

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE (415) 904-5200
FAX (415) 904-5400
TDD (415) 597-5885



W13

September 24, 2009

TO: COMMISSIONERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

FROM: CHARLES LESTER, SENIOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR
ELIZABETH A. FUCHS, AICP, MANAGER, STATEWIDE PLANNING UNIT
RICK HYMAN, SENIOR PLANNER, STATEWIDE PLANNING UNIT

SUBJECT: **REPORT ON THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LCP WORKSHOP OF
AUGUST 12, 2009**

On August 12, 2009, at the request of the California League of Cities Coastal Cities Issue Group, the Commissioners, thirteen locally elected officials and the public participated in a moderated workshop to discuss improving the Local Coastal Program (LCP) planning process. This report highlights the main comments and ideas discussed at the workshop and some of the opportunities and constraints associated with implementation of the suggestions. As discussed below, in addition to the on-going regular activities of Commission staff to coordinate with local governments on pending matters, there are five specific short term actions that can be pursued with existing staffing and agency resources:

- Continuing to meet regularly with the Local Government Working Group to increase outreach, coordination, and feedback concerning implementation of the Commission's programs;
- Working with the Local Government Working Group to coordinate review and comment by local governments on two draft guidance documents expected to be completed in January 2010 (Procedural Guidance on Updating Implementation Plans and Guidance on Protecting Lower Cost Recreational Overnight Accommodations);
- Developing an email list of local officials and planning staff to facilitate quick transmittal of significant Commission information, key decisions, and other guidance;
- Reviewing and updating case examples in the Commission's online LUP Update Guide;
- Sending a letter to Planning Directors in coastal jurisdictions outlining the general process for submittal and review of LCP Amendments, identifying existing Commission local assistance materials and underscoring the need for regular and early coordination, as staffing allows, on priority issues, policy development, and procedural matters.

In addition to these short-term actions, staff will continue to evaluate potential longer-term actions or initiatives, including potential funding strategies, and the feasibility of their future implementation. As noted during the workshop, the Commission's current severe budget and staffing limitations, including mandated furlough days for all staff, preclude implementation of any other actions at this time. Staff will report back to the Commission on the progress of the short-term actions and other possible initiatives and funding opportunities to enhance the LCP planning process in 2010.

I. Summary of Workshop Comments and Suggestions

The August 12, 2009 Commission workshop on Improving the Local Coastal Planning Process included two major discussion sessions, each of which included public comment times. Eleven Commissioners and thirteen local officials participated in the roundtable, which was moderated by former Commissioner and County Supervisor Mike Reilly. Eighteen persons commented at the workshop and eleven comment letters were submitted. Background material for the workshop, including correspondence received, may be found on the Commission's website at: <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/meetings/mtg-mm9-8.html>. A recording of the entire workshop is archived at: <http://www.cal-span.org/cgi-bin/media.pl?folder=CCC>.

Participants and written comments expressed a wide variety of observations and ideas through the workshop. Overall, there appeared to be a general and strong commitment to the Coastal Act, and the workshop discussion focused on ways to improve its implementation for the benefit of all Californians. Staff has organized a summary of the comments and ideas into seven major categories. Staff has also attached a summary report on the Workshop prepared by the League of Cities Coastal Issues Group (Exhibit 1).

LCP Completion: Overview

Moderator Mike Reilly provided some background information on LCPs. As summarized in the background material for the workshop, most LCPs (covering about 88% of the coastal zone) are certified. Mike Reilly observed that since 1981, local government has issued over 36,000 coastal permits with only a small percentage appealed to the Commission. Thirty-six (36) LCP segments of the 128 segments (28%) remain to be certified. During the workshop, local officials and the Commissioners were in general agreement that all are committed to the Coastal Act and the protection of coastal resources, and want to find ways to better implement the Coastal Act. Local officials and Commissioners also agreed, however, that many LCPs need to be updated. If LCPs are updated it may result in a more efficient process and fewer conflicts. Participants noted that the LCP process includes the Commission (six of whose members are local officials), the public and local government, and all have different roles and responsibilities.

