

## comments on Sea-Level Rise Policy Draft

Inga [REDACTED]

[Actions](#)

To:

[CoastalSLRGuidanceDocument](#)

Thursday, February 06, 2014 3:52 PM

I am excited to see the CCC address sea level rise. I have a few comments and questions.

Page 50:

Aren't most coastal communities affected by salt water intrusion? Is not groundwater extraction the primary cause? I can definitely see how sea level rise will exacerbate the situation but I would think that the Commission would encourage small developments that rely on groundwater resources rather than developments who use municipal water (some depleting that very aquifer, most traveling a long ways, contributing to the depletion of ground water elsewhere.) Small households that rely on wells tend to be the most conscientious of water use. In this case limiting developments that use ground water would probably hurt small land owners and farmers.

Page 50 and Page 69: 2.1 Erosion. Most people that live along the coast, tend to live in steep areas due to the coastal mountain ranges and do have to control erosion with some sort of protective device. I am not a fan of massive concrete retaining walls, but are there alternatives? In the Americas, Europe, etc. there are reminders of beautiful and well engineered terraces that have allowed people to practice agriculture in an area that would not support it. In San Mateo county there is a lot of coastal land that is steep, subdivided, and zoned for agriculture. Because of its steepness, the only agricultural activity one could imagine is grazing, but most parcels are too small to graze or if large enough, too expensive for most farmers. If the goal is to support farming on these parcels, there may be a way that land be terraced for small scale agriculture that would not show in the view shed and still be ecologically minded. I am thinking of the Austrian wine valleys, terraced by the Romans in the wee days, and still used to this day or terraces around Mexico City.

page 73-Public Access and Recreation

I am not sure why one should identify ALL public access locations, trails, pull outs, etc on or near a proposed project site. Depending on coastal county, only certain public access roads like HWY 1 or specific pull outs need to be addressed. It definitely makes sense for the new development to show that the access road will not be flooded in future but adding all public vantage points seems like additional burdens placed on an already extensive permitting process.

Page 62 and page 76-Scenic Resources

Again right now a new proposed project site does not have to be evaluated from ALL public vantage points. Why are all of these being added in relation to sea level rise? Seems to me that this needs to be more specific.

page 79: It is not necessarily true that elevated development change the scenic quality and visual character of area. A lot of old cabins up and down the coast are built on piers and contribute to the historic quality and visual character of area. Looking at the new projects approved by the CCC I feel that "scenic quality and visual character of area" is often poorly defined. I would like to see better definitions

put forth by architects, historians, and urban planners. Much of what constitutes visual character of areas happened long before existence of the Commission. The funk and charm of the California coast was built by renegades, artists, hippies, farmers, miners, and the working class. Most of these people would not be able to pass through the CCC permitting process today.

The CCC permitting is well intentioned but it has created a California coast where only the wealthy can afford to build. The permitting process looks more like a plumbing diagram or scary board game. Looks aside, when one actually adds permit costs, it's prohibitive except for those in the upper economic bracket. This may not be something that seems relevant in a sea level rise report, but since this does add an extra layer of permitting, mapping, fees: have you every thought of having a more progressive fee structure based on income level?

Not addressed: I would like to see the Coastal Commission take a more proactive role in encouraging off grid and renewable energies. As of now wind power is illegal on coast. Wind power technology is changing rapidly and as long as it's safe for environment, esp. birds, I'd like to see people use it. If "looks" or "seeing" a small wind power turbine from a gas guzzling car on HWY 1 is the only deterrent in permitting then we all need to jump into the next century. Solar and wind is the new sexy scenic view shed.

Thank you,

Inga D.  
San Francisco, CA