

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

South Coast District Office
301 E Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802-4302
(562) 590-5071



F13a

Filed: 11/19/21
180th Day: 5/18/22
Staff: C. Seifert-LB
Staff Report: 3/18/22
Hearing Date: 4/8/22

STAFF REPORT: REGULAR CALENDAR

Application No.: 5-21-0281

Applicant: Lee Searing

Agent: Swift Slip Dock & Pier Builders, Inc.
(Attn: Marissa Morales, Randy Ocampo)

Location: 514 S. Bay Front, Newport Beach, Orange County
(APN: 050-051-20)

Project Description: Removal of an existing 687 sq. ft. floating dock, gangway, and pier with six 14-inch wide square- and T-shaped piles, and construction of new 497 sq. ft. floating dock, gangway, and pier with four 14-inch wide square- and T-shaped piles in new locations.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposed project is the removal of an existing private dock system and replacement with a new private dock system on and over the water (Newport Harbor) associated with a single-family residence on a bayfront lot in Newport Beach. The proposed project is located within the Commission's original permit jurisdiction because it is on and over the waters of Newport Bay. The standard of review for this development is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, and the City's certified Local Coastal Plan (LCP) may provide guidance.

Commission staff is recommending **APPROVAL** of the coastal development permit (CDP) application with **nine special conditions**. The major issues raised by this

proposed development concern consistency with the marine resources, water quality, public access, and recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

The proposed dock system would reduce existing overwater coverage and fill of soft-bottom habitat by 190 sq. ft. and 2.7 sq. ft., respectively. These reductions would increase sunlight and substrate available for eelgrass growth and increase avian foraging opportunities. However, the proposed dock float would directly shade 46 sq. ft. of an existing eelgrass patch. The applicant proposes to mitigate impacts at a 1.38:1 ratio by transplanting a portion of the existing eelgrass to a location immediately adjacent to the project site. After discussion with Commission staff, the applicant provided an alternatives analysis with a revised plan (dated March 7, 2022) referenced as "Alternative 4") that would reduce eelgrass shading to a total of 33 sq. ft. while maintaining the reductions in coverage and fill indicated above. The existing eelgrass bed extends the full length of the project area, rendering the "No Project" alternative as the only method of completely avoiding direct eelgrass impacts. The least environmentally damaging alternative that complies with Newport Beach Harbor Design Guidelines is Alternative 4, in combination with an Eelgrass Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to ensure that new eelgrass is established in the area. Therefore, staff recommends the Commission impose **Special Condition 1**, which requires the applicant to submit revised project plans, in substantial conformance with Alternative 4, bearing an approval in concept stamp from the City of Newport Beach and a Final Eelgrass Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, which shall be reviewed and approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The dock has been designed in a manner that avoids adverse impacts to marine resources while still maintaining a usable dock and enabling recreational boating. However, to minimize potential adverse impacts to biological resources and avoid negative cumulative impacts to the Newport Bay ecosystem, staff recommends the Commission impose **Special Condition 2**, which requires the applicant to prepare a new eelgrass survey prior to construction. This condition will also require the applicant to apply for a permit amendment to relocate or redesign the dock to further minimize any additional direct impacts to existing eelgrass beds if the updated survey indicates additional eelgrass would be impacted by the proposed dock footprint. Staff also recommends the Commission impose **Special Condition 3**, which requires the applicant to survey the project area for the presence of *Caulerpa* (an invasive, non-native aquatic species), prior to commencement of construction activities, consistent with the requirements for bay bottom-disturbing activities in infected systems specified in the *Caulerpa* Control Protocol developed in consultation with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the relevant Water Board offices.

Any potential addition/expansion to the floating dock system, whether temporary or permanent, even if not required to be attached to the bulkhead or a pile in the bay, would: 1) constitute development as defined in Section 30106 of the Coastal Act, 2) be located in Newport Bay within the Commission's retained jurisdiction, and 3) necessitate review and approval by the Coastal Commission, including issuance of an amendment to this permit or a new CDP. This review would also give the Commission an

opportunity to review and analyze any potential adverse impacts of an increase of water coverage in an area where such coverage is already a concern. In order to ensure that future development on the site does not adversely impact biological resources, public access, or any other protected resource, staff recommends the Commission impose **Special Condition 4**, which informs the applicant and/or any future landowner that future development at the site requires a permit amendment or a new CDP.

During construction and post-construction, the proposed project has potential for adverse impacts to water quality and marine resources. Therefore, **Special Condition 5** outlines construction responsibilities and debris removal requirements for the applicant and **Special Condition 6** requires the applicant to implement post-construction operational Best Management Practices (BMPs) to protect water quality.

To ensure that the applicant complies with all requirements, requests and mitigation measures from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), with respect to preservation and protection of water quality and the marine environment, **Special Condition 7** requires that the applicant comply with all the requirements, requests, and mitigation measures of these agencies.

The public tidelands over which the dock is proposed are managed by the City of Newport Beach. Since these are Public Trust Lands, the public maintains a right to access these navigable bay waters for navigation and recreational purposes. To preserve and maintain access to the Public Trust Tidelands, **Special Condition 8** preserves any public rights or interests that exist or may exist on the property.

Finally, the applicant submitted an administrative permit fee for the subject CDP application; **Special Condition 9** thus requires the applicant to submit the additional \$3,175 fee required for the subject non-administrative permit prior to issuance of the CDP.

If approved with the conditions recommended by staff, the proposed project will conform with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The motion to approve the CDP application is on page 5. The special conditions begin on page 6.

