

**ATTACHMENT 3**  
**RESOLUTION OF THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**  
**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

IN THE MATTER OF ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT     )  
TO THE COASTAL LAND USE PLAN OF THE         )  
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY LOCAL COASTAL         )     RESOLUTION NO. 18-\_\_\_\_\_  
PROGRAM THAT ADDS POLICY LANGUAGE TO       )  
ALLOW FOR ADAPATION TO THREATS RESULTING   )  
FROM SEA LEVEL RISE AND COASTAL HAZARDS     )     CASE NO: 17GPA-00000-00004

WITH REFERENCE TO THE FOLLOWING:

- A. On January 7, 1980, by Resolution No. 80-12, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara (Board) adopted the Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan.
- B. The proposed amendments are consistent with the Coastal Act of 1976, the Santa Barbara County Coastal Land Use Plan, the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, including the Community and Area Plans, and the requirements of California Planning, Zoning, and Development laws, as discussed in the Board Agenda Letter dated November 6, 2018, and hereby incorporated by reference.
- C. Citizens, Native American tribes, public agencies, public utility companies, and civic, education, and other community groups have been provided the opportunity for involvement in compliance with Government Code Section 65351.
- D. The County communicated with Native American tribes in compliance with Government Code Sections 65352.3 and 65352.4.
- E. In compliance with Government Code Section 65350.2, before a substantial amendment of the Comprehensive Plan, the Board is required to review and consider a groundwater sustainability plan or groundwater management plan, an adjudication of water rights, and/or an order or interim plan by the State Water Resources Control Board; however, such plans do not exist at the time of this action, thus the Board has satisfied its duties pursuant to Government Code Section 65350.5.
- F. The Montecito Planning Commission held duly noticed hearings on May 16 and July 18, 2018, in compliance with Government Code Sections 65353 and 65854 on the proposed amendments at which hearing the amendments were explained and comments invited from the persons in attendance.
- G. The County Planning Commission held duly noticed hearings on August 1 and August 29, 2018, in compliance with Government Code Section 65353 on the proposed amendments at which hearing the amendment was explained and comments invited from the persons in attendance, and has endorsed and transmitted a written recommendation to the Board of Supervisors in compliance with Government Code Section 65354.
- H. The Board held a duly noticed public hearing on November 6, 2018, in compliance with Government Code Section 65355 on the proposed amendments at which hearing the proposed amendments were explained and comments invited from the persons in attendance.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED as follows:

- 1. The above recitations are true and correct.
- 2. The Board now finds, consistent with the authority of Government Code Section 65358, that it is in the interest of orderly development of the County and important to the preservation of the health, safety, and general welfare of the residents of said County to amend Chapter 3, The

Resource Protection and Development Policies; amend Appendix A, Definitions of the Coastal Land Use Plan; amend Appendix C, References; add a new Appendix J, Medium Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazard Screening Map; and add a new Appendix K, High Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazard Screening Map, to the Coastal Land Use Plan, to read as follows:

## **CHAPTER 3: THE RESOURCE PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

### **3.2 DEVELOPMENT**

#### **3.2.2 PLANNING ISSUES**

##### **Development Policies**

**Policy 2-12:** The densities specified in the land use plan are maximums and shall be reduced if it is determined that such reduction is warranted by conditions specifically applicable to a site such as topography; geologic ~~or~~; flood or fire hazards; coastal bluff or shoreline retreat; habitat areas; or steep slopes. However, ~~density~~ densities may be increased for affordable housing projects provided such projects are found consistent with all applicable policies and provisions of the Local Coastal Program.

##### **Planned Development**

**Policy 2-17:** ~~Use~~ All development shall use ~~of flexible design concepts, including (e.g., clustering of units; and/or a mixture of dwelling types, etc.) and flexible building design (e.g., flood proofing such as breakaway walls or elevated utilities)~~ shall be required to accomplish as much as possible all of the following goals:

- a. protection of the scenic qualities of the site;
- b. protection of coastal resources, ~~i.e. (e.g., public access, water quality, habitat areas, and archaeological sites, etc.);~~
- c. avoidance of siting ~~of structures on~~ within hazardous areas, including reasonably foreseeable coastal hazards from sea level rise;
- d. provision of public open space, recreation, and/or beach access;
- e. preservation of existing healthy trees; and
- f. provision of very low, low and moderate income housing ~~opportunities.~~