Communication/Coordination

Comments emphasized the importance of early and ongoing face-to-face communication and collaboration to avoid disputes and foster better understanding; where such early collaboration occurred, it resulted in a more productive process. Comments suggested that new policy under

consideration should be more available for public comment before adoption as a precedent. Others commented that suggested modifications to LCPs that are approved by the Commission do not get adequate public participation at the local level, and extensive public participation at the local level should be given deference.

Public comments noted that transparency is key to public participation and due diligence in assuring that LCPs and amendments are consistent with the Coastal Act takes time and effort to ensure the long term protection of finite resources. Further, sometimes, early input from the Commission staff about Coastal Act requirements is given but is not accepted by local governments. And, lack of agreement does not mean the process is not working. Communication may mean that the Commission and local government do not come to the same conclusion. Comments also noted that disputes may arise because the Commission implements statewide statutory requirements of the Coastal Act and statewide standards that differ from local requirements. The Coastal Act also requires a perspective that reflects all the people in the state and that balance of competing interests and stakeholders is part of the Coastal Act. But local governments should be recognized for managing coastlines for millions of visitors.

Ideas discussed to improve communication and coordination included:

- implementing a listserve to share information and best practices;
- conducting joint site visits;
- increased participation by coastal staff at local hearings;
- providing early input to coastal aspects of General Plan Updates;
- establishing a technical working group;
- providing earlier publication of proposed decision documents.

Education/Technology

Comments noted communication and participation among all stakeholders could improve by making better use of technology. It also is important to make better use of existing guidance available through the Commission's website, and to update and expand that guidance. Comments noted a need for education for local planners and officials on Coastal Act requirements and processes. Suggestions for improvements included:

- providing education for local planners and officials through local government training institutes;
- expanding the Commission's online LUP Update Guide and other materials;
- providing existing certified LCPs online;
- expanding use of websites to share information.

Streamlining/Efficiencies

Comments called for streamlining actions and encouraging a more consistent, predictable and timely process for LCP related reviews. Local government is frustrated by how long things take. Completion takes a long time and changes suggested late in the process are an issue. But

projects also need to be consistent with the LCP. Comments noted that if local government approved projects consistent with LCPs there would be no need for appeals. And, if an LCP is up to date Commission reviews generally do not take too long. Inconsistent scientific analysis is also an issue. The public also needs to be given adequate time for input. Suggestions for improvement included:

- more pre-application meetings;
- continuing to assess priorities in order to streamline more minor actions;
- setting priorities among the pending LCP items;
- considering possible MOUs with other agencies; and
- agreeing on an optimal process with timelines and with the scope of an LCP amendment defined at the beginning.

Guidance/Local Assistance

Discussion at the workshop highlighted suggestions to increase local assistance and provide a better understanding of what is expected by the Commission. It was noted that the Commission has done workshops in support of new policy (e.g. condo/hotels). Also, a template for an LCP could be difficult because every community is different so one size fits all may not be a good idea. Ideas for improvement included:

- developing guidance for a model LCP;
- developing guidance for standard components such as common definitions, mapping, standard and special conditions;
- expanding and updating the existing LUP Update Guide;
- providing an online clearinghouse of LCPs;
- providing additional technical information on sea level rise and a template of LCP provisions;
- developing a Technical Advisory Committee to provide input to new policy guidelines for example for sea level rise, climate change, erosion, ESHA, delineating habitat, other emerging issues.

Funding

Comments noted the financial constraints on the Commission and local governments to implement program enhancements at this time. Comments noted that pursuing technology improvements, efficiencies and streamlining can save everyone time and money and that it may be useful during the current economic downturn to address these issues. Public comments noted local priorities for spending should not focus on funding lobbyists and the Commission should share litigation judgment costs if local governments lose litigation. Suggestions were made to:

- have local government support the Commission in seeking coastal program funding;
- look for ways to fund pre-application meetings;
- investigate possible resources through the Strategic Growth Council.

Other

Workshop discussion also mentioned the need to update and strengthen the Coastal Act and LCPs to address emerging issues, to get seawall reform to prevent loss of beaches, to strengthen local enforcement and give the Commission the ability to decertify or suspend LCPs if not enforced, to change periodic review to 10 years, to develop sustainability metrics and to find ways to better engage inland governments.