Table of Contents

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION	5
II. STANDARD CONDITIONS	5
III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS	6
IV. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.....	11
A. Project Description	11
B. Marine Resources/Water Quality	13
C. Public Access and Recreation	20
D. Local Coastal Program.....	23
E. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)	23
APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS.....	25

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit 1 – Vicinity Map](#)

[Exhibit 2 – Project Plans](#)

[Exhibit 3 – Alternatives 1-4](#)

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION

Motion: I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit 5-21-0281 pursuant to the staff recommendation.

Staff recommends a **YES** vote on the foregoing motion. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of Commissioners present.

Resolution: The Commission hereby approves the Coastal Development Permit for the proposed project and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

II. STANDARD CONDITIONS

- 1. Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment.** The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the applicant or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
- 2. Expiration.** If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
- 3. Interpretation.** Any questions of intent of interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
- 4. Assignment.** The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided that the assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
- 5. Terms and Conditions Run with the Land.** These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the applicant to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. **Submittal of Final Plans.** PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit, for the review and written approval of the Executive Director, two (2) full size sets of the following final plans:

- A. Final dock, pier, and pile design plans that substantially conform with the plans submitted to the Commission on March 9, 2022, titled "514 Bay Front S, Newport Beach, CA 92662" and dated March 7, 2022.
- B. Final eelgrass mitigation and monitoring plans that substantially conform with the plans submitted to the Commission on March 18, 2022, titled "Initial Eelgrass Mitigation and Monitoring Plan" and dated October 14, 2020, with proof of plan review and approval by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

The applicant shall undertake development in conformance with the approved final plans unless the Commission amends this permit or the Executive Director provides a written determination that no amendment is legally required for any proposed minor deviations.

2. **Eelgrass Survey(s).**

A. **Pre-Construction Eelgrass Survey.** A valid pre-construction eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) survey shall be completed during the period of active growth of eelgrass (typically March through October). The pre-construction survey shall be completed prior to the beginning of construction and shall be valid until the next period of active growth. The survey shall be prepared in full compliance with the "California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy" dated October 2014 (except as modified by this special condition) adopted by the National Marine Fisheries Service and shall be prepared in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The applicants shall submit the eelgrass survey for the review and approval of the Executive Director within five (5) business days of completion of each eelgrass survey and in any event no later than fifteen (15) business days prior to commencement of any development. If the eelgrass survey identifies any eelgrass within the project area which would be impacted by the proposed project, the applicant shall undertake mitigation pursuant to the Final Eelgrass Mitigation and Monitoring Plan approved by the Executive Director..

B. **Post-Construction Eelgrass Survey.** If any eelgrass is identified in the project area or the 10 meter buffer area by the pre-construction survey required by Subsection A of this condition, within 30 days of completion of construction, or within the first 30 days of the next active growth period following completion of construction that occurs outside of the active growth period, the applicants shall survey the project site and the 10 meter buffer area to determine if any eelgrass was adversely impacted. The survey shall be prepared in full compliance with the CEMP adopted by the NMFS (except as modified by this special condition), and in consultation with the CDFW. If side-scan sonar methods are to be used,

evidence of a valid permit from CSLC must also be provided prior to the commencement of each survey period. The applicants shall submit the post-construction eelgrass survey for the review and approval of the Executive Director within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey. If any additional eelgrass has been adversely impacted beyond the area of impacted identified in the pre-construction eelgrass survey, the applicants shall replace the impacted eelgrass at a minimum final 1.38:1 ratio on-site (mitigation: impact), or at another location, in accordance with the CEMP. Any exceptions to the required 1.38:1 minimum final mitigation ratio found within the CEMP shall not apply. Based on past performance of eelgrass mitigation efforts, in order to achieve this minimum, the appropriate regional initial planting ratio provided in the CEMP should be used. Implementation of mitigation to ensure success in achieving the minimum final mitigation ratio (1.38:1) shall require an amendment to this permit or a new coastal development permit unless the Executive Director provides a written determination that no amendment or new permit is required.

3. Pre-construction Caulerpa Sp. Survey.

- A. Not earlier than 90 days nor later than 30 days prior to commencement or re-commencement of any development authorized under this coastal development permit (the "project"), the applicant shall undertake a survey of the project area and a buffer area at least 10 meters beyond the project area to determine the presence of the invasive alga *Caulerpa* sp. The survey shall include a visual examination of the substrate.
- B. The survey protocol shall be prepared in consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the National Marine Fisheries Service.
- C. Within five (5) business days of completion of the survey, the applicant shall submit the survey:
 1. for the review and approval of the Executive Director; and
 2. to the Surveillance Subcommittee of the Southern California Caulerpa Action Team (SCCAT). The SCCAT Surveillance Subcommittee may be contacted through California Department of Fish & Wildlife (858/467-4218) National Marine Fisheries Service (562/980-4043).
- D. Prior to initiation of any authorized Bottom Disturbing Activity within an Infected System, two surveys, initiated not less than 60 days apart, shall be conducted within the project APE. The first survey shall be conducted using High Intensity Level techniques and the second survey shall be conducted using Eradication Area Level techniques. Both surveys shall be conducted within the same High Growth Period. Deviations from this condition may be considered on a case-by-

case basis by the appropriate regulatory agency in consultation with NOAA Fisheries and CDFW. 2.

E. At least one survey shall be conducted within 45 days of initiation of an authorized Bottom Disturbing Activity (a "Pre-Act Survey"). This survey could be the second (Eradication Area Level) survey conducted during the High Growth Period. However, project delays may require that a third survey be conducted prior to initiation of the Bottom Disturbing Activity in order to meet this 45-day requirement. If a third survey is required, this survey shall be conducted at either a High Intensity Level or Eradication Area Level as determined by the NOAA Fisheries/CDFW Contacts based upon site circumstances and proximity to infestations. To determine appropriate survey level, please contact the NOAA Fisheries/CDFW Contacts with project specific information.