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section.*

### **3.3 HAZARDS**

#### **3.3.2 PLANNING ISSUES**

Recent and historic events provide strong evidence of the vulnerability of certain coastal areas to natural hazards. Following saturating rains in the winter of 1978, large sections of the cliff face in Isla Vista fell into the sea, threatening several apartments; soil slippage caused a road washout in the community of Summerland; severe erosion occurred in graded areas above Summerland; several bluff top homes slid into the sea in the City of Santa Barbara; and flooding and heavy wave action damaged some homes along Miramar Beach. Also in 1978, an earthquake disrupted a rail line in the Ellwood area, produced numerous bluff slides and fissures along the South Coast, and caused considerable structural damage in the surrounding areas. These types of natural hazards along the County's coastline have continued to occur. Recent significant events include bluff failure in Isla Vista and flash flooding in El Capitan Canyon in 2017 and the devastating debris flow and mudslides in Montecito in 2018.

The Coastal Act requires that the risks to new development from such occurrences be minimized. Moreover, it specifies that new development must be located and built neither to “create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.”

The County has an array of policies and regulations within its zoning, grading, and fire ordinances, and building code which address many of the concerns of the Coastal Act. In addition, Santa Barbara County has undertaken public works projects ~~in recent years~~ which now protect large areas that were previously vulnerable to flooding. Extensive creek channelizations in the Carpinteria Valley and the construction of upstream debris dams are two ~~recent~~ examples.

~~However, in spite of measures currently imposed by the County, recent problems with bluff top development and severe erosion in certain hillside agricultural areas suggest that more stringent controls are needed.~~

### **Bluff and Beach Erosion**

Bluff erosion is a potential hazard for new development and continues to be a recurring hazard for existing development in portions of the South Coast. The bluff areas along Del Playa Drive in Isla Vista, sections of More Mesa and Hope Ranch, and areas along Channel Drive and Padaro Lane are all subject to hazards due to bluff erosion. Because of this recurring threat, many retaining walls, groins, and sections of rip-rap have been needed to protect life and property. In the aftermath of the 1978 winter, property owners initiated additional protective measures, such as major seawall projects proposed for Isla Vista and Padaro Lane.

The County’s policy on bluff development is handled on a case-by-case basis except in Isla Vista ~~and Hope Ranch~~. In Isla Vista, a 30-foot setback requirement exists. It is based on an engineering study that was undertaken in 1963 to determine cliff stability and related problems in the Isla Vista area. The study identified an average “natural” rate of cliff retreat at six inches per year and recommended that a value of twice the apparent retreat rate (12 inches) per year be applied for safety purposes, along with specific site drainage requirements. Assuming an average “economic life” of 30 years per structure, the County developed the 30-foot setback for the area. ~~In Hope Ranch, a 50-foot setback is required under the provisions of the County’s Zoning Ordinance #661.~~

~~The inadequacy of the present requirements with respect to the Coastal Act is especially apparent in Isla Vista, since new “protective devices” which may substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs are now necessary to protect property.~~

Bluff areas adjacent to development at More Mesa have been eroding at an average rate of ten inches per year, while along a section of Padaro Lane bluff losses of up to two feet per year have been reported. More than 10 feet were lost in a single event in Isla Vista in 2017. These examples provide additional evidence why County setback standards should be strengthened in order to eliminate the possibility of needing new “protective devices” in areas where future development may occur.

~~While serious beach erosion occurred during the winter storms of 1978, damage was localized and temporary in most cases. Heavy river and stream flows replenished much of the losses. Existing and proposed flood control projects are not considered to have a significant impact on sand supply to the beaches that would require corrective measures.~~

## Geologic Hazards

Geologic hazards include seismic hazards (surface ruptures, liquefaction, severe ground shaking, tsunami run-up), landslides, soil erosion, expansive soils, and subsidence. Since these hazards can ~~affect~~ adversely impact both life and property, additional siting criteria or special engineering measures are needed to compensate for these hazards.

The entire South Coast lies in an area of high seismic risk. Seismic, landslide, and tsunami hazards have been mapped by the County and are used by the Public Works Department to review development proposals. Where faults are identifiable, the County Public Works Department has been generally requiring a 50-foot setback from the fault, though precise setback decisions are made on a case-by-case basis. In addition, geologic and soil engineering reports may be required under ~~Grading Ordinance No. 1795~~ the County's Grading Ordinance (Chapter 14 of the Santa Barbara County Code of Ordinances) for obtaining a grading permit. These reports are used to identify geologic and soil problems and to establish conditions for siting and constructing structures where hazards or problems exist.

