

Appendices

A. Survey on the water assessment

The planning departments of ten cities in the Netherlands, five water boards and a handful of other institutions were approached by telephone, asking for their cooperation in this research. Three cities, two water boards, a regional office of the Directorate of Public Works and Water Management, a province and an urban developments consultancy firm were willing to cooperate. They first filled in a survey on-line, which then formed the basis for further questions through email contact, telephone contact, and some face-to-face interviews. The internet-based question form can be viewed at <http://watertoets.anneliesverheijen.nl>. Below are first a screen-view of the on-line survey, and then the complete list of questions asked in the survey (in Dutch).

The screenshot shows a web-based survey form with a light blue background. It is divided into two main sections. The first section, titled 'Algemene vragen' (General questions), contains five questions with corresponding text input fields. The second section, titled 'Vragen m.b.t. het watertoetsproces' (Questions about the water assessment process), contains three questions with corresponding text input fields. The questions are in Dutch.

Algemene vragen

Voor welke gemeente of instantie werkt u?

Wat is uw functie?

Wat is uw emailadres (voor evt. aanvullende vragen)?

Op welke wijze bent u betrokken bij het watertoetsproces?

Met welke andere instanties onderhoudt u contacten met betrekking tot het watertoetsproces?

Vragen m.b.t. het watertoetsproces

Is het planvormingsproces binnen uw organisatie substantieel veranderd na invoering van de watertoets?

De watertoets zou een constant en cyclisch proces in het planvormingsproces moeten zijn. Is dat in de praktijk ook zo of is er meer sprake van een momentopname of eenmalige toepassing?

Wordt het watertoetsproces binnen uw organisatie ervaren als een zinvolle verdieping van het planvormingsproces, of vooral als extra administratieve verplichting? Of is dat

Algemene vragen
Voor welke gemeente of instantie werkt u?
Wat is uw functie?
Wat is uw emailadres (voor evt. aanvullende vragen)?
Op welke wijze bent u betrokken bij het watertoetsproces?
Met welke andere instanties onderhoudt u contacten met betrekking tot het watertoetsproces?

Vragen m.b.t. het watertoetsproces
Is het planvormingsproces binnen uw organisatie substantieel veranderd na invoering van de watertoets?
De watertoets zou een constant en cyclisch proces in het planvormingsproces moeten zijn. Is dat in de praktijk ook zo of is er meer sprake van een momentopname of eenmalige toepassing?
Wordt het watertoetsproces binnen uw organisatie ervaren als een zinvolle verdieping van het planvormingsproces, of vooral als extra administratieve verplichting? Of is dat bijvoorbeeld mede afhankelijk van het plantype?
Is naar uw idee de relatie tussen de verschillende waterbeheerders en de planmakers voor de ruimtelijke ordening veranderd door de invoer van de watertoets? Zo ja, op welke wijze?
Wordt, sinds de invoer van de watertoets, daadwerkelijk meer gewicht toegekend aan water bij het nemen van besluiten over de ruimtelijke ordening?
Is de watertoets in alle fases van het planvormingsproces van belang gebleken? De fases die worden onderscheiden zijn de initiatieffase, de ontwikkelfase, de afwegingsfase en de beoordelingsfase.
Wordt de watertoets actief gebruikt in alle fases van ruimtelijke ordening? De fases die worden onderscheiden zijn locatiekeuze, inrichting en beheer/herinrichting.

Hieronder volgt een aantal stellingen. Deze hebben betrekking op de doelstellingen van "Waterbeheer voor de 21e eeuw" en/of het watertoetsproces. Kunt u voor elke stelling aangeven of de watertoets in de praktijk bijdraagt aan het verwezenlijken van deze doelen? Een korte toelichting op uw antwoord wordt op prijs gesteld.

Stellingen
"De watertoets garandeert een volwassen inbreng van wateraspecten in ruimtelijke plannen."
"Door de watertoets wordt water structureel en expliciet beter betrokken bij de afweging van ruimtelijke plannen."
"De watertoets zorgt ervoor dat water een ordenend principe wordt in de ruimtelijke ordening."
"De watertoets zorgt ervoor dat er waterbewust gebouwd en ingericht wordt."
"De watertoets garandeert toepassing van de driestapsstrategie: vasthouden-bergen-afvoeren."

