

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

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



F9b

March 28, 2013

TO: COMMISSIONERS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

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

**SUBJECT: REPORT ON THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT – COASTAL COMMISSION
WORKSHOP OF DECEMBER 12, 2012– IMPROVING THE LOCAL
COASTAL PLANNING PROCESS**

Representatives of the California League of Cities (LOC) Coastal Cities Issue Group and the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Coastal Counties Caucus requested a second workshop between Local Officials and Coastal Commissioners, similar to that held August 12, 2009,¹ to continue to enhance communication and improve the LCP Process. The local organizations also recommended that this workshop be established as a biennial event. Twelve locally elected officials and the public participated in a moderated workshop on December 12, 2012, in San Francisco.² Please see the Attachment A for the list of participants.

This report highlights the main comments and ideas discussed at the workshop. Following the workshop the Commission staff also received input on suggested next steps. As detailed in Section II of this report and in Attachment B, these involve suggestions for ways to build strong relationships between Coastal Commission and local jurisdictions, increase efficiencies in the LCP Amendment Process, make priorities and expectations more clear, and increase education on the LCP process. Many of these are suggestions that staff supports and are integrated into the staff recommended actions.

Staff recommends that there are six specific short term actions that could be pursued subject to available staffing to respond to the issues discussed in the workshop. In the workshop,

¹ Please see the results of that initial workshop meeting at:

<http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2009/10/W13-10-2009.pdf> .

² The agenda is available at: <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/12/W3-12-2012-a1.pdf> and the background staff report at: <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/12/W3-12-2012.pdf> .

Commission staff noted efforts made to date to increase early communication and coordination, and these efforts will continue.

The following are suggested as actions that Commission staff will pursue as part of the LCP program and implementation of the agency's Strategic Plan:

- Continue to discuss improving the LCP process with representatives of local governments. Decide with them the best ways to further this discussion and the best venue(s) in which to participate (e.g., meetings of the Coastal Groups of the League of Cities (LOC) and California State Association of Counties (CSAC), continuation of the Local Government Working Group; other coordination events.) (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.4.1)
- In coordination with local staff, follow the *Draft Tips/ Best Practices for Processing LCP Amendments* (Appendix II of <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/12/W3-12-2012.pdf>) to the extent resources allow. Allocate resources to those amendments deemed priorities; and for the highest priority items, meet with local staffs at their request and as resources allow to reach agreement on priorities, scope and scheduling of any pending LCP amendments, consistent with Coastal Act statutory deadlines (Draft Strategic Plan Action 4.4.2 and 4.4.3);
- Develop additional communication tools to facilitate quick transmittal of significant Commission information, key decisions, and other guidance to local planning staff and local officials (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 7.2.4);
- Complete the update of the Commission's online LUP Update Guide (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.2.3; 2.13; 2.4.2; 2.5.1);
- Investigate and, in coordination with local governments and other coastal stakeholders, pursue strategies to bolster funding for LCP program activities (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.4.6);
- Organize and conduct workshops on policy and planning information related to sea level rise (anticipated Feb 2013) and protection of agricultural resources (anticipated May 2013) (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.2.3).

In addition to these short-term actions which could be initiated now and over the next 1-2 years subject to available staffing, staff will continue to evaluate potential longer-term initiatives and the feasibility of their future implementation. Staff plans to report back to the Commission on the progress of the short-term actions and initiating additional actions to enhance the LCP planning process at a later date.

I. Summary of Workshop Comments and Suggestions

The December 12, 2012 Commission workshop on Improving the Local Coastal Planning Process consisted of two major discussion sessions, each of which included public comment times. Twelve Commissioners and twelve local officials participated in the roundtable, which was moderated by former Commissioner and newly elected Assemblyman Mark Stone. Eleven persons commented at the workshop and sixteen comment letters were submitted. (Please see Attachment A for list of participants.) 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>.

Comments embraced a wide variety of observations and ideas. Overall, there appeared to be a general and strong commitment to the Coastal Act. 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 the following six major categories.

Communication/Coordination/Efficiency in LCP Amendment Process

Support was voiced for following the *Draft Tips/ Best Practices for Processing LCP Amendments* (Appendix II of <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/12/W3-12-2012.pdf>), in particular communication as early as possible in the LCP process. Speakers acknowledged that Commission staff had coordinated earlier and more frequently with many jurisdictions in the last few years and those efforts were productive. (Please see: *Successful LCP Amendment Coordination – Commission Examples* Attachment I of <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/12/W3-12-2012.pdf>.)

