%	18.55%	48.42%	6.79%
Energy Action Plan	12.74%	6.60%	12.74%	57.55%	10.38%
Local Hazard Mitigation Plan	60.32%	19.84%	10.93%	6.48%	2.43%
Sustainability Plan	14.16%	8.22%	14.61%	57.08%	5.94%
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory	35.29%	16.39%	17.23%	26.89%	4.20%
Local Coastal Program	10.19%	6.48%	1.39%	12.50%	69.44%
Codes or Ordinances	28.94%	25.96%	24.26%	17.02%	3.83%
Vulnerability Assessment	26.98%	14.42%	12.09%	37.67%	8.84%

9.2 Is your jurisdiction adopting any of the following decarbonization strategies?

(Check all that apply: All-electric construction reach codes for residential development; All-electric construction building standards for commercial uses; Policies to implement energy efficiency retrofits for existing buildings; Policies to replace energy-intensive appliances and equipment with more efficient systems; Policies to electrify appliances for space heating; Policies to electrify water heating; Policies to electrify cooking appliances; Policies to electrify clothes drying appliances; Deployment of renewable energy production and distribution and energy storage on privately owned land uses; Deployment of renewable energy production and energy storage directly in new public projects and on existing public facilities; Other)

Of the strategies listed above, over 48 percent of jurisdictions stated that they had policies to implement energy efficiency retrofits for existing buildings. Other popular strategies included deployment of renewable energy production and storage, all-electric construction reach codes for residential development, policies to replace energy-intensive appliances and equipment with more efficient systems, and all-electric construction building standards for commercial uses. Jurisdictions were less likely to implement electrification policies specific to space heating, water heating, cooking appliances, or clothes-drying appliances.

Figure 18: Percentage of jurisdictions reporting relevant decarbonization strategies



Conclusion

In conclusion, jurisdictions are making progress in several areas of their general plans, although additional opportunities for growth remain with respect to equity. This includes enacting policies that specifically address health equity and active living, supporting meaningful community engagement and tribal consultation beyond state requirements, and identifying new strategies to support historically disadvantaged communities. Jurisdictions are also advancing in areas such as climate resiliency and adaptation, including increasing alignment with the safety element of their general plans. However, agencies such as OPR can still provide more guidance in each of these areas.

Currently, jurisdictions are working to address legislative requirements pertaining to housing, safety, and environmental justice. Many respondents noted that they are planning to update those elements of their general plans within the next few years, although they expressed a need for more support in topics such as housing affordability and production, applying for (and managing) grants, and interpreting and acting on new legislation relevant to these areas. Moving forward, there are many opportunities to translate these topics into guidance to help local jurisdictions meet their long-term planning and equity goals.

Overall, OPR values the insights of our city and county partners. We are thankful for the time and effort that agencies put into completing the 2023 Annual Planning Survey. The information provided in this report will inform our efforts as we continue to support all communities throughout our state.