F. If *Caulerpa* species is found within the project or buffer areas, the applicant shall not proceed with the project until 1) the applicant provides evidence to the Executive Director, subject to concurrence by the Executive Director, that all *Caulerpa* sp. discovered within the project and buffer area has been eliminated in a manner that complies with all applicable governmental approval requirements, including but not limited to those of the California Coastal Act, or 2) the applicant has revised the project to avoid any contact with *Caulerpa* species. No revisions to the project shall occur without a Coastal Commission approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

4. **Future Development.** This permit is only for the development described in CDP No. 5-21-0281. Pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 13253(b)(6), the exemptions otherwise provided in Public Resources Code Section 30610(b) shall not apply to the development governed by CDP No. 5-21-0281, including the proposed private dock system. Accordingly, any future improvements to the development authorized by this permit, including but not limited to repair and maintenance identified as requiring a permit in Public Resources Code Section 30610(d) and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 13252(a)-(b), shall require an amendment to CDP No. 5-21-0281 from the Commission or shall require an additional CDP from the Commission or from the applicable certified local government.

5. **Construction Responsibilities and Debris Removal.** By acceptance of this permit, the permittee agrees to comply with the following construction related requirements:

A. No demolition or construction materials, equipment, debris, or waste shall be placed or stored where it may enter sensitive habitat, receiving waters or a storm drain, or be subject to wave, wind, rain, or tidal erosion and dispersion;

- B. Any and all debris resulting from demolition or construction activities, and any remaining construction material, shall be removed from the project site within 24 hours of completion of the project;
- C. Demolition or construction debris and sediment shall be removed from work areas each day that demolition or construction occurs to prevent the accumulation of sediment and other debris that may be discharged into coastal waters;
- D. Machinery or construction materials not essential for project improvements will not be allowed at any time in the intertidal zone;
- E. If turbid conditions are generated during construction a silt curtain will be utilized to control turbidity;
- F. Floating booms will be used to contain debris discharged into coastal waters and any debris discharged will be removed as soon as possible but no later than the end of each day;
- G. Non buoyant debris discharged into coastal waters will be recovered by divers as soon as possible after loss;
- H. All trash and debris shall be disposed in the proper trash and recycling receptacles at the end of every construction day;
- I. The permittee shall provide adequate disposal facilities for solid waste, including excess concrete, produced during demolition or construction;
- J. Debris shall be disposed of at a legal disposal site or recycled at a recycling facility. If the disposal site is located in the coastal zone, a Coastal Development Permit or an amendment to this permit shall be required before disposal can take place unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment or new permit is legally required;
- K. All stock piles and construction materials shall be covered, enclosed on all sides, shall be located as far away as possible from drain inlets and any waterway, and shall not be stored in contact with the soil;
- L. Machinery and equipment shall be maintained and washed in confined areas specifically designed to control runoff. Thinners or solvents shall not be discharged into sanitary or storm sewer systems;
- M. The discharge of any hazardous materials into any receiving waters shall be prohibited;
- N. Spill prevention and control measures shall be implemented to ensure the proper handling and storage of petroleum products and other construction materials. Measures shall include a designated fueling and vehicle maintenance

area with appropriate berms and protection to prevent any spillage of gasoline or related petroleum products or contact with runoff. The area shall be located as far away from the receiving waters and storm drain inlets as possible;

- O. Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Good Housekeeping Practices (GHPs) designed to prevent spillage and/or runoff of demolition or construction-related materials, and to contain sediment or contaminants associated with demolition or construction activity, shall be implemented prior to the on-set of such activity; and
- P. All BMPs shall be maintained in a functional condition throughout the duration of construction activity.

6. Best Management Practices (BMPs) Program. By acceptance of this permit, the permittee agrees that the long-term water-borne berthing of boat(s) in the approved dock and/or boat slip will be managed in a manner that protects water quality pursuant to the implementation of the following BMPs.

A. Boat Cleaning and Maintenance Measures:

- 1. In-water top-side and bottom-side boat cleaning shall minimize the discharge of soaps, paints, and debris;
- 2. In-the-water hull scraping or any process that occurs under water that results in the removal of paint from boat hulls shall be prohibited. Only detergents and cleaning components that are designated by the manufacturer as phosphate-free and biodegradable shall be used, and the amounts used minimized; and

B. Solid and Liquid Waste Management Measures:

- 1. All trash, recyclables, and hazardous wastes or potential water contaminants, including old gasoline or gasoline with water, absorbent materials, oily rags, lead acid batteries, anti-freeze, waste diesel, kerosene and mineral spirits shall not at any time be disposed of in the water or gutter but, rather be disposed of in a manner consistent with state and/or federal regulations.