Nevertheless, some participants still raised concerns about lack of adequate coordination with Commission staff. Two concerns, in particular, were voiced -- “scope creep” and the process and schedule for review of suggested modification. “Scope creep” is a concern that the Commission and staff attempt to address issues that the local government believes are not included in the scope of the LCP Amendment submittal and that were not the subject of a local public review process. The concern with the suggested modification process is that because recommended suggested modifications to LCP amendments are developed by Commission staff later in the development of the staff recommendation, they may not have been given due consideration at the local level thus making it more difficult to try to resolve disputes prior to the Commission hearing. The two concerns can be related. If information has not been adequately communicated among all parties in ongoing coordination, the release of recommended suggested modifications may trigger “scope creep” concerns; e.g., a frustration that the Commission is presenting new ideas only at a late stage.

Suggestions for the Commission to improve communication, coordination and efficiency included:

- Assigning sufficient staff to LCP review and/or dedicating certain staff exclusively to LCP review and making staff available to meet with local governments as needed or requested throughout the LCP amendment process;
- Formalizing the procedures for submitting Coastal Commission staff comments to local governments during their consideration of an LCP amendment;
- As much as resources allow, encouraging both Commission and local staff to follow the suggested process in *Draft Best Practices for Processing LCP Amendments* (dated November 29, 2012); manage the process to ensure that the best practices are followed;
- In addition to requirements in the California Code of Regulations, standardizing timelines for various steps in the process (e.g., 90 days for initial scoping; 90 days to 1 year for

final issue scoping at the local level; or apply state Permit Streamlining Act timelines to LCP amendments);

- Clarifying expectations with local government early in their process as to the scope and/or content of an LCP amendment and honoring any agreement reached throughout the process;
- Using the process mandated for resolving permit disputes with local governments (Regulation §13569) to resolve disagreements on LCP issues;
- Processing more LCP amendments as “minor” amendments;
- Providing more definitive guidance on what constitutes an acceptable LCP amendment submittal, including suggestions on appropriate organization of required materials and examples of sufficient LCP amendment submittals; if requested, meeting with the local staff before they submit to ensure that their submittal package will satisfy requirements;
- Avoiding granting time extensions to the statutory deadlines for acting on LCP amendments routinely; tailoring the amount of time extended to the specific LCP amendment (as opposed to granting 1 year extensions); informing local governments of issues with LCP amendments pending at the Commission before granting time extensions for acting on the amendment;
- Agreeing on more rapid timelines for action on each LCP amendment (e.g. 3 months) depending on its complexity, or whether it facilitates a project beneficial to economic development; ; adhering to agreed upon schedules;
- Ensuring ample public participation in all stages of the LCP amendment hearing process;
- Meeting with local representatives about unresolved issues before Commission action on an LCP submittal; affording them sufficient time to react to suggested modifications before taking action;
- Approving non-contentious parts of LCP amendments rather than denying the entire submittal or allowing local governments to remove contentious parts before a Commission decision (note: Regulations currently allow local governments to revise a LCP amendment submittal any time before Commission action);
- Establishing appropriate parameters for suggested modifications, such as nexus (e.g., avoiding suggesting modifications to parts of an LCP not part of the amendment submittal) and proportionality (e.g., avoiding suggesting substantive modifications to LCP amendments that only involve reorganization or reformatting);
- Initiating a LCP amendment improvement task force to help ensure ideas are implemented and to develop additional suggestions.

LCP Completion and Updating

Some commenters acknowledged that uncertified LCPs (where the Commission still issues all coastal permits) and outdated LCPs contribute to workload and LCPA amendment review issues. Certified and updated LCPs might result in fewer appeals of locally issued coastal permits and when appeals are made, fewer required project modifications and conditions.

Suggestions for the Commission to ensure that LCPs are certified or updated included:

- Penalizing local governments that do not have complete certified LCPs;
- Prioritizing LCP work;

- Requiring LCPs to be updated;
- Conducting periodic reviews.