With the exception of a slope hazard area in Summerland, problems due to slope instability are generally confined to areas outside of the proposed urban development limits set forth in the land use plan. Although the coastal zone between Ellwood and Point Arguello is either hilly or mountainous with variable and complex geologic conditions, only low-intensity, nonurban land uses will be located in this area. Consequently, slope-related hazards will be minimized. Soil erosion is a slope-related hazard which has become more problematic in recent years because of extensive agricultural development on slopes of 30 percent or more. ~~A recent study conducted by the Agricultural Unit of the State Water Resources Control Board documents severe erosion in some areas of the South Coast where new orchards are being established.~~

The County Grading Ordinance ~~No. 1795 (as amended by Ordinance No. 2770)~~ provides exemptions for grading related to farming and agricultural operations. However, the County's Brush Removal Ordinance ~~(No. 2767) Chapter 9A of the Santa Barbara County Code of Ordinances~~, ~~which applies to the South Coast~~, does regulate removal of vegetation on parcels over five acres in size, and requires a permit and approval of drainage and erosion control devices before agricultural grading commences.

## Flooding

Flooding has occurred along Santa Barbara's South Coast in recent years, particularly in the Carpinteria Valley, sections of Montecito, and the Santa Barbara Airport area. Severe floods in 1969 undermined a section of U. S. 101 in Carpinteria. These flood hazards are progressively being eliminated in the populated portions of Carpinteria Valley and other areas of the South Coast as a result of stream channelizations and the construction of debris dams and silt basins by the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and by the U. S. Soil Conservation Service.

~~The U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) through the National Flood Insurance Program has investigated the existence and severity of flood hazards in the unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County. One of the objectives of this study is was to provide information to local planners in promoting sound land use and flood plain management. The Federal Insurance Administration has adopted the 100 year flood (the flood having a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year) as the national standard for purposes of flood plain management. The 100-year "flood plain" is comprised of a "floodway" and a "floodway fringe". The floodway is the channel of a stream, plus any adjacent flood plain areas, which must be kept free of encroachment in order that the 100 year flood be carried without substantial~~

~~increases in flood heights. As minimum standards, increases in flood heights are limited to 1.0 foot, provided that hazardous velocities are not produced. The area between the floodway and the boundary of the 100-year flood is termed the floodway fringe. This area encompasses that portion of the floodplain that could be completely obstructed without increasing the water surface elevation of the 100-year flood more than 1.0 foot at any point.~~

~~County Flood Combining Regulations, administered by the Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, regulate construction, excavation, and grading in a “designated” floodway. The designated floodway, as defined in Ordinance No. 661 the County’s Floodplain Management Ordinance, only includes “land reasonably required to provide for the construction of a flood control project for passage of a flood against which protection is provided or eventually will be provided by said project including land necessary for construction of project levees.” Thus, the restrictions are not as comprehensive as those recommended by HUD. In addition, the “FW” Flood Hazard Combining Regulations currently apply only to areas in Carpinteria and Goleta, along Atascadero Creek, and the Goleta Slough.~~

New regulations covering all development within the 100-year flood plain have been formulated. The County adopted the FloodpPlain Management Ordinance, Chapter 15A of the County Code, has been adopted in order to comply with the requirements of the HUD-sponsored Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Federal Flood Insurance Program in which this County is participating. FEMA has adopted the 100-year flood (the flood having a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year) as the national standard for purposes of floodplain management. The 100-year “floodplain” is comprised of a “floodway” and a “floodway fringe” as shown in Figure 4-1 below. The floodway is the channel of a stream, plus any adjacent floodplain areas, which must be kept free of encroachment in order that the 100-year flood can be carried without substantial increases in flood heights. The areas of a floodplain on either side of the designated floodway are termed the floodway fringe, and encroachments (e.g., landscaping, structures, and utilities) may be permitted in the fringe areas. Development proposed within Santa Barbara County’s Coastal Zone that is located within the Flood Hazard Area Overlay District is reviewed to ensure compliance with the Floodplain Management Ordinance as well as the County LCP.




Figure 4-1. Characteristics of a Floodplain.

