

Summarized Comments from 8/2/17 CCC Webinar

- 1) There were multiple questions about the status of legislation or the need for changes to the Coastal Act.
- 2) Many participants asked about land uses other than residential, citing commercial and infrastructure assets as important for adaptation planning.
- 3) A little more background on what methodologies would help to "internalize risk" was requested.
- 4) One question was about how public beach nourishment would be funded.

5) In the guidance, do you intend to weight or emphasize some adaptation measures over others? For example, choosing armoring over managed retreat for a threatened or damaged residential site, over a longer time horizon, as the area continues to get threatened and damaged with increasing magnitude and frequency which will most certainly be the case, the site will ultimately become an "unmanaged retreat.

6) Pg 2 Are the model policies part of the proposed interpretive guideline? Specifically:

Pg 46 50% or more of a major structural component, taking into consideration previous alterations approved on or after the date of this LUP (or subject amendment) certification; or an alteration that constitutes less than 50% increase in floor area where the proposed alteration would result in a cumulative addition of 50% or greater of the floor area

7) What does use of policies 'only if relevant' mean? Can a local government determine not only what is relevant, but what is APPROPRIATE?

8) The Guidelines stress the need for "enhanced community participation." In this case the statewide constituency for SLR is the affected community, and this is of such importance that it deserves an interactive workshop with the Commission where the public can participate in a meaningful way. For example, based on online interactive polling, each of those issues could be taken up for discussion by the Commission individually, with some of the original commenters stating their case and interacting with the Commission. The workshop should be scheduled for a day when no other items are to be heard to give the Commission enough time to digest the information. Then they should vote after a regular public hearing at a later date.

9) Will the State Lands Commission be addressing the issue of public trust lands and harm to public trust resources by interfering with future migration of such trust lands?

Will the State Lands Commission be addressing in a rulemaking the issue of current development interfering with FUTURE migration of public trust lands?

10) Good to hear there will be more opportunities for input. It is unfortunate that there was so minimal advance notice of this webinar, and such limited capacity to accommodate interested and affected

parties, especially for meaningful give and take. Future interaction should provide ample opportunity for input.

11) Does the coastal commission have a 'default position', (to protect or to not protect) concerning residential developments that are closer to the waterline than would be allowed since the coastal act? Would the commission just assume these developments be eliminated over time? Or is the commission neutral and leaving that up to local LCPs?

12) In the implementation of the adaptation pathway there are triggering actions, how are the funding paths and timelines matched up the triggers identified in the pathways?

13) How do you see adaptation pilot or demonstration projects specifically for residential development being permitted or tried under current policies?

14) The guidance presents examples where local agencies plan to purchase private property in some instances. This is not realistic for many agencies and could involve a costly condemnation process. Is anyone at the CCC considering a program to assist agencies in this regard?

15) Is existing development only defined as structures build prior to the Coastal Act? What about newer structures that are building legally under a CDP?

16) Are storms considered by the CC as "sea level rise"?

17) Are roads / streets close to the ocean under the CC purview?

18) Is there guidance on balancing competing needs--e.g. the need to protect existing private development, versus protecting a walkable beach, where the two conflict?

Summarized Comments from 8/29/17 CCC Webinar

19) Why is there not a section mandating that the state purchase those existing homes which the Coastal Commission will not allow to be protected?

20) What is the Commission's view of maintaining already existing (county-permitted) sea walls protecting development?

21) Under F 1 are all post 1-1-77 properties with existing shoreline protection required to secure new permits for the protective devices? Ed Spriggs, Imperial Beach city council

22) There is going to be a lot of review work coming up - is the Coastal Commission going to expand staff and budget?

23) How will this guidance incorporate the revision to State SLR guidance scheduled for adoption in January 2018?

24) Where is information on repair of seawalls becoming new development found in the draft document?

25) On pg. 46, the box language about increased market value should be eliminated because first it is not discussed in A or B below, and second because it is very hard to measure the causation of market value increases in rising market time periods.

26) Are you expecting to require local governments to do detailed hazard exposure mapping with SLR as part of LCP updates?