

## Exhibit 6: Board of Supervisors Work Session Discussion Topics

The following table was distilled from the Preliminary Draft Coastal Area Plan Sea Level Rise Policies in Exhibit 7. It is intended to guide the work session discussion pertaining to sea level rise. Guidance from the Board will help provide direction for subsequent phases of sea level rise planning, which would initially focus on updating the Local Coastal Program to address sea level rise and associated hazards.

Topic and Overview	Reference to Preliminary Policy Number from Exhibit 7	Planning Division Staff Approach	Another Approach	Board Discussion Questions
<b>1. Policies for Shoreline Protective Devices.</b> Should existing shoreline protective armor devices protecting existing development on private and public property (e.g., seawalls) begin to be phased out now, or in the future?	8, 16, 19, 20, 22 thru 30, 4.2.4-B.1, 4.2.4-B.4, 4.2.5-D.4, 4.2.9-A.5	<p>Staff recommends a phased approach to armor removal. Specifically, a policy framework that would limit the construction of armor devices for new development, but not require the removal of existing armor that is protecting existing development. In other words, repair, maintenance, and modifications to existing seawalls that are protecting existing development would continue to be authorized.</p> <p>Sea level rise models show that adaptation strategies for beaches are viable in the near to mid-term. As such, these strategies could be used while a long-term plan is developed and more development is designed without reliance on armor. This approach would leave existing development in</p>	<p>The implementation of Statewide guidance and one interpretation of the Coastal Act strongly emphasizes an approach that would focus the uses entitled to armor based on which structures were built prior to January 1, 1977. This approach, when paired with policies for armor removal, would facilitate a managed retreat approach on a site-by-site or neighborhood-scale basis. Application of this approach would help conserve public beaches, and the recreational and environmental services that they provide.</p> <p>For example, the approximate 100-to-300-foot widths of land between the shoreline and Old Coast Highway on the North Coast could provide</p>	<p>In regard to proposed coastal armoring policies (e.g. those affecting seawalls, revetments, etc.), should the County adopt an approach that requires armor removal in the short-term (i.e. within the next few decades) or the medium-to-long term?</p> <p>The primary policy distinction here is between allowing existing seawalls to be replaced or enlarged in</p>

Topic and Overview	Reference to Preliminary Policy Number from Exhibit 7	Planning Division Staff Approach	Another Approach	Board Discussion Questions
		<p>hazardous locations longer, potentially increasing costs and liability while diminishing public access, habitat, and the sediment supply on beaches.</p> <p>It is uncertain whether there is sufficient nexus from a legal standpoint to require removal of existing armor if it is not included in a new discretionary project, especially when a homeowner's association owns the coastal armor, not individual private property owners.</p>	valuable space for public beaches, access, and recreation if existing armor was removed and natural processes were restored.	response to sea level rise when they protect existing development (long-term strategy), versus prohibiting replacement/modification on to these seawalls, and only allowing basic repair and maintenance (near-term strategy).

Topic and Overview	Reference to Preliminary Policy Number from Exhibit 7	Planning Division Staff Approach	Another Approach	Board Discussion Questions
<p><b>2. Definition of Existing Development.</b> The date to be used for “existing structures” pursuant to Sec. 30235 of the Coastal Act. This date would define which existing structures are entitled to protection using shoreline protective devices like seawalls.</p> <p>Section 30235 of the Coastal Act states, in pertinent part: “Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or to protect existing structures or public beaches in danger from erosion and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply.”</p>	<p>32, 4.2.4-B.1</p>	<p>Staff recommends using the date of certification of the proposed sea level rise LCP amendments to define “existing structures” rather than using the date of January 1, 1977 (the date the California Coastal Act went into effect). This would allow for nearly 45 more years of development to be considered consistent with Sec. 30235 of the Coastal Act and, therefore, provide a permitting pathway for property owners to repair, maintain, and modify seawalls and other coastal armor protecting these structures.</p> <p>Using the date of the LCP amendments would provide a more consistent and comprehensive approach for planning purposes as well as more certainty for current landowners. It would also allow more time to explore the use of hybrid adaptation solutions to sea level rise for the near and mid-term, while long-term adaptation options are explored and emerging science continues to evolve.</p>	<p>January 1, 1977, which is the effective date of the Coastal Act, would be used to define “existing structures” in the County’s LCP. Any seawalls or other coastal armor intended to protect principal use structures built after this date would be required to be removed when they are no longer required to protect “existing” development that is onsite or on an adjacent site. Although, any coastal armor protecting post-1977 development would still be permitted repair and maintenance over time, as currently allowed by the County’s LCP.</p> <p>This approach would implement a long-term adaptation strategy of managed retreat and allow existing armor to be maintained, but not significantly modified.</p>	<p>Should the County define “existing structures” in the LCP to mean development permitted and existing prior to the adoption of proposed sea level rise LCP amendments? (This would be a long-term strategy to phase-out coastal armor.)</p> <p>Or, should the County define “existing structures” as only those permitted prior to 1977? (This would be a short-term strategy to phase out coastal armor.)</p>