**Coastal Hazards Exacerbated by Sea Level Rise**

Global greenhouse gas emissions and resulting sea level rise from thermal expansion of ocean waters and melting ice sheets are predicted to increase and intensify beach and bluff erosion, coastal flooding, slope instability, wave uprush, and other coastal hazards. The magnitude and timing of these changes are not precisely known. However, the trend is clear and the need to incorporate sea level rise issues into coastal planning and permitting decisions is increasingly evident. The original Coastal Land Use Plan contained some policies to protect coastal resources and address coastal hazards. However, the County amended and expanded those policies in 2018 to specifically reflect current science, regulate development, and protect public access and other coastal resources consistent with the Coastal Act.

**Sea Level Rise Projections**

The National Research Council projected sea level rise through the end of this century in their 2012 publication “Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington.” Santa Barbara County refined the 2012 data for the county’s coastline, as described in the 2017 “Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazards Vulnerability Assessment.” Table 1 shows the resulting low, medium, and high sea level rise scenarios for the Santa Barbara County coastline.

**Table 1. Sea Level Rise Projections for Santa Barbara County (inches)**

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Low Sea Level Rise Scenario</u>	<u>Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario</u>	<u>High Sea Level Rise Scenario</u>
<u>By 2030</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>10.2</u>
<u>By 2060</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>27.2</u>
<u>By 2100</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>30.7</u>	<u>60.2</u>

Source: Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazards Vulnerability Assessment, July 2017.

The California Ocean Protection Council updated the sea level rise projections in 2017 using the best available science and modeling techniques. The California Natural Resources Agency used the updated information to update the probabilistic projections in its 2018 sea level rise guidance document. Table 2 shows the updated sea level rise projections for the Santa Barbara tidal gauge area.

**Table 2  
 Projected Sea Level Rise (inches) for the Santa Barbara Tidal Gauge**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Likely Range</u>	<u>1-in-20 Chance</u>	<u>1-in-200 Chance</u>
	<u>50% probability sea level rise meets or exceeds:</u>	<u>66% probability sea level rise is between:</u>	<u>5% probability sea level rise meets or exceeds:</u>	<u>0.5% probability sea level rise meets or exceeds:</u>
<u>2030</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>2.4 - 4.8</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>8.4</u>
<u>2060</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>7.2 – 15.6</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>30.0</u>
<u>2100 – low emissions scenario</u>	<u>14.4</u>	<u>7.2 – 24.0</u>	<u>34.8</u>	<u>63.6</u>
<u>2100 – high emissions scenario</u>	<u>25.2</u>	<u>14.4 – 37.2</u>	<u>49.2</u>	<u>79.2</u>

Source: California Natural Resources Agency and California Ocean Protection Council, 2018, State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update.

The County uses the “medium” sea level rise scenario to analyze potential hazards to future development, except for land divisions and certain lot line adjustments. It uses the “high” sea level rise scenario for land divisions, and for lot line adjustments that result in an increased subdivision potential or a greater number of residentially developable lots. Land divisions and certain lot line adjustments are expected to last in perpetuity and are not subject to obsolescence as are new structures and development. Therefore, the “high” sea level rise scenario, in combination with a 100-year timeframe, is used to establish safe, buildable new lots. As described above, new development on the new or adjusted lots is to be sited and designed using the “medium” sea level rise scenario and appropriate anticipated life of the development (e.g., 75 years for residential and commercial development).

The County is committed to using the best available science to analyze potential hazards to future development. It also acknowledges that the climate change science supporting these projections is being constantly refined and updated, and will reevaluate the County’s vulnerability on a consistent basis based on evolving scientific understanding.

#### Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Maps

The Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Maps (Appendices J and K) shows areas of the county coastline that are potentially subject to increased threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards, where further site-specific study is needed to assess potential adverse impacts. The Medium Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazard Screening Map in Appendix J shows the “medium” sea level rise scenarios by the years 2030, 2060, and 2100. The Screening Maps in Appendix J are to be used for proposed development projects (e.g., new structures and development permitted by a Coastal Development Permit) in accordance with Policy 3-6. The screening maps in Appendix J identify coastal areas that require additional review and development standards to avoid and minimize adverse impacts from sea level rise and coastal hazards.

The High Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazard Screening Map in Appendix K shows the “high” sea level rise scenarios by the years 2030, 2060, and 2100. The “high” sea level rise scenario maps in Appendix K are to be used for the review of subdivisions and certain lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.

The low, medium, and high sea level rise scenarios can also be visually examined using the Coastal Resilience Mapping Portal available online at <http://maps.coastalresilience.org/california/#> or through the Planning and Development Department website at <http://longrange.sbcountyplanning.org/programs/coastalresiliencyproject/coastalresiliency.php>.