C. Petroleum Control Management Measures:

- 1. Boaters will practice preventive engine maintenance and will use oil absorbents in the bilge and under the engine to prevent oil and fuel discharges. Oil absorbent materials shall be examined at least once a year and replaced as necessary. Used oil absorbents are hazardous waste in California. Used oil absorbents must therefore be disposed in accordance with hazardous waste disposal regulations. The boaters shall regularly inspect and maintain engines, seals, gaskets, lines and hoses in order to

prevent oil and fuel spills. The use of soaps that can be discharged by bilge pumps is prohibited;

2. If the bilge needs more extensive cleaning (e.g., due to spills of engine fuels, lubricants or other liquid materials), the boaters will use a bilge pump-out facility or steam cleaning services that recover and properly dispose or recycle all contaminated liquids; and
 3. Bilge cleaners which contain detergents or emulsifiers will not be used for bilge cleaning since they may be discharged to surface waters by the bilge pumps.
- 7. Resource Agencies.** The permittee shall comply with all requirements, requests and mitigation measures from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) with respect to preservation and protection of water quality and the marine environment. The permittee shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife prior to transplant of eelgrass, shall obtain a Scientific Collecting Permit if the Department deems such permit required, and shall provide evidence of the approved permit to the Executive Director prior to transplant of eelgrass. Any change in the approved project that may be required by the above-stated agencies shall be submitted to the Executive Director in order to determine if the proposed change shall require a permit amendment pursuant to the requirements of the Coastal Act and the California Code of Regulations.
- 8. Public Rights and Public Trust.** The Coastal Commission's approval of this permit shall not constitute a waiver of any public rights that exist or may exist on the property. The permittee shall not use this permit as evidence of a waiver of any public rights that may exist on the property now or in the future.
- 9. Application Fee.** PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall pay the balance of the application fee for a dock less than 1,000 gross sq. ft., which equals \$3,175.

IV. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. Project Description

The subject site is located in and over the waters of Newport Bay adjacent to 514 S. Bay Front in Newport Beach, Orange County ([Exhibit 1](#)). The privately-owned dock is located on Balboa Island and the proposed replacement is intended to berth recreational vessels associated with the adjacent single family residence.

The subject dock is located on public tidelands managed by the City of Newport Beach within the Coastal Commission's retained permit jurisdiction. The City issues local permits, entitled "City of Newport Beach Harbor Permits," for dock systems and other

forms of development in the public tidelands area. While the Harbor Permit does not constitute a lease, it does authorize the development and requires a fee from the applicant for temporary private use of the public tidelands, either bi-monthly or annually, estimated from the water bill associated with the adjacent private property. The City determines and collects the fee, for deposit in a Tidelands Fund reserved for public access and water quality improvements to Newport Harbor. The applicant provided an exhibit from the City's website as evidence that their dock is over public waters subject to the City's fee program and they are required to pay the recurring fees.

The applicant proposes removal of an existing, 210 sq. ft. floating dock (21 by 10-ft.), 51 sq. ft. gangway (3 by 17-ft.), 196 sq. ft. pier (14 by 14-ft.) and six square/T-shaped¹ marina guide piles (14 by 14-inches). The existing dock system and piles will be replaced with a new, 192 sq. ft. dock float (8 by 24-ft.), 72 sq. ft. gangway (3 by 24-ft.), 233 sq. ft. pier (varying length/width), and four square/T-shaped piles (14 by 14-inches) installed in new locations below the proposed dock system ([Exhibit 2](#)). The new dock system will be comprised of wood, composite material, Styrofoam, and concrete. While water coverage from the gangway will increase by 21 sq. ft., the overall water coverage will decrease by 190 sq. ft. The existing 8.2 sq. ft. of fill in harbor waters will be reduced to 5.44 sq. ft. The existing and proposed dock systems are both sited four feet channelward of the U.S. Pierhead Line, as allowed with the City of Newport Beach Harbor Permit Policy allowing up to 10-ft. encroachment between U.S. Bulkhead Station Nos. 256 and 259.

The existing dock directly shades approximately 13 sq. ft. of an existing eelgrass bed onsite. The applicant's initially proposed dock system would shade approximately 46 sq. ft. of the existing eelgrass bed. The applicant has provided alternative designs to further reduce the amount of eelgrass shading. The applicant provided four alternative dock layouts resulting in varying levels of eelgrass shading, water coverage, and fill; Alternative 4 would result in the same reduction in water coverage and fill summarized above, with 33 sq. ft. of direct eelgrass shading rather than the initially proposed 46 sq. ft.

The Commission issued CDP Waiver No. 5-04-477-W for demolition and construction of a new single-family residence on the subject landside lot on January 31, 2005. No other permit history exists for the project area. The applicant has indicated the existing dock system was constructed prior to adoption of the Coastal Act in 1972; historic aerials available for the subject site extend only as far back as 1995 and show the existing dock system.

The City of Newport Beach LCP was effectively certified on January 13, 2017. The project area is within the Commission's original permit jurisdiction, due to its location beyond the bulkhead and bayward of the mean high tide line. The standard of review for

¹ Square and T-shaped piles differ in shape solely at the dock-attachment end; the end of the pile installed in harbor substrate is square for both types, resulting in the same amount of fill.

development within the Commission's original permit jurisdiction is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. The City's certified LCP is advisory in nature and may provide guidance.

B. Marine Resources/Water Quality

Section 30230 of the Coastal Act states:

Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act states:

The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

Section 30232 of the Coastal Act states:

Protection against the spillage of crude oil, gas, petroleum products, or hazardous substances shall be provided in relation to any development or transportation of such materials. Effective containment and cleanup facilities and procedures shall be provided for accidental spills that do occur.

Section 30233 of the Coastal Act states, in relevant in part:

- (a) The diking, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to the following:...
- (2) Maintaining existing, or restoring previously dredged, depths in existing navigational channels, turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring areas, and boat launch areas.
- (3) In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including streams, estuaries, and lakes, new or expanded boating facilities and the placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreational opportunities...

6) Restoration purposes.