B. Survey on the safety element

About thirty-five planning departments in California were approached through email, asking for their cooperation in this research. Five cities were willing to cooperate. They first filled in a survey on-line, which then formed the basis for further questions through email contact. The internet-based question form can be viewed at http://safety_element.anneliesverheijen.nl. Below are first a screen-view of the on-line survey, and then the complete list of questions asked in the survey.

General questions

What city do you work for?

What is your email address (in case if additional questions)?

When was the current General Plan adopted?

When was the Land Use Element last updated?

When was the Safety Element last updated?

Is the General Plan (and/or its Land Use Element or Safety Element) currently being updated?

No

Yes, these elements:

Which natural threats does the Safety Element (or similar elements of the General Plan) address?

Seismic hazards

Flood hazard

Wildfire hazard

Landslide hazard

Other natural hazards:

How would you rate the priority of natural hazards in the local planning process, compared to other problems or threats your city encounters?

Low

Medium

High

Questions about the Safety Element

Does your city have a separate natural hazard mitigation plan? And what are, in your opinion, the advantages and/or disadvantages of having a separate mitigation plan not included in the General Plan?

General questions
What city do you work for?
What is your email address (in case if additional questions)?
When was the current General Plan adopted?
When was the Land Use Element last updated?
When was the Safety Element last updated?
Is the General Plan (and/or its Land Use Element or Safety Element) currently being updated?
Which natural threats does the Safety Element (or similar elements of the General Plan) address?
How would you rate the priority of natural hazards in the local planning process, compared to other problems or threats your city encounters?

Questions about the Safety Element
Does your city have a separate natural hazard mitigation plan? And what are, in your opinion, the advantages and/or disadvantages of having a separate mitigation plan not included in the General Plan?
In your opinion, are state guidelines for the General Plan and its Safety Element detailed enough to support planning departments in achieving the best possible planning solutions for reducing natural hazard risk?
In your opinion, is the Safety Element a meaningful part of the General Plan? Does it really belong in the General Plan or would you prefer a different organisation of plan types?
To what extent are the outcomes of a hazard assessment considered in all phases of planning (<i>phases: choice of location / spatial design / spatial management</i>)?
In your opinion, is the technical assistance a local planning department can request from state agencies such as the Division of Mines and Geology or the Department of Water Resources, sufficient and helpful when developing or updating the Safety Element?
In what phases of the General Plan (or its Safety Element) planning process is there consultation with state planning agencies (<i>phases: hazard research / plan development / balancing of interests / plan review</i>)?
Do you think there would be less attention to natural hazards in the local planning process if there was no obligation to include a Safety Element in the local General Plan?
State guidelines for the Safety Element speak of avoiding 'unreasonable' risks. Is it clear to your planning department how you should define reasonable and unreasonable risk? Do you appreciate the freedom that you have here in defining goals, or do you think it would be better if the state guidelines were more specific?

Below are several posings. These refer to goals of the Safety Element as a planning instrument, or to natural hazard mitigation theories in general. Please indicate for every posing if, in your opinion, the Safety Element in practice substantially contributes to achieving these goals. A brief explanation of your answer would be appreciated.

Posings
"The Safety Element guarantees mitigation through the avoidance of hazards."
"Trough the Safety Element, the loss of life and property due to natural threats is minimized."
"The Safety Element keeps new developments out of hazardous areas."
"The Safety Element and the Land Use Element of the General Plan are closely related and support each other."
"The Safety Element regulates land use intensity and density based on risks and threats."
"Natural hazard mitigation policies are developed cooperatively with local, state and federal agencies if necessary."

C. List of interviewees and survey respondents - Netherlands

Hans van Ammers	-	Water consultant City of Arnhem
Wim Beursgens	-	Legal and planning consultant Buro 5 consultants, Maastricht
Sigrid Bosten	-	Water advice assistant Directorate of Public Works and Water Management - Region South
Sandra Coomans	-	Spatial planning assistant Water board "Groot Salland"
Christien Jansen	-	Spatial planning assistant City of Roermond
Andrea Kan	-	Urban developments and water consultant Province of Limburg
Frank Ramacher	-	Spatial planning assistant City of Maasgouw
Eric Teunissen	-	Senior water advice assistant Water board "Roer en Overmaas"

D. List of interviewees and survey respondents - California

Jonathan Borego	-	Principal planner City of Anaheim
Michelle Drouse	-	Associate planner City of Irvine
Barbara Lazar	-	Senior planner City of Burbank
Brian Miller	-	Planning and development assistant City of Fairfield
Tom Passanisi	-	Principal planner City of Redwood City