II. Next Steps for Improving the LCP Planning Process

The workshop provided an excellent opportunity for local officials, the Commissioners and the public to discuss concerns about the LCP process and to suggest improvements. Staff will continue to work internally and with representatives of the League of Cities (LOC) and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), on the identification of ways to improve LCP planning and other coordination on regulatory matters. In addition to the on-going regular activities of Commission staff to coordinate with local governments over pending matters, there are five specific short term actions that can be pursued with existing staffing and agency resources:

- Continuing to meet regularly with the Local Government Working Group to increase outreach, coordination, and feedback concerning implementation of the Commission's programs;
- Working with the Local Government Working Group to coordinate review and comment by local governments on two draft guidance documents expected to be completed in January 2010 (Procedural Guidance on Updating Local Coastal Implementation Plans and Guidance on Protecting Lower Cost Recreational Overnight Accommodations);
- Developing an email list of local officials and planning staff to facilitate quick transmittal of significant Commission information, key decisions, and other guidance;
- Reviewing and updating case examples in the Commission's online LUP Update Guide;
- Sending a letter to Planning Directors in coastal jurisdictions outlining the general process for submittal and review of LCP Amendments, identifying existing Commission local assistance materials and underscoring the need for regular and early coordination, as staffing allows, on priority issues, policy development, and procedural matters.

In addition to these short-term actions, staff will continue to evaluate potential longer-term actions or initiatives, including potential funding strategies, and the feasibility of their future implementation. As noted during the workshop, the Commission's current severe budget and staffing limitations, including mandated furlough days for all staff, preclude implementation of any other actions at this time. Staff will report back to the Commission on the progress of the short-term actions and other possible initiatives and funding opportunities to enhance the LCP planning process in 2010.

Analysis

The Commission staff agrees that improving coordination and communication on LCP planning is an effective means to minimize conflict and improve LCP decision-making. However, significant staff time is needed to do so effectively with the 75 cities and counties that have land use responsibilities in the coastal zone. Current efforts are severely constrained by existing resource deficiencies. Nonetheless, staff continues to try to provide comments, meet with local planning staff and the public and provide early guidance on key priority LCP items within the constraints of existing resources.

LCPs are a Priority but Delays Necessarily Occur Due to Limited Staffing

LCP planning matters are one of the highest priorities of the Commission and a significant component of its annual workload. In FY07-08 the Commission reviewed an estimated 49 LCP related agenda items. In FY 08-09 it reviewed 82 planning related agenda items (a 67% increase). In addition in FY 08-09 there were 19 Executive Director Certification Reviews and 38 Time Extensions approved for pending LCP items. This data reflects that the Commission staff has been directing available resources to LCP planning items as a priority for action. But resources remain very limited. During this same time period the Commission had significantly fewer front-line coastal analysts available for planning and regulatory reviews due to budget cuts. Most analysts are responsible for multiple jurisdictions; and the workload associated with original jurisdiction permitting, appeals of local permits, and LCP items for even a single county is substantial. Coastal analyst staff time currently is even further reduced for FY 09-10 due to the mandatory three furlough days per month (equivalent to an approximate 15% reduction in staff or 21 positions). Yet, recently staff estimated that there were 105 LCP items awaiting action, in addition to other regulatory work.

Other resource constraints impact the Commission's capacity to work effectively with local governments. For example, a Local Assistance Program has been started and eliminated several times over the past decade depending on available funding. Given limited resources local assistance now is dependent in large part on federal grant funds.

Overall, it is clear that while LCPs continue to be a priority for the Commission, delays in LCP reviews may not be primarily due to problems in the LCP process but rather because of the lack of sufficient resources to support the optimum LCP review process. Communication takes considerable staff time. With declining resources the Commission staff has fewer staff hours available for early consultation and commenting, pre-application meetings, consistent attendance at local meetings, local assistance guidance and other means of early coordination. It also seems clear that local governments are often struggling with the same lack of staff resources to adequately coordinate on coastal planning matters. Hence, further identification of resources to support more efficient communication mechanisms and collaboration, such as regular coordination meetings, would no doubt benefit both the Commission and local governments.