Policy 4.1.4-5 of the certified Newport Beach Land Use Plan (LUP) states:

Where applicable require eelgrass and *Caulerpa taxifolia* surveys to be conducted as a condition of City approval for projects in Newport Bay in accordance with operative protocols of the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy and *Caulerpa taxifolia* Survey protocols.

Policy 4.2.3-1 of the certified LUP states, in relevant part:

Permit the diking, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes in accordance with other applicable provisions of the LCP, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects and limited to the following:...

- C. In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including estuaries and streams, new or expanded boating facilities, including slips, access ramps, piers, marinas, recreational boating, launching ramps, and pleasure ferries, and the placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreational opportunities.

Policy 4.2.3-2 of the certified LUP states:

Continue to permit recreational docks and piers as an allowable use within intertidal areas in Newport Harbor.

Policy 4.2.5-1 of the certified LUP states:

Avoid impacts to eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) to the greatest extent possible. Mitigate losses of eelgrass at a 1.2 to 1 mitigation ratio and in accordance with the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy. Encourage the restoration of eelgrass throughout Newport Harbor where feasible.

Policy 4.3.1-8 of the certified LUP states:

Protection against the spillage of crude oil, gas, petroleum products, or hazardous substances shall be provided in relation to any development or transportation of such materials. Effective containment and cleanup facilities and procedures shall be provided for accidental spills that do occur.

Policy 4.3.2-1 of the certified LUP states:

Promote pollution prevention and elimination methods that minimize the introduction of pollutants into coastal waters, as well as the generation and impacts of dry weather and polluted runoff.

Policy 4.3.2-6 of the certified LUP states:

Implement and improve upon best management practices (BMPs) for residences, businesses, new development and significant redevelopment, and City operations.

Policy 4.3.2-7 of the certified LUP states:

Incorporate BMPs into the project design in the following progression:

Site Design BMPs.

Source Control BMPs.

Treatment Control BMPs.

Include site design and source control BMPs in all developments. When the combination of site design and source control BMPs are not sufficient to protect water quality as required by the LCP or Coastal Act, structural treatment BMPs will be implemented along with site design and source control measures.

Policy 4.3.2-22 of the certified LUP states:

Require beachfront and waterfront development to incorporate BMPs designed to prevent or minimize polluted runoff to beach and coastal waters.

Section 21.30C.050 of the Implementation Plan (IP) states, in relevant part:

D. Eelgrass and Marine Habitat.

Pier, pier platform, gangway and dock design shall be designed and sited and make use of materials that will minimize and, where feasible, avoid impacts to eelgrass and marine habitat. Where possible, design structures to avoid any net increase in overall water coverage, and wherever possible reduce the overall water coverage.

F. Pollution Control.

The permittee shall maintain the area delineated on the harbor development permit free and clear from beached or floating rubbish, debris or litter at all times. Adequate safeguards shall be maintained by the permittee to avert any other type of pollution of Newport Harbor from recreational and/or commercial use of the tidelands.

Sections 30230 and 30231 of the Coastal Act require the biological productivity of coastal waters to be maintained and, where feasible, restored. Section 30232 specifies protection against hazardous substances entering coastal waters as one method of protecting biological productivity via maintaining water quality. Section 30233 requires that fill of open coastal waters for the purposes of new boating facilities shall only be

permitted “where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects[.]” These requirements are echoed by relevant policies 4.1 through 4.3 of the certified Newport Beach LUP, as listed above, and Section 21.30C.050 of the City’s certified IP.

Biological Productivity

The biological productivity of coastal waters is highly dependent on sunlight for photosynthesis by lower order green algae, phytoplankton, and diatoms that form the basis of the marine food chain. In addition to reduced sunlight and decreases in the biological productivity of coastal waters, increased coverage of coastal waters is a significant concern since it also impedes avian foraging activities. Larger dock structures decrease foraging habitat for sight foraging marine birds, such as the State and federally listed California brown pelican found throughout Newport Harbor. Although the coverage of bay surface area habitat associated with any one project may not seem significant, the cumulative effect of allowing unnecessarily large dock structures and resulting increases in water coverage throughout Newport Harbor could be significant. It should be noted that there are hundreds of private residential docks in Newport Harbor. If each were permitted to increase the amount of fill and water coverage beyond that which is consistent with the Coastal Act, the cumulative effect would be a significant loss of coastal waters and soft bottom habitat.

Eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) can be adversely affected by increased water coverage. Eelgrass is a marine flowering plant that grows in soft sediments within coastal bays and estuaries. Eelgrass canopies consist of shoots and leaves approximately one to three-feet long that typically attract marine invertebrates and fish species. Under normal circumstances, a diverse community of benthic organisms (e.g. clams, crabs, and worms) live within the soft sediments that cover eelgrass root and rhizome mass systems. Eelgrass beds also function as a nursery for many juvenile fishes – including species of commercial and/or sporting value such as California halibut and corbina. Eelgrass beds are also important foraging areas for piscivorous seabirds that seek baitfish attracted to eelgrass cover. Eelgrass is also an important ecological contributor to the detrital (decaying organic material) food web of bays and estuaries as the decaying plant material is consumed by many benthic invertebrates and converted to primary nutrients by bacteria.

Impacts to Soft-Bottom Habitat

The applicant proposes to remove six existing concrete piles (with 8.2 sq. ft. existing fill) and install four in new locations (with 5.4 sq. ft. proposed fill), resulting in an approximately 2.7 sq. ft. reduction in existing fill onsite. The proposed number of piles constitute the minimum necessary to assure structural stability and will provide additional substrate for eelgrass growth compared to current onsite conditions.