The County will monitor measurable sea level rise locally and along the Pacific Coast as regional and global climate changes occur. It will compare results of the sea level rise monitoring against the sea level rise projections used in this LCP, and will update projections when needed. It will also update the Screening Maps using the best available science to show current and reasonably foreseeable future sea level rise and coastal hazards.

#### Coastal Hazard Setbacks

Coastal Act Section 30253 requires that new development “minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.” New development and redevelopment in coastal hazard areas must be located outside or set back from hazardous areas when feasible, to minimize risks to life and property. The required coastal hazard setbacks vary depending upon the anticipated life of development. Different types of development have different anticipated lives and, therefore, different

coastal hazard setbacks. For example, a coastal hazards analysis for a new structure with an anticipated life of 75 years shall evaluate the project site over 75 years, including the range of projected sea level rise over that period. Using that evaluation, the development would be set back or designed to avoid coastal hazards over 75 years (i.e., anticipated life of development).

### Shoreline Protective Devices

Shoreline protective devices include seawalls, revetments, breakwaters, groins, and cliff retaining walls. Shoreline protective devices vary in design and materials, ranging from the strategic placement of sand or rocks to vertical walls made of wood, concrete, or steel. They can protect development from short-term erosion and wave action, but can also obstruct and/or diminish public access to beaches, adversely impact the natural movement of sediments (e.g., sand, silt, and gravel) along the coastline, and result in the loss of beach widths and coastal habitat and resources.

Shoreline protective devices' adverse impacts on beach areas and local shoreline sand supply generally include:

- Losing sand and beach area through the device's physical encroachment on a beach,
- Accelerating bluff and shoreline erosion,
- Preventing new beach formation in areas where the bluff/shoreline would have otherwise naturally eroded, and
- Losing sand-generating bluff/shoreline materials that would have entered the sand supply absent the shoreline protective device.

The adverse impacts of shoreline protective devices can also create secondary adverse impacts such as the loss of natural habitat and visual resources as a result of beach, dune, and sand loss and the loss of horizontal beach access for recreation. If such adverse impacts cannot be avoided, they may be mitigated through options such as providing equivalent new public access or recreational facilities and/or undertaking restoration of nearby beach habitat.

## **3.3.3 POLICIES**

### **Land Division**

**Policy 3-1:** Subdivisions and certain lot line adjustments in areas subject to threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards shall only be permitted if each created parcel will comply with all applicable coastal hazard policies and standards of the LCP, will not require shoreline protection, and will not adversely impact coastal resources or public access. This policy shall only apply to lot line adjustments that would result in (1) an increased subdivision potential for any affected lot in the lot line adjustment, or (2) a greater number of residentially developable lots than existed before the lot line adjustment. This policy shall not apply to parcels created or adjusted for the purpose of providing open space or public access. For the purposes of this policy, the County shall use the "high" sea level rise scenario, as shown in the High Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazards Screening Map in Appendix K, and analyze potential hazards over a 100-year timeframe.



### **Seawalls and Shoreline Structures Shoreline Protection and Management**

**Policy 3-2:** The County shall collaborate with the Beach Erosion Authority for Clean Oceans and Nourishment (BEACON), local coastal cities, relevant state and federal agencies, and nonprofit organizations on shoreline management planning research and methods along the coastline of Santa Barbara County, including beach erosion from sea level rise and feasible sediment management solutions.

**Policy 3-3:** Prior to emergency conditions, the County will encourage and work with landowners whose property is subject to threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards to develop appropriate adaptation strategies, such as protect (e.g., soft, non-structural measures), accommodate (e.g., floodproofing retrofits), and/or retreat (e.g., relocate or remove existing development). Where contiguous properties are subject to similar coastal hazards, landowners should develop coordinated adaptation strategies.