Financial Support

Commenters generally recognized that a large part of the communication issue was due to lack of Commission funding to adequately staff the program. Absent adequate staffing levels, staff assigned to LCPs do not have time to be fully engaged in every pending LCP amendment. Staffing levels have decreased over the years and planning workload remains high. Discussion at the workshop identified a range of possible methods to raise revenue so that the Commission can allocate more staff to LCP amendment review, including clearing the backlog of pending amendments. The benefits and constraints of some of the methods for increasing revenues were discussed. For example, one method would target ways for applicants to fully pay for processing of project-driven LCP amendments. The applicant would benefit from priority processing. And, because additional funds would cover processing those LCP amendments, the remaining amendments would then be subject to less delay. But, such a funding method has the potential to introduce bias and inequity into the process because it would favor larger, more well-funded companies and may burden individuals with smaller projects seeking amendments.

Suggestions for the Commission to pursue a funding strategy included:

- Brainstorming ways to obtain more money;
- Obtaining payment from local governments to process their amendments;
- Charging the full cost (recovery) of processing LCP amendments;
- Requesting funding from the legislature for LCP amendment work;
- Obtaining support from NOAA Coastal Services;
- Obtaining support from the Institute for Local Government.

General Communication Improvements

Although the workshop focus was on the LCP process, some discussion addressed broader communication issues that involve local government and the public. Some commenters perceived inconsistencies in direction from Commission staff. Also, some frustrations were expressed with the Commission making a decision on an LCP amendment that then becomes precedent for future items without adequate communication and input from other local governments. Other local governments may not have been informed of the decision on the prior item, may not have been made aware of how the decision could affect pending amendments in their jurisdictions or may not have been in a position to respond to the Commission decision because it was made too late relative to their own amendment process. In addition there were observations that improvements could be made in how the Commission disseminates information, especially about such influential decisions, and in how local planners and officials are informed about Coastal Act requirements and processes. The need to improve the Commission's website to be a more effective communication tool was noted.

Suggestions for improvements the Commission could institute included:

- Having the Executive Director meet with each local government and explain his philosophy and management approach;

- Offering opportunities for local governments to discuss with Commissioners disagreements they have with Commission staff;
- Producing more informative and updated guidance documents;
- Improving the Commission website;
- Providing training materials to local staffs and/or conducting workshops and training sessions for local staffs;
- Conducting field trips to sites of major amendments;
- Sending timely emails to local staffs on Commission policy decisions.

Specific Coastal Act Topics

Comments suggested that workshops on specific, priority Coastal Act topics would be another way to enhance communication with local government and improve the LCP process.

Suggested topics for the Commission to hold workshops on included:

- Sea level rise and other aspects of climate change;
- Agriculture;
- Lot line adjustments;
- Fire hazards, as well as other topics where there are potentially conflicting mandates from different agencies;
- Lower-cost accommodation mitigation and the requirements to protect such mitigation “in perpetuity”;
- ESHA – the statutory definition, methods to ensure complete protection and potential adverse effects of not managing ESHA;
- Marine debris;
- Tsunami run-up.

The workshop also served to alert local officials to the forthcoming release of draft guidance for addressing Sea Level Rise. Following the Local Government Workshop, Dr. Gary Griggs, Director, Institute of Marine Sciences at University of California, Santa Cruz and NRC Scientific Committee Member presented findings and California highlights from the National Research Council’s new report: *Sea-Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future*. (Please see <http://www.cal-span.org/cgi-bin/archive.php?owner=CCC&date=2012-12-12> Item #4.5 for Dr. Griggs’ presentation and see http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13389 for the report itself.)

Commission Decision-Making and General Procedures

Many commenters acknowledged the statutory requirements of the Coastal Act, the decision-making authority of the Commission and the Coastal Act as the standard of review. They recognized disagreements will occasionally remain between local governments and the Commission even if all the suggested Best Practices and other recommendations for improved communication, coordination and efficiency are followed. Nevertheless, some comments expressed displeasure with aspects of Commission decision-making or reflected a fundamental

disagreement with the constraints on local government in the regulatory framework contained in Coastal Act.

Suggestions for the Commission regarding decision-making and the process to follow included:

- Being less detailed in decisions rendered; deferring to or collaborating with local governments on the details; factoring social and economic benefits and other local interests into decisions; making “balanced” decisions;
- Being consistent in rendering decisions (e.g., rendering consistent decisions statewide or at least regionally on issues, such as adaptation to climate change; respecting court settlements in subsequent decisions);
- Limiting amount of appeals heard and/or limiting the extent that appeal decisions are considered precedential;
- Interpreting definition of “development” in a narrower way;
- Allowing applicants to speak at the substantial issue hearing on an appeal;
- Recognizing expertise of applicants;
- Revising regulations to accomplish these suggestions.