Efforts to Set Priorities Have Occurred and Will Continue

Concerning comments to set priorities to streamline LCP planning efforts, the Coastal Commission recently has reviewed the staff criteria for setting priorities. On March 11, 2009, the Commission reviewed with the Executive Director the agency workload priorities. (See <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2009/3/W26b-3-2009.pdf>). Planning and regulatory priorities were identified and among these priorities are LCP updates, amendments and completion, with the direction that:

. . . working with local government to identify amendments with relatively higher priority is one way to allocate staff time. Minor or project driven amendments having little coastal resource impacts are clearly of lower priority. Of highest importance are those more general LCP updates initiated by local government that seek to address various significant weaknesses in existing programs such as topical areas dealing with public access, ESHA, water quality, climate change, agricultural lands protection, view shed protections and lower cost recreational and visitor serving opportunities and facilities.

The report goes on to note that priorities include efforts where success is likely and efforts to strengthen the planning partnership with local governments and concludes with the factors considered in allocating limited staff resources.

As noted above, most of the geographic area of the coastal zone is governed by a certified LCP. The remaining uncertified segments may not be completed for a variety of reasons, including that these coastal areas may be small relative to the rest of the jurisdiction or LCP planning may not be a high priority for the local jurisdiction's limited resources or there is a fundamental disagreement in policy application that precludes progress. As a result, the Commission's priorities reflect that it may be more effective to focus resources on comprehensive updates as opposed to more limited and in particular project-driven LCP amendments. Given limited staff and the number of pending items, staff will continue to set priorities for completing LCP reviews in a timely manner as possible. The Commission staff will seek ways to streamline reviews wherever possible. Staff will also continue to work with local governments, as feasible, on identification of mutual LCP planning priorities.

Early Coordination has Occurred and Should be Expanded if Possible

The Commission staff has and will continue to try to provide early comments on priority LCP matters as feasible. Enforcement staff has also participated in regional taskforces and enforcement groups to strengthen the local-state planning and regulatory partnership. Examples of recent coordination efforts are noted in Table 1.

TABLE 1: EARLY COORDINATION EXAMPLES

<i>Northern and Central California Examples</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early coordination with city staff, Georgia Pacific officials, and consultants on the City of Fort Bragg's Georgia Pacific Mill Site Re-use Plan. Workshop with Commission on the preliminary plan in August, 2009 to provide direct Commission input to the City; • Comment letters on the draft sections of the Marin County LCP Update; • Early consultation with Sonoma County staff on a pending comprehensive LCP Update; • Comment letters, staff-to-staff meetings, and Board attendance by Commission staff on the San Mateo County Mid-Coast Update; • Initiating regular coordination with Santa Cruz County; • On-going quarterly coordination meetings with Monterey County on pending items and issues; • Regular coordination with San Luis Obispo County on the proposed modifications to the Agricultural Cluster Ordinance;
<i>South Central and Southern California Examples</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly coordination meetings with the County of Santa Barbara concerning pending items, including Goleta Beach Pier project and Miramar hotel project and comment letters concerning the Naples LCP amendment and the Moore Mesa project; • Comment letter on the draft LCP for the City of Goleta; • Early coordination meetings with the County of Ventura concerning the Channel Islands Public Works Plan update; • In coordination with CA State Parks, CCC staff prepared the Pierpont Sand Management Plan for the City of Ventura and participated in a public workshop concerning the plan; • On-going coordination meetings with the County of Los Angeles on the Marina del Rey "aggregate" LCP amendment and critical public works projects in the Santa Monica Mountains; • On-going participation on the Santa Monica Mountains Enforcement Task Force; • Early coordination meetings with the City of Redondo Beach regarding the Redondo Beach Harbor Area LCP segment; • On-going quarterly meetings with the City of Long Beach on pending LCP amendments and coastal development permits; • Early coordination meetings with the City of Los Angeles regarding the Venice preferential parking program and Portero Canyon project; • Early coordination meetings with the City of Santa Monica on Civic Center project and Third Street Mall project. • EIR comments and early coordination meetings on Dana Point Harbor Revitalization Plan; • City tour and early coordination meetings on comprehensive update to the Newport Beach LUP; • Site tour and early coordination on Aliso Creek Redevelopment LCPA; • Site tour, draft EIR comment letter and early coordination on Banning Ranch LCPA; • Comment letters, attendance at local workshop and early coordination meetings for several versions of the draft City of Solana Beach LUP; • Early coordination meetings and EIR comment letter on City of Oceanside LCPA for Oceanside Beach Resort and the D Downtown District

One of the communication issues that should be addressed is how to improve coordination between local staff, local decision-makers, and the Commission. In most LCP planning matters wherein the Commission staff provides feedback, it is generally provided to local planning staff so that local officials (and Coastal Commissioners) do not necessarily see achievements or issues that may have been resolved or conflicts avoided through communication at the staff level. Greater Commission staff participation at local Board and Council meetings is preferred, but depends on available resources.