While the proposed gangway (72 sq. ft.) will result in increased water coverage compared to the existing gangway (51 sq. ft.), the proposed dock float and pier (425 cumulative sq. ft.) will offset this with reduction in size from the existing dock float (636 sq. ft.). The overall water coverage will thus be reduced by 190 sq. ft. ([Exhibit 2](#)).

Regardless, the Commission must analyze new overwater development independently of existing coverage. The proposed dock system is of a similar size to docks in the surrounding area and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area. More importantly, it has been designed at the minimum size to ensure the structural stability necessary for private recreational boating opportunities with commonly-sized recreational vessels. The City of Newport Beach has developed Harbor Design Criteria which, though not certified by the Coastal Commission, provide guidelines for designing dock systems to minimize water coverage while providing a usable dock. The proposed project is generally consistent with those guidelines and standards.

While the proposed dock size does not pose an issue with regard to water coverage, the dock location does pose an issue. The applicant's submitted eelgrass survey, conducted on October 18, 2020, indicates an eelgrass bed extending the full 30-ft. width of the project area as of the survey date. Any new dock system compliant with the City's Harbor Design Criteria would result in impact to some portion of the eelgrass bed, based on its location. However, the vegetated width varies throughout the eelgrass bed—the amount of direct shading can be minimized by locating the proposed dock over a narrow portion of the eelgrass bed.

The applicant's initial proposal located the dock float in a position that provided a 12-ft. and 10-ft. buffer on either side to accommodate the applicant's two private, recreational vessels, resulting in 46 sq. ft. of direct eelgrass shading. In order to file a complete application, the applicant was required to provide project alternatives (including a revised project design) that would minimize adverse impacts to marine resources. The applicant indicated that the "no-project" alternative—maintaining the existing dock float, gangway, and pier—was not feasible, as the existing dock has reached the end of its functional design life. Replacing the existing dock within the existing footprint is also not feasible while adhering to relevant Harbor Design Guidelines, and would not reduce water coverage and fill to the greatest extent feasible.

The applicant subsequently provided four alternative dock designs ([Exhibit 3](#)). Alternative 1 is a U-shaped dock, which would result in 579 sq. ft. of coverage, 6.8 sq. ft. of fill, and 82 sq. ft. of eelgrass shading for compliance with the City's Harbor Design Criteria. This alternative would increase all three parameters compared to the initial proposal. Alternative 2 is a T-shaped dock, which would result in 588 sq. ft. of coverage, 6.8 sq. ft. of fill, and 70 sq. ft. of eelgrass shading for compliance with the City's Harbor Design Criteria. This alternative would also increase all three parameters compared to the initial proposal. Alternative 3 is an I-shaped dock which is similar to the initial proposal with regard to 497 sq. ft. of coverage and 5.4 sq. ft. of fill, but shifts the dock float 1.5-ft. east to result in 37 sq. ft. of eelgrass shading. This alternative reduces overall water coverage and fill from the existing condition onsite and results in less eelgrass shading compared with the initial proposal. The applicant communicated concerns with this design, however, due to the reduced buffer widths that wouldn't allow the applicant's 10-ft. and 12-ft. wide private vessels.

The applicant provided a final Alternative 4, an I-shaped dock similar to the initial proposal, with 497 sq. ft. of coverage and 5.4 sq. ft. of fill, but shifts the dock float two

feet east to result in 33 sq. ft. of eelgrass shading. Alternative 4 also relocates a pile further from the existing eelgrass bed to reduce potential impacts associated with installation disturbance. This alternative minimizes eelgrass shading to the greatest extent feasible, compared to all other alternatives except the “no-project” alternative. Unlike the “no-project” alternative, it also reduces the total existing water coverage onsite by 190 sq. ft. and provides a usable dock compliant with the minimum size allowed by the City’s design guidelines. Overall, Alternative 4 is the least environmentally damaging alternative. To ensure the project proceeds as revised, **Special Condition 1** requires the applicant submit final project plans consistent with the plans dated March 3, 2022 (which show Alternative 4) for Executive Director approval prior to CDP issuance.

The applicant proposes to mitigate the 33 sq. ft. eelgrass impact of Alternative 4 at a 1.38:1 ratio via the submitted Eelgrass Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, dated October 14, 2020 (the date of the initial eelgrass survey). The Eelgrass Mitigation Plan proposes to relocate the impacted eelgrass adjacent to the project area. The transplant site is located at near the channelward edge of the project area, with the intent of connecting a smaller, existing eelgrass bed (located just outside the project area) to the larger, impacted bed. Eelgrass would be harvested in bundles and planted in a grid over a three-day period, within 30 days of the project completion and prior to the next period of active growth beginning March 1. The eelgrass transplant site would be monitored for success criteria within a five-year period, with the ultimate requirement of 100% area coverage in the transplant area, as well as 85% shoot density in the transplant area, by the end of the fifth year. If the transplant area fails to meet this criteria, a supplementary transplant area will subsequently be planted to meet the 1.38:1 mitigation ratio. The applicant has provided a revised mitigation plan to reflect the impacts posed by Alternative 4; however, additional revisions may be required by the CDFW. **Special Condition 1** therefore requires the applicant to submit a final eelgrass mitigation and monitoring plan in substantial conformance with the plan dated October 14, 2020 (submitted to Commission staff on March 18, 2022) for Executive Director approval prior to issuance of the subject CDP.