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. In addition to the many comments made at the Workshop as outlined in this report, some subsequent correspondence suggested more immediate steps that could be taken (see Attachment B).

Several steps are proposed to encourage more communication through meetings both with statewide organizations and with individual local jurisdictions pursuing LCP amendments. Commission staff is supportive of such communication efforts as much as resources allow.

Steps to encourage more education on, and communication about, the LCP process and Commission policies through local government training sessions and workshops and other mechanisms was suggested including a clear/streamlined means of communicating policies with local jurisdictions, including website improvement. The Commission staff supports further discussion of these types of educational activities and the continuation of the Commission-Local Government Joint Workshops every 2-3 years, but such activities, including improvements to the website, are dependent on the availability of staff resources.

Several steps were suggested to help increase efficiencies in the process and to adhere to the scope of the amendment submittals. These included such measures as prioritizing staff workload to facilitate early coordination and issue identification, identifying standard timelines for each stage of the process, mechanisms to adhere to the timelines, making information about scheduling and efforts to resolve issues more transparent and providing checklists and other guidance for Amendment submittals. Commission staff is already increasing early communication with local government staff and is pursuing early coordination for priority LCP Amendments to the extent existing resource allow. Often, if a local jurisdiction has several amendments planned, Commission staff will coordinate with them on priority and scheduling of

the various amendments. Commission staff supports communication to reach a mutually-agreeable process and timeline on any given LCP Amendment, but such timelines must reflect available resources and statutory requirements.

Staff worked to integrate many of these suggestions into the short term measures outlined below. The suggestions are dependent on availability of resources. As any additional post-workshop suggestions are submitted from local government and the public, staff will continue to consider additional steps to enhance the process.

Short-term Measures

There are six specific short-term actions that the Commission staff will pursue subject to available staffing:

- Continue to discuss improving the LCP process with representatives of local governments. Decide with them the best ways to further this discussion and the best venue(s) in which to participate (e.g., meetings of the Coastal Groups of the League of Cities (LOC) and California State Association of Counties (CSAC), continuation of the Local Government Working Group; other coordination events.) (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.4.1)
- In coordination with local staff, follow the *Draft Tips/ Best Practices For Processing LCP Amendments* (Appendix II of <http://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2012/12/W3-12-2012.pdf>) to the extent resources allow. Allocate resources to those amendments deemed priorities; and for the highest priority items, meet with local staffs at their request and as resources allow to reach agreement on priorities, scope and scheduling of any pending LCP amendments, consistent with Coastal Act statutory deadlines (Draft Strategic Plan Action 4.4.2 and 4.4.3);
- Develop additional communication tools to facilitate quick transmittal of significant Commission information, key decisions, and other guidance to local planning staff and local officials (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 7.2.4);
- Complete the update of the Commission's online LUP Update Guide (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.2.3; 2.13; 2.4.2; 2.5.1);
- Investigate and, in coordination with local governments and other coastal stakeholders, pursue strategies to bolster funding for LCP program activities (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.4.6);
- Organize and conduct workshops on policy and planning information related to sea level rise (anticipated Feb 2013) and protection of agricultural resources (anticipated May 2013) (Draft Strategic Plan Action item 4.2.3).

As discussed by staff at the Workshop, it bears repeating that the Commission's capacity to engage in increased communication, meetings, and early review concerning LCP amendments is extremely limited by existing funding constraints. While the staff has been successful to a certain degree, more staff will be needed to fully meet the objectives of the process envisioned by the Best Practices for LCP Amendments outline. Currently, available Commission planning staff are

responsible for processing LCP amendments, oversight of local coastal plan implementation, appealed coastal development permits, and original jurisdiction permits and any other miscellaneous agenda items that may need to be addressed (e.g. dispute resolutions, reconsiderations, revocations, public works, long range development, and port master plans, etc.). This makes it extremely difficult to allocate the time necessary to engage in focused, long-range work inherent in LCP planning. The number of Commission planning staff is greatly reduced from the early 1980s when LCPs were first being written and when significantly more money was available (including federal dollars) for funding LCP planning. To be effective, therefore, it will be important that the Commission secure additional funding and staffing for LCP program implementation. This includes funding for LCP planning grants for local government.