Overall, the Commission staff has and continues to emphasize early communication and coordination within existing resources and will seek ways to expand these efforts. The existing League of Cities and CSAC working group formed to implement the August workshop agenda is one vehicle for sharing information and with agreement of participants will continue to meet on a periodic basis. On major projects, the Commission staff will try to provide early comments and feedback and encourage joint field trips or site visits where relevant. Pre-application meetings are often already held for many major permit and LCP Amendment projects and will be further encouraged.

Unfortunately, the main constraint for the Commission to increasing face-to-face communication and coordination on LCP planning matters with each of the 75 coastal jurisdictions is lack of sufficient staff in each of the Commission's district offices. Lacking additional staff, the Commission will need to continue to target only the highest priority matters.

Staff Will Continue to Provide LCP Guidance Where Possible

Many comments at the workshop highlighted the need for more training and guidance and consideration of a model LCP template. Over the years the Commission has provided LCP guidance ranging from specific topics to the current on-line LUP update guide. The Commission also has long made available a "Local Coastal Program Post-Certification Guide" that provides general guidance on the local coastal development permit process, appeals to the Commission, and the LCP amendment process. The Commission has not prepared a model template for LCPs or LCP components. This is partly because of the unique circumstances of each local government and the need to customize LCPs to local jurisdictions and methods. In some cases there may not be one model policy that will fit all cases throughout the geographic and resource diverse coastal zone. On the other hand, some model language on specific issues, such as providing a definition of development consistent with the Coastal Act, is more straight-forward.

Commission staff appreciates and understands the interest in having more direct guidance on both policy and procedural issues, and will continue to pursue options for providing enhanced LCP guidance in the future. The Commission has developed and is continuing to develop local assistance guidance documents. Funded by a federal grant, the Commission developed the existing LUP Update Guide in 2007. Under a FY 08 federal grant, the Commission staff will be releasing a draft Guide to updating Local Implementation components of the LCP and guidance on Protecting Lower Cost Visitor Serving Overnight Accommodations in January 2010. As part of the Commission FY 09-10 federal grant the Commission staff will pursue projects to help

implement priority tasks that address some of the workshop ideas. In addition, in the immediate term, staff will be updating various examples in the Commission's online LUP Update Guide.

Longer Term Goals and Objectives

Many good suggestions were made by local government, the Commission, and the public at the workshop, for example, developing educational and training efforts and pursuing expanded use of technology. Staff personnel and financial resources are extremely limited to pursue new initiatives. For example, expansion of technology may be dependent on upgrade of the Commission's computer systems. Development of an online digital certified LCP library requires extensive research into, and conversion of, decades-old documents. Despite these obstacles the staff believes that it is important for the staff to continue to evaluate the ideas presented at the workshop and possible additional ideas that, if funded, could help address some of the concerns raised at the workshop as well as contribute to the general improvement of California's coastal management program. Such evaluation could help the Commission pursue funding opportunities to initiate priority projects.

In addition to pursuing the short term projects identified above, staff will report back to the Commission on progress and possible future initiatives later in 2010. Although immediate options are limited, staff is optimistic that significant reinvestment in LCP planning will occur over the longer term. Such investment will be critical for the Commission and local governments to be able to respond effectively to on-going mutual coastal resource management challenges, such as adapting to the wide-ranging impacts of climate change. Staff also looks forward to continuing to build on the positive working relationship that has been established with coastal cities and counties through the League of Cities and California State Association of Counties engagement of the Commission in the last several years.



“Improving the Local Coastal Program”
A Joint Workshop with the California Coastal Commission and
Coastal Cities and Counties
Report from the Coastal Cities Issues Group
~September 2009~

The Coastal Cities Issues Group, established by the League Board in the spring of 2007, has been working to make the local coastal program process more efficient and predictable as well as improve communications and the working relationship between coastal cities and the California Coastal Commission (CCC).