~~**Policy 3-1:** Seawalls shall not be permitted unless the County has determined that there are no other less environmentally damaging alternatives reasonably available for protection of existing principal structures. The County prefers and encourages non structural solutions to shoreline erosion problems, including beach replenishment, removal of endangered structures and prevention of land divisions on shorefront property subject to erosion; and, will seek solutions to shoreline hazards on a larger geographic basis than a single lot circumstance. Where permitted, seawall design and construction shall respect to the degree possible natural landforms. Adequate provision for lateral beach access shall be made and the project shall be designed to minimize visual impacts by the use of appropriate colors and materials.~~

~~**Policy 3-2:** Revetments, groins, cliff retaining walls, pipelines and outfalls, and other such construction that may alter natural shoreline processes shall be permitted when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply and so as not to block lateral beach access.~~

**Policy 3-4:** Shoreline protective devices shall only be permitted when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or protect existing principal structures or public beaches in danger from erosion, when sited and designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply, when designed to avoid, or mitigate if avoidance is infeasible, adverse impacts to lateral beach access, biological resources, water quality, visual, and other coastal resources, and when no less environmentally damaging alternative exists. Shoreline protective devices shall be sited to avoid sensitive resources, and adverse impacts on all coastal resources shall be mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. For the purposes of this policy, “existing structure” means a principal structure (e.g., residential dwelling, accessory dwelling unit, or public recreation facility) that was legally established on or before [effective date of the proposed sea level rise/coastal hazard LCP amendment].

**Policy 3-35:** To avoid the need for future protective devices that could adversely impact sand movement and supply, no permanent above-ground structures shall be permitted on the dry sandy beach except facilities necessary for public health and safety, such as lifeguard towers, public access, such as boardwalks, or where such restriction would cause the inverse condemnation of the parcel lot by the County.

## **Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Areas**

**Policy 3-6:** The Medium Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazards Screening Map (Appendix J) shall be used to identify coastal areas that require additional review and development standards to avoid and minimize adverse impacts from sea level rise and coastal hazards. Properties located in areas not shown on the Coastal Hazards Screening Map shall also be subject to policies requiring site-specific hazards analysis and avoidance of threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards if there is substantial evidence demonstrating that the site may be subject to reasonably foreseeable future coastal hazards.

**Policy 3-7:** The County shall monitor sea level rise using the best available science, compare modeled projections against measurable changes in sea level, and report the results to the Board of Supervisors every 10 years, or sooner as necessary to incorporate new sea level rise science and information on coastal conditions. The County shall update the Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazards Screening Maps and sea level rise scenario standards if monitoring demonstrates a significant difference between modeled projections and measurable changes in sea level rise.

The County may act on a Coastal Development Permit application in compliance with LCP policies and standards, even if the Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazards Screening Maps need an update, but have not been updated as of the time of action on the Coastal Development Permit application.

**Policy 3-8:** All development within areas shown in the Medium Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazards Screening Map (Appendix J), or otherwise subject to coastal hazards pursuant to Policy 3-6, shall be sited and designed to avoid existing or reasonably foreseeable future threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards without reliance on shoreline protective devices over the anticipated life of the development. (Refer to Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 3-10.) Utility infrastructure required for safe habitation (e.g., water, sewer, and onsite wastewater treatment systems) shall be set back at least the same distance as the development to ensure provision of adequate services during the anticipated life of the development. Minor and/or ancillary development that does not require foundations or grading, does not adversely impact beach, dune, or other coastal resource stability, and can be readily removed or relocated (e.g., decks, fences, patios, and walkways) may be permitted within coastal hazard setback areas if consistent with the protection of coastal resources.

**Policy 3-9:** In areas of known coastal hazards, including those areas shown on the Medium Sea Level Rise and Coastal Hazards Screening Map (Appendix J), a site-specific Coastal Hazard Report shall be prepared according to the requirements in Appendix I of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Technical Guidelines for Preparation of a Coastal Hazard Report). The analysis shall identify any hazards affecting the proposed development using the best available science, any necessary mitigation measures, and contain substantial evidence that the project site, with mitigation, is suitable for the proposed development and that the development will adequately protect life and property from the identified hazards. Mitigation measures shall be applied to development when required to avoid or minimize impacts related to sea level rise and related coastal hazards.

**Policy 3-10:** Coastal hazard setbacks shall be determined based upon the anticipated life of development. The anticipated life of development shall be defined as follows:

- a. Temporary structures, or moveable or expendable construction (e.g., trails, boardwalks, bike racks, playgrounds): 5 years
- b. Ancillary development or amenity structures (e.g., shoreline restrooms, parking lots): 25 years.
- c. Mobile homes: 30 years.
- d. Residential or commercial structures, accessory dwelling units, or manufactured homes: 75 years.

- e. Critical infrastructure (e.g., emergency medical facilities, bridges, water treatment plants): 100 years.