Longer-term Initiatives

Additional initiatives to improve the LCP Amendment process will require more time and resources. Staff will report to the Commission on the progress of implementing the short-term actions. Continued discussion with the LOC and CSAC representatives may lead to identifying further suggestions that can be pursued with existing resources. Staff will also work within the context of the agency's Strategic Plan to improve the LCP process. If additional staffing and funding become available, more enhancements will be pursued.

Attachment A: Participants

County Representatives

Supervisor Kathy Long - Ventura County
Supervisor Mark Lovelace - Humboldt County
Supervisor Efren Carrillo, Sonoma County
Supervisor Bruce Gibson - San Luis Obispo County
Supervisor Greg Cox - San Diego County
Supervisor Salud Carbajal – Santa Barbara County

City Representatives

Councilmember Mark Wheatley – City of Arcata
Councilmember Lance Madsen - City of Eureka
Mayor Shelly Higginbotham – City of Pismo Beach
Mayor John Shoals - City of Grover Beach
Mayor Cheryl Cox – City of Chula Vista
Councilmember John Sibert – City of Malibu

Coastal Commissioners

Brian Brennan
Steve Blank
Dayna Bochco
Dr. William A. Burke
Carole Groom
Steve Kinsey (Vice-Chair)
Martha McClure, Supervisor
Wendy Mitchell
Jay Norvell
Esther Sanchez
Mary K. Shallenberger (Chair)
Jana Zimmer

Public Speakers:

Jamie Irons, Mayor, Morro Bay
Amanda Wallner, Sierra Club California
Jennifer Barrett, Sonoma County
Allison Rolfe, Pacifica Companies
Bob Perroust, City Manager, Grover Beach
Susan Jordan, Director, California Coastal Protection Network
Sara Townsend, on behalf of Humboldt Bay Keepers
Amy Trainer, Environmental Action Committee of West Marin
Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition
Ann Notthoff, Natural Resources Defense Council
Sarah Sikich, Heal the Bay

Mike Reilly, former Coastal Commissioner

Correspondents:

Francis Drouillard

Mike Novo, Planning Director, Monterey County

Susan Jordan, Director, California Coastal Protection Network

Brian Crawford, Director, Community Development Agency and Jack Liebster, Planning Manager, Marin County

Kathy Long, Supervisor, Ventura County

Margo Parks, California Cattlemen's Association

John Shoals, Mayor, City of Grover Beach

Shelly Higginbotham, Mayor, City of Pismo Beach

Patrick Murphy, Director of Planning and Building, City of Encinitas

Richard Bruckner, Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County

Jennifer Kalt, Humboldt Baykeeper

Mark Wheatley, League of Cities

Amanda Wallner, Sierra Club

Don Horsley, Supervisor, San Mateo County

Glenn Russell, Ph.D, Director, Planning and Development, Santa Barbara County

Jason H. Giffen, Director, Department of Planning and Building, San Luis Obispo County

Attachment B: Post-Workshop Correspondence

Email from Supervisor Kathy Long

Email from Patrick Murphy, Director of Planning and Building, City of Encinitas

Fuchs, Elizabeth@Coastal

From: Lester, Charles@Coastal
Sent: Friday, March 22, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Fuchs, Elizabeth@Coastal
Subject: FW: Local Government Workshop

Charles Lester
Executive Director
California Coastal Commission
www.coastal.ca.gov
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-904-5202

From: Kathy Long [<mailto:Kathy.Long@ventura.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 5:03 PM
To: Lester, Charles@Coastal
Cc: mark.lovelace@co.humboldt.ca.us; Fuchs.Elizabeth@coastal.gov
Subject: Local Government Workshop

Dear Dr. Lester,

First, a big thank you for your coordination of the Coastal Commission Local Government Workshop in December. We were pleased with the level of engagement on behalf of the Counties, Cities and Coastal Commissioners and staff. Furthermore, we look forward to the future work on specific action steps, along with continued dialogue.

Per our discussion, I have provided below the Joint Workshop feedback of important next steps from our Coastal Counties Regional Association. I would also like to extend an invitation to you to participate in the Coastal Counties meeting during the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Spring Conference May 29th-30th in Sacramento. CSAC is currently setting the agenda for the conference, therefore I will provide you with the exact date and time of our meeting in the next couple of weeks.

PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

Build strong relationships between Coastal Commission and local jurisdictions:

1. Continue CCC Executive Director outreach through meetings with local jurisdictions. Including, conducting more frequent meetings with jurisdictions that have amendments in process.
2. Request that the CCC Executive Director attends the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Annual Meeting or Legislative Conference to provide annual updates to the Coastal Counties Regional Association.
3. Conduct a CCC Academy through an organization such as the Institute for Local Government or Workshops on Coastal policy issues for Coastal Commission staff and local jurisdiction staff.

4. Request that the CCC Executive Director coordinate a Joint Local Government Workshop on a biannual basis.

Efficiencies in the LCP Amendment Process:

1. Re-prioritize CCC staff workload to increase focus and collaboration during the early scoping phase of a proposed amendment. Direct and authorize staff to identify key issues during an early review of proposed amendments.
2. Identify standard timelines for each stage of the amendment process (e.g. scoping, drafting revisions, etc.). Different timelines could be established for simple and complex amendments.
3. Develop specific procedures/mechanisms for adhering to established timelines. For example, define time extensions for amendment submittals on a case-by-case basis, rather than unilateral decisions of the Coastal Commission to extend the review period for the maximum one year period.
4. Direct staff that when an extension is requested, staff clearly identifies: the original submittal date by the local jurisdiction, what the incomplete or disputed items are, and the meetings that have taken place to resolve them.
5. Identify specific procedures/mechanisms that the identified scope of the amendment is not expanded without agreement between local jurisdiction and Coastal Commission staff.

Clarity of Priorities and Expectations:

1. Provide a template for submittals and/or examples of submittals that meet Coastal Commissions policies and expectations. This could also include a submittal check list that indicates what a local jurisdiction needs to provide in order to have a complete submittal.
2. Create a clear/streamline means of communicating policies with local jurisdictions, including website improvement and consistent communication with local jurisdiction staff.

Proposed by CCC Chair Mary K. Shallenberger:

1. Pursue legislative funding options that will enhance efficiency and accountability in the Local Coastal Planning Process. Counties are open to future discussions on this through the Local Government Working Group, with a mutual agreement that the identified steps towards streamlining processes will occur.

Thank you again for your leadership and engagement. On behalf of Supervisor Mark Lovelace and myself, we look forward to the partnership of the Coastal Counties and CCC on implementing these next steps.

Sincerely,

Kathy I. Long
Supervisor
Third District

Fuchs, Elizabeth@Coastal

From: Patrick Murphy <Pmurphy@encinitasca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2012 5:55 PM
To: Lester, Charles@Coastal; Fuchs, Elizabeth@Coastal
Subject: Coastal Commission Workshop - Improving the LCP process

I watched the Coastal Commission workshop today at my office. I thought the workshop went very well.

A couple of comments seem to make sense to me:

1. Have specific Coastal staff work on major LCP amendment (someone said an LCP strike team). These staff members can be located throughout the state in different offices but coordinate efforts quarterly to deal with common issues, solutions, and staffing workload. For example: someone from the San Francisco office could be assigned to work on a major LCP amendment in San Diego (Chula Vista Bay Front plan, for example). The selection of staff would be based on the project complexity, expertise, availability (not solely based on where the project is located). Based on some of the discussion, it sounded like Coastal might already do this. We do it on a local level, match the project to the planner, expertise, availability, etc., and if we are too busy, we get a consultant in to process.
2. Establish a 3-tiers for assisting with LCPA – 1. establish state-wide conditions/standards for LCPs, 2. regional standards that address specific regional issues, and 3. local policies at the local level. Tier 1 and 2 could already, to a large extent, be addressed for the local jurisdiction); the local agency can then spend most of their time on local issues.
3. One of the problems that I see with local jurisdictions is that they don't fully understand state-wide issue (tier 1) and how that applies at a local level. Coastal access is one state-wide issue but when applied, it can touch a lot of local policy issues – from circulation to land use to trails. As such, education at the local level is important.
4. I do agree with the comment that one of the goals is to get 100% approval of jurisdictions LCP. Once done, need to focus on the older ones (like Encinitas) to get updated so everyone is on the same page. We are currently in a General Plan/LCP update, but it has gotten controversial at the local level, so it might take some time.

Thanks for all your efforts on working with the counties and cities. Your efforts have gone a long way in relationship building.

Thanks.

Patrick Murphy
Director of Planning and Building
City of Encinitas
505 S. Vulcan Avenue
Encinitas, CA 92024
w 760/633-2696
f 760/633-2818