The eelgrass impact estimation and mitigation described above are dependent on the results of the eelgrass survey conducted on October 14, 2020. Eelgrass surveys completed between August through October are valid until the resumption of active growth (in this case, March 1, 2021). This date has passed and the subject eelgrass survey is no longer valid for project construction. Therefore, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 2**, which requires a new pre-construction eelgrass survey and identifies the procedures necessary to be completed prior to beginning construction. **Special Condition 2** requires an additional post-construction eelgrass survey and, if any new impacts to eelgrass are shown beyond the 33 sq. ft. of impact estimated by the pre-construction survey, requires the applicant to mitigate the additional impact at a ratio of 1.38:1.

Additionally, the applicant’s proposed eelgrass transplant mitigation must be approved by local resource permitting agencies, including CDFW. To ensure that the proposed project adheres to the requirements from other resource agencies, and to account for

changes to other resource agency permits that may be necessary given the design alternative required by the Commission, **Special Condition 7** requires the applicants to comply with all requirements and mitigation measures from the CDFW, the RWQCB, the USACE, and the USFWS with respect to preservation and protection of water quality and marine environment. If the proposed eelgrass mitigation plan is not approved by local permitting agencies, the applicant must apply for a CDP amendment or new CDP to propose an alternate form of mitigation.

The applicant submitted the fee associated with an Administrative Permit for the subject application; however, the direct eelgrass impacts and special conditions for mitigation detailed above required the application to be scheduled on the Commission's regular calendar. Thus, **Special Condition 9** requires the applicant to submit the remaining application fee associated with projects resulting in less than 1,000 gross sq. ft. of new development other than residential development prior to issuance of the subject CDP.

Caulerpa and Soft-Bottom Habitat

In 1999, *Caulerpa spp.* ("Caulerpa") was first discovered in portions of Huntington Harbor. Caulerpa is a non-native, invasive marine algae identified as a significant threat to California's coastal marine environment, due to its ability to displace native aquatic plant species and habitats (including eelgrass). Caulerpa is known to grow on rock, sand, or mud substrates in both shallow and deep-water areas. Information available from NMFS indicates that Caulerpa can grow in large monotypic stands within which no native aquatic plant species can co-exist. Native seaweeds, seagrasses, and kelp forests can be displaced, which can adversely impact marine biodiversity, causing attendant impacts upon fishing, recreational diving, and tourism.

The applicant has submitted a Caulerpa survey conducted in conjunction with the eelgrass survey on October 14, 2020. The bathymetric surveys did not find evidence of Caulerpa onsite—however, Caulerpa surveys only remain valid for 90 days. In April 2021, a specimen of a potentially invasive seaweed (*Caulerpa prolifera*) was collected from within Newport Bay. The genus Caulerpa consists of approximately 75 different species of single-celled aquatic organisms that can grow rapidly and have the potential to adversely impact native marine habitat along the West Coast.

Given the proximity of Alamos Bay and the project site to the Newport Bay and the potential for the Caulerpa species to take over eelgrass and other marine habitat in the project vicinity, **Special Condition 3** requires the applicant to submit updated Caulerpa surveys no earlier than 90 days, and no later than 30 days, prior to commencement of project construction. If any Caulerpa is found on the project site, **Special Condition 3** requires the applicant to comply with specific procedures for Caulerpa removal and provision of proof of removal. The surveys must be consistent with the requirements for bottom-disturbing activities in infected systems specified in the Caulerpa Control Protocol developed in consultation with the Army Corps, National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Water Boards. To protect the biological resources onsite from any potential future impacts, **Special Condition 4** requires that the applicant must obtain a permit amendment or a new permit for any future repair or maintenance of the proposed dock system.

Construction and Post-Construction Impacts

The proposed work will occur in and over coastal waters. The storage or placement of construction material, debris, or waste in a location where it could be discharged into coastal waters would result in adverse impacts on the marine environment. The applicants are proposing Best Management Practices (BMPs) for reducing or eliminating construction-related impacts to water quality during construction, such as placing a catch bucket and floating boom at the project site to prevent debris from entering the water and to also capture floating debris. The Commission imposes **Special Condition 5**, which requires appropriate storage and handling of construction equipment and materials to minimize the potential for pollutants to enter coastal waters. To reduce the potential for post-construction impacts to water quality, **Special Condition 6** requires the continued use and maintenance of post-construction BMPs.

Conclusion

The project proposes fill of open coastal waters, but has been conditioned to comply with the least environmentally damaging alternative feasible (Alternative 4) and to include mitigation measures to address the adverse environmental effects of eelgrass shading. As conditioned, the project will also comply with pre- and post-construction BMPs to avoid impacts to water quality and biological productivity. The project will also avoid adverse environmental impacts associated with invasive *Caulerpa*.

Thus, as conditioned, the Commission finds that the proposed project is consistent with Sections 30230, 30231, 30232, and 30233 of the Coastal Act and with relevant portions of the City's certified LCP used as guidance that generally require maintaining, protecting, and enhancing the biological productivity and the water quality of coastal waters.

C. Public Access and Recreation

Section 30210 of the Coastal Act states:

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30220 of the Coastal Act states:

Coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such uses.

Section 30221 of the Coastal Act states:

Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or

commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.

Section 30224 of the Coastal Act states:

Increased recreational boating use of coastal waters shall be encouraged, in accordance with this division, by developing dry storage areas, increasing public launching facilities, providing additional berthing space in existing harbors, limiting non-water-dependent land uses that congest access corridors and preclude boating support facilities, providing harbors of refuge, and by providing for new boating facilities in natural harbors, new protected water areas, and in areas dredged from dry land.

Section 21.30.015 of the certified Newport Beach IP states, in relevant part:

D. Waterfront Development

1. Applicability. This subsection applies to coastal development permit applications for development on residential and nonresidential properties fronting on the waterfront of Newport Bay...