**Policy 3-11:** A legally permitted building or structure that does not conform to coastal resource protection or coastal hazard standards or setbacks shall be considered a nonconforming building or structure. Nonconforming buildings and structures must be brought into conformance with all LCP policies and standards for new development when proposed development activities (e.g., reconstruction, alterations, and additions) would replace 50 percent or more of a nonconforming building or structure. The definition of “redevelopment” in Appendix A, Definitions, establishes standards for calculating this threshold.

**Policy 3-12:** Development within coastal hazard areas shall be removed, relocated, or modified, and the area restored at the applicant’s or property owner’s expense, if:

- (1) The structure has been damaged and designated as unsafe to enter by the County Building Official or designee due to coastal hazards, or
- (2) Essential services to the site can no longer feasibly be maintained (e.g., utilities and roads).

**Policy 3-13:** Applicants or property owners receiving a Coastal Development Permit for development subject to existing or reasonably foreseeable future threats from sea level rise or coastal hazards and any related conditions of approval shall record a notice to property owner (NTPO) disclosing such threats and conditions. The NTPO shall notify current and future property owners of the: (1) conditions of approval of the Coastal Development Permit that authorized the development; (2) existing and reasonably foreseeable future threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards, including bluff retreat, erosion, wave run-up, and flooding/inundation and the results of any site-specific analysis thereof; and (3) potential for the public trust boundary to move inland, encompassing part or all of the development and therefore requiring a permit from the California Coastal Commission or State Lands Commission to remain.

### **Bluff and Dune Protection**

~~**Policy 3-414:** In areas of new development, above ground structures shall be set back a sufficient distance from the bluff edge to be safe from the threat of bluff erosion for a minimum of 75 years, unless such standard will make a lot unbuildable, in which case a standard of 50 years shall be used. The County shall determine the required setback. A geologic report shall be required by the County in order to make this determination. At a minimum, such geologic report shall be prepared in conformance with the Coastal Commission’s adopted Statewide Interpretive Guidelines regarding “Geologic Stability of Bluff top Development.”(See also Policy 4-5 regarding protection of visual resources.)~~<sup>21</sup>

All development on bluff top lots shall be sited a sufficient distance from the bluff edge to be safe from the threat of bluff erosion and slope instability, factoring in the effects of sea level rise using the “medium” sea level rise scenario as shown in Appendix J, and without reliance on shoreline protective devices, over the anticipated life of the development. (Refer to Coastal Land Use Plan Policy 3-10 and Appendix I of the Article II, Coastal Zoning Ordinance for the anticipated life of development and technical guidance on calculating the bluff edge setback, respectively.) Utility infrastructure required for safe habitation (e.g., water, sewer, and onsite wastewater treatment systems) shall be set back from the bluff edge to at least the same distance as the development to ensure provision of adequate services during the anticipated life of the development.

Applications for development on bluff top lots shall include a site-specific Coastal Hazard Report prepared according to the requirements in Appendix I of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Technical Guidelines for Preparation of a Coastal Hazard Report).

**Policy 3-515:** ~~Within the Drought-tolerant vegetation shall be maintained on all bluff-top areas seaward of the required blufftop edge setback, drought tolerant vegetation shall be maintained, using native plants and materials to the maximum extent feasible. Minor Ggrading, as that may be required to establish proper drainage or to install landscaping, and minor improvements, i.e., patios and fences that do not impact bluff stability, may be permitted. Surface water shall be directed away from the top of the bluff top or be handled in a manner satisfactory managed to prevent damage to the bluff by surface and percolating water.~~

**Policy 3-16:** Minor, at grade, easily removable development associated with passive public recreational uses (e.g., signs, benches, and trails) may be located within coastal bluff edge setbacks.

**Policy 3-617:** ~~All Ddevelopment and activity of any kind beyond landward of the required bluff-top edge setback shall be constructed to ensure that all surface and subsurface drainage shall not contribute to the erosion of the bluff face or the stability of the bluff itself.~~

**Policy 3-718:** ~~No development shall be permitted on the bluff face, except for engineered staircases or accessways to provide for public beach access, and pipelines for scientific research or coastal dependent industry. Drainpipes shall be allowed; such uses are permitted only where no other less environmentally damaging drain system alternative is feasible and the drainpipes are development is sited and designed and placed to minimize erosion and impacts to the bluff face, toe, and beach. Drainage devices extending over the bluff face shall not be permitted if the property can feasibly be drained away from the bluff face.~~

**Policy 3-19:** All development adjacent to dunes shall be sited and designed to prevent adverse impacts to coastal resources, assure structural stability of the development, and avoid coastal hazards over the anticipated life of the development. Siting and design shall take into account the anticipated extent of the landward migration of foredunes over the anticipated life of the development. This landward migration shall be determined based upon historic dune erosion, storm damage, anticipated sea level rise, and foreseeable changes in sand supply.

