

LAW OFFICES  
**JOHN H. REAVES**  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
550 WEST "C" STREET, SUITE 930  
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101  
Telephone (619) 525-0035  
Facsimile (619) 525-0077  
[lawreaves@pacbell.net](mailto:lawreaves@pacbell.net)  
[lawreaves.com](http://lawreaves.com)  
April 2, 2008

BUILDING IN AN AGE OF GLOBAL WARMING AND WATER SHORTAGES.

Evidence of global warming is both real and alarming. By AB 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006) and other laws, California has taken the lead on an ambitious path to more efficient and cleaner energy use. Through AB 32, greenhouse gas (GHG) must be reduced about 25% to the 1990 levels by 2020, and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

While our Air Resources Board and Public Utilities Commission work feverishly to decide how to cut bigger producers of GHG and implement interim measures, most local governments are dragging feet and allowing development that will exacerbate the problem. New structures will last 30, 50, 70, maybe 100 years, and add new long-term fossil fuel demands. Attaining AB 32's goal is further compounded by our swelling population, roughly 37 million residents today, with 60 million predicted by 2050. State law should plug a senseless leak and require all new construction to be part of the solution, not work against us, both in terms of GHG and water.

This year, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) consisting of a couple thousand scientists from 140 countries, issued increasingly alarming and urgent calls for action due to mounting evidence that warming is occurring faster than expected. IPCC Chairman, Dr. Rachandra Pachauri, has said what we do in the next 2-3 years will determine our future. Further, a climate scientist at NASA, Jay Zwally, has said at current rates the Arctic Ocean may be nearly ice-free by 2012, while Mark Serreze, a senior scientist at the federal snow and ice center (CIRES) says "The Arctic is screaming."

Despite optimism for what change can bring, I am dismayed at the local response. The old mind set is in denial, and inertia is real. My home town, San Diego, undoubtedly is typical of other cities. One political aide asked me what global warming has to do with local government, while another said Washington should address global warming. San Diego only *encourages* developers to build sustainably.

The urgency demands we do more, faster. Buildings represent the greatest source of GHG in the United States, at 43% in 2002. Why shouldn't new development provide its own new energy needs? If there is insufficient space to cover the site power needs, a marvelous opportunity for environmental justice presents itself - *verifiable*, reinvestment in our own needy communities with conservation measures or photo-voltaics (PV). We should encourage parties with extra resources to install more PV than needed by pricing excess power sales higher than wholesale. We need legislation to remove current disincentives. We can go far beyond getting

20% of our energy from renewable sources by 2020 by unleashing the power of so many individuals who would like to do more. We could go even further by requiring retrofits along these same lines at the time of property transfers.

Development as usual also exacerbates water shortages. Because roughly 40% of our state's electricity moves water around the state, development which relies on imported water adds to GHG. When combined with the dire forecast for future water availability, local government must rethink how new development can be handled without adding to the problems. Although the California Environmental Quality Act requires a 20 year water availability analysis, local governments' reference to anticipated conservation seems to be enough for most to justify development as usual.

Local governments' insatiable desire for a larger tax base at any cost, and an acute reluctance to impose new conditions on development, are drivers for more of the same. One Southern California water district chief recently said he did not want the water district to be the one that puts restraints on growth. Why would the more abstract concern of global warming be any more of an impediment to local decision makers?

My county, San Diego, predicts a 25% increase in water needs to accommodate another million people by 2030 despite aggressive water conservation. That seems incongruous with the reality we face. Besides, why should some cut back voluntarily if water hogs do not and if conservation simply allows for more thirsty development to be approved?

State law is needed that requires plans and funding to be in place to cultivate new water supplies (such as sewage reuse, desalination) wherever shortages are projected which offset projected shortages *before* accommodating new growth, with sufficient margin of error. We can start today in requiring new development to recapture rain water and stop allowing wasteful water support of tropical plants and grass in arid areas, for starters, where needed.

The price of admission has changed. *Now* is a golden opportunity to set new standards to address GHG and water shortages, standards that will have, well, *lifetime* benefits. I urge the state legislature immediately require all new construction in the state be carbon neutral and water-wise and for retrofits when property is transferred.

John H. Reaves, Esq., San Diego, CA (619) 525-0035 lawreaves.com

John H. Reaves is an environmental lawyer in San Diego, California, who has been actively working on global warming issues.