2. Considerations. In reviewing a coastal development permit application for development along the waterfront, the review authority shall consider the following:...

f. Whether any boating facilities (e.g., piers, pier platforms, gangways and dock floats) associated with waterfront development are so sited and designed to protect, and where feasible, expand and enhance public access to and along shoreline areas;

g. Whether the structure is nonconforming with regard to setbacks from the shoreline, bluff and/or bulkhead; and

h. For improvements to existing structures, whether the proposed improvements increase the degree of nonconformity or result in replacement of more than fifty (50) percent of the existing structure.

Section 21.30.050 of the IP states, in relevant part:

A. Protection of Coastal Access and Resources. All harbor structures, including remodels of, additions to, or replacement of existing structures, and new structures, shall be designed and sited so as not to obstruct public access and to minimize impacts to coastal views and coastal resources...

G. Piers.

1. Limits on Use. Only piers, floats and patio decks and their appurtenances pursuant to subsection (G)(5) of this section shall be permitted bayward of the bulkhead...

Section 21.38.040 of the IP states, in relevant part:

A. Maintenance and Repairs. Routine maintenance and repairs may be made to nonconforming principal and accessory structures. The replacement of fifty (50) percent or more of a structure is not repair and maintenance but instead constitutes a replacement structure...

Policy 3.1.1-1 of the certified LUP states:

Protect, and where feasible, expand and enhance public access to and along the shoreline and to beaches, coastal waters, tidelands, coastal parks, and trails.

Policy 3.1.1-9 of the certified LUP states:

Protect, expand, and enhance a system of public coastal access that achieves the following:

Maximizes public access to and along the shoreline;

Policy 3.1.1-11 of the certified LUP states:

Require new development to minimize impacts to public access to and along the shoreline.

Policy 3.1.4-3 of the certified LUP states:

Design and site piers, including remodels of and additions to existing piers so as not to obstruct public lateral access and to minimize impacts to coastal views and coastal resources.

Policy 3.1.4-4 of the certified LUP states:

In residential areas, limit structures bayward of the bulkhead line to piers and floats. Limit appurtenances and storage areas to those related to vessel launching and berthing.

Policy 4.2.3-17 of the certified LUP states, in relevant part:

Continue to limit residential and commercial structures permitted to encroach beyond the bulkhead line to piers and docks used exclusively for berthing of vessels...

Coastal Act Section 30210 requires that maximum public access and recreational opportunities be provided, and that development not interfere with the public's right to access the coast. Additionally, sections 30220 and 30221 of the Coastal Act protect

coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities and oceanfront land for recreational uses, such as boating. The City's certified LCP also includes a number of similar policies that protect public access. Newport Harbor is well known as a popular spot for recreational boating. Numerous private boat docks and public marinas line the shores of the harbor. Sandy shoreline areas along the bay are also used for access/recreation, including swimming and hand launching of small watercraft such as kayaks and stand up paddleboards.

The proposed project includes the removal and replacement of an existing private boat dock system associated with residential development. The proposed project extends out into public tidelands and submerged lands in Newport Bay that are administered by the City of Newport Beach pursuant to a Tidelands Grant (City of Newport Beach Tidelands and Submerged Lands in Newport Bay – Statutes of 1927, Chapter 70, Page 125). There is no direct public pedestrian access to public tidelands through the private residential lot at the subject site. However, lateral public access is available along an existing public walkway, which occurs bayward of the landside residence and fronts the harbor bulkhead along the perimeter of Balboa Island.

The proposed dock system extends four feet beyond the U.S. Pierhead Line, as allowed by the City of Newport Beach Harbor Permit Policy allowing up to 10-ft. encroachment between U.S. Bulkhead Station Nos. 256 and 259. The proposed dock does not impact the approximately 700-ft. wide navigable channel between Balboa Island and Balboa Peninsula. In order to preserve and maintain access to the Public Trust Tidelands, **Special Condition 8** states that the approval of a CDP for the project does not waive any public rights or interest that exist or may exist on the property.

Thus, as conditioned, the Commission finds that the proposed project is consistent with Sections 30210, 30220, 30221, and 30224 of the Coastal Act and the City's certified LCP used as guidance regarding the public's right of access to the sea and does not interfere with recreational opportunities on public tidelands.

D. Local Coastal Program

On January 13, 2017, the City of Newport Beach LCP was effectively certified. Development proposed bayward of the property line is located within the Commission's jurisdiction and consequently, the standard of review is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, and the certified LCP serves as guidance. As conditioned, the proposed development within the Commission's original jurisdiction is consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

E. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Section 13096 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations requires Commission approval of Coastal Development Permit applications to be supported by findings showing the approval, as conditioned, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA

prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment. The Commission's regulatory program for reviewing and granting CDPs has been certified by the Resources Secretary to be the functional equivalent of CEQA. (14 CCR § 15251(c).)

In this case, the City of Newport Beach Harbor Resources Division is the lead agency and the Commission is a responsible agency for the purposes of CEQA. The City of Newport Beach determined on February 24, 2021, that the proposed project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Class 1 (Section 15301), Existing Facilities, and Class 2 (Section 15302), Replacement and Reconstruction. The Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned, is the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative and is consistent with the resource protection requirements of the Coastal Act and CEQA.

APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS

City of Newport Beach Waterfront Project Guidelines and Standards— Harbor Design Criteria, Commercial & Residential Facilities.

Eelgrass Survey Prepared by Swift Slip Dock & Pier Builders, Inc. dated October 18, 2020.

City of Newport Beach Harbor Resources Division Approval-In-Concept dated February 24, 2021.