The group has made much progress towards this goal in the past year. Coastal cities partnered with coastal counties to hold a roundtable public discussion with coastal commissioners on improving the local coastal program process. The workshop allowed for significant progress toward achieving the goals set forth in the 2009-10 work program (attached). The following is a summary of the public workshop.

Summary of the Public Workshop with the Coastal Commission:

On August 12, representatives from the coastal cities issues group and the coastal counties caucus participated in a historic roundtable discussion with Coastal Commissioners as part of a special commission workshop on improving the Local Coastal Program (LCP) process. Mike Reilly, former Sonoma County Supervisor and former Coastal Commissioner moderated the four hour workshop.

Local government participants included Jere Melo, Council Member, City of Fort Bragg; Rich Gordon, Supervisor, San Mateo County; John P. Shoals, Mayor, City of Grover Beach; David Finigan, Supervisor, Del Norte County; Carrie Downey, Council Member, City of Coronado; Bruce Gibson, Supervisor, San Luis Obispo County; Toni Iseman, Council Member, City of Laguna Beach; Iya Falcone, Council Member, City of Santa Barbara; Kathy Long, Supervisor, Ventura County; Nancy Gardner, Council Member, City of Newport Beach; Greg Cox, Supervisor, San Diego County; Peter Tucker, Council Member, Hermosa Beach; and Kendall Smith, Supervisor, Mendocino County.

Coastal Commission participants included Steve Blank, Sara Wan, Dr. William Burke, Mary Shallenberger, Patrick Kruer, Bonnie Neely (chair), Ross Mirkarimi, Khatchik Achadjian, Larry Clark, Dan Secord and Gregg Albright (Business, Transportation and Housing Department).

This was the first meeting of local government representatives and commissioners to discuss issues of mutual interest in the thirty-three years since adoption of the Coastal Act. Local coastal government representatives emphasized the need for all cities and counties to have an updated LCP. In order to accomplish this, they commented that the Local Coastal Program process needs to be more consistent, be reviewed using common standards and have a more predictable timeline.

Workshop participants had a thoughtful and courteous exchange. Both local government and the coastal commission representatives made general references to difficult experiences with the LCP

process. Below is a summary of the comments that were made during the workshop and possible solutions to improve the local coastal program process going forward.

Summary of Comments from the workshop:

Improving the Local Coastal Program Process

- Many jurisdictions have an out of date LCP or do not have an approved LCP. The Coastal Commission and local coastal governments need to move forward together toward the shared goal of complete implementation of the coastal act.
- Both coastal commissioners and local government representatives agree- every jurisdiction needs to have an updated certified LCP. In order to accomplish this, local governments feel the LCP process must become more timely, predictable, and consistent. LCP's should be reviewed principally on the basis of whether or not they meet the requirements of the Coastal Act.
- Early coordination between coastal staff and local government staff on LCP issues has proven successful in the past. Need to open the lines of communication between the two parties and have a continued dialogue.
- Local government representatives expressed concern that LCP's are more detailed than is required by the Coastal Act. Often times, the CCC inappropriately scrutinize details that go well beyond the Coastal Act. What can a city or county do when this happens?
- The Coastal Act calls for maximum public participation. Participants expressed concern that local public input is not always taken into consideration by CCC staff. The CCC staff makes changes to an LCP in a staff report to the CCC, yet those changes have never been vetted or discussed by the local public. Additionally, many local jurisdictions have tremendous public involvement in the process of preparing their LCP- this should be considered by the CCC in the approval process.
- Need to have a more open process when the CCC is dealing with a new issue. Currently, the new issue is typically addressed at the project level without full discussion with local jurisdictions as a group; the issue then becomes precedent setting and applied to all without full discussion (i.e., condo hotel issue)
- LCPs need to take into consideration unique local circumstances. Workshop examples included the Santa Barbara "funk zone", agriculture lands in northern California, and agency agreements for public coastal developments, prior to a review and certification by the CCC.

Limited Resources

- Need to discuss the funding issue. CCC has very limited funding or no funding opportunities to accomplish these issues. Need direction on how CCC affords any action items that may come out of this workshop.
- Budget shortfalls limit the CCC staff support needed to process LCPs.
- Technology can cut costs and improve tracking of LCPs. Workshop examples were posting current LCPs on local government web sites, creation of one or more list-serve sites to share information and use of state-created Strategic Growth Council guidelines.
- It was noted that local jurisdictions also have limited funding resources, but still believe these are issues that need to be addressed. It was pointed out that a recession (slow time for development) might be a good opportunity to look at efficiencies and address these issues in preparation for a time when the economy turns around. Financial constraints are the reason we need to address these issues. Resolving these issues will save all parties time and money.

- CCC should recognize that coastal cities pay millions of dollars to keep the beaches preserved, open and clean for millions of Californians and visitors.
- It was noted that it cost approx. \$80,000 to set up the workshop. This included CCC staff time to work with the League and others in coordinating the workshop.
- The requirement for a five years review of LCPs is not practical; should the Coastal Act be revised to establish a different time for review?
- Some attention is needed to address the necessity of lobbyist-type representatives for matters before the CCC.

Potential Solutions

- Need to develop a model LCP or standardize LCP issues when possible to assist local jurisdictions. A goal should be to establish a template that all jurisdictions can use. An LCP template for common use might not be possible due to the uniqueness of the different communities; however, it was discussed that there are common LCP issues in everyone's LCP and other issues can be standardized and applied to a jurisdiction if applicable. Suggest a technical advisory committee with local city and county planners to help address the issues.
- Need to prioritize CCC LCP process/applications.
- Should focus on key LCP issues and set aside small, insignificant issues that are not critical or necessary to be consistent with the Coastal Act.
- Set up a coastal list serve between coastal jurisdictions and CCC staff.
- All LCP's should be posted online as a resource.
- An optimal timeline diagram could be produced as a guide for local governments and commission staff as well as a flow diagram of the LCP process.
- Early consultation, and continued communication throughout the local process, should minimize or eliminate "recommended modifications" once an LCP is submitted to the Commission.
- A pre-application process might be used to bring better understanding of the standards of review. Should a fee be established to support this idea?
- Coastal planning is somewhat different from more common planning matters. The League and CSAC should include coastal planning specific sessions to their conferences and seminars for coastal planners and elected officials.
- Policy conflict process-have a process to resolve issues collectively and not in an isolated (project related) report that then becomes precedent setting.
- Should there be a series of memorandums of understanding between local governments, the commission and other state agencies to resolve issues such as housing, water quality NPDES permits, where review standards and time frames and jurisdictions are not the same?
- Some state agencies publish a "proposed decision" well in advance of their public hearing. Would a similar process work for the LCP certification process?
- Fees for CCC permits and appeals are transferred to the Coastal Conservancy. Should CCC fees become available as operating funds?
- Explore and leverage the Strategic Growth Council funding.
- Develop working groups and move forward on a couple of the issues.
- Many local governments experience problems with the LCP amendment process similar to the problems experienced with LCP submittal. Many of potential solutions proposed

to make the LCP submittal process should also be considered for the LCP amendment process. **

- Programs funded through the Coastal Conservancy should have a local government focus. **

Many thanks to the twelve coastal city and county representatives who participated in the public workshop as well as coastal city and county staff who spoke during the public comment period. Following the workshop, participants as well as staff felt that it was a successful and worthwhile first step in improving the local coastal program process and opening the lines of communication between local coastal governments and the coastal commission.

Next Steps. Over the next several months the Coastal Cities Issues Group will be working on the following projects to move forward with the goal of improving the LCP process:

- Establish an email listserv for coastal city and county planners to exchange information about projects and regulations.
- Convene a working group of coastal city and county planners to offer suggested changes and amendments to the local coastal program guide currently offered by the Coastal Commission. A similar type of working group could meet with Coastal Commission staff to work on other technical issues commonly experienced with the LCP process.
- Encourage the League and CSAC to offer coastal planning educational sessions at conferences throughout the year.

Local government representatives wish to hold another roundtable discussion with the coastal commission in the near future to discuss how possible solutions to improve the LCP process may be implemented.

** These comments were made by coastal cities issues group members following the public workshop