### **Coastal Hazards Adversely Impacting Transportation Resources**

**Policy 3-20:** The County shall consult and coordinate with the California Department of Transportation to protect public access to the coast and to minimize adverse impacts of sea level rise on U.S. Highway 101. Areas that will become regularly inundated by the ocean or are at risk of periodic inundation from storm surge and sea level rise shall be identified. A combination of structural and non-structural measures to protect public access and use of Highway 101 shall be considered with a preference towards non-structural solutions, unless the structural solutions are less environmentally damaging.

**Policy 3-21:** All Coastal Development Permit applications for new roads and road projects shall: (1) identify existing and reasonably foreseeable future coastal hazards, including flooding, storm surge, and sea level rise, and (2) set forth alternatives and adaptation measures to minimize risk and avoid shoreline protective devices over the anticipated life of the project.

**Policy 3-22:** The County shall consult and coordinate with the Union Pacific Railroad to protect public access to the coast and to minimize current and future threats from sea level rise and coastal hazards on regional railway lines. Areas that will become regularly inundated by the ocean or are at risk of periodic inundation from storm surge and sea level rise should be identified. A combination of

structural and non-structural measures to protect local and regional access and use of railway transportation should be considered with a preference towards non-structural solutions, unless the structural solutions are less environmentally damaging.

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section except renumbering of policies as required.*

### **3.3.4 HILLSIDE AND WATERSHED PROTECTION**

#### ***Policies***

**Policy 3-1429:** All development shall be sited and designed to: (1) fit the minimize alteration of existing site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions, and (2) be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited for development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion, or other hazards, including those associated with sea level rise, shall remain in open space.

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section except renumbering of policies as required.*

### **3.4 VISUAL RESOURCES**

#### **3.4.3 POLICIES**

**Policy 4-5:** In addition to that required for safety (see Policy 3-414), ~~further~~ larger bluff setbacks may be required for oceanfront structures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts on public views from the beach. Bluff-top structures shall be located as far landward as necessary set back from the bluff edge sufficiently far to ensure that the structure does not infringe on views from the beach except in areas where existing structures on both sides of the proposed structure already adversely impact public views from the beach. In such cases, the new structure shall be located no closer to the bluff's edge than the adjacent structures.

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section.*

### **3.6 INDUSTRIAL AND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Policy Implementation**

**Policy 6-9:** Applicants for oil and gas processing facilities shall prepare and keep updated emergency response plans to address deal with the potential consequences of hydrocarbon leaks, or fires. These emergency response plans shall be approved by the, and facility impacts from increased coastal flooding and erosion due to sea level rise. The County's Office of Emergency Services Coordinator Management and Fire Department shall review and, if found to be adequate, approve these emergency response plans.

#### **Pipelines**

**Policy 6-16:** ~~The p~~Pipelines shall be sited and constructed in such a manner as to inhibit erosion, taking into account areas subject to likely future erosion during the anticipated lifespan of the pipeline as sea level rises.

**Policy 6-20:** When feasible, pipelines shall be routed to avoid coastal hazard areas, including those areas shown on the Medium Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazards Screening Map (Appendix J). If avoidance of these areas is infeasible, pipeline segments passing through such coastal hazard areas shall be isolated by shutoff valves.

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section except renumbering of policies as required.*

### **3.7 COASTAL ACCESS AND RECREATION**

#### **3.7.4 POLICIES**

**Policy 7-1:** The County shall take all necessary steps to protect and defend the public's constitutionally guaranteed rights of access to and along the shoreline. At a minimum, County actions shall include:

- a. Initiating legal action to acquire easements to beaches and access corridors for which prescriptive rights exist consistent with the availability of staff and funds;
- b. Accepting offers of dedication which will increase opportunities for public access and recreation consistent with the County's ability to assume liability and maintenance costs;
- c. ~~Actively s~~Seeking other public or private agencies to accept offers of dedications, having them assume liability and maintenance responsibilities, and allowing such agencies to initiate legal action to pursue beach access; and
- d. Working with landowners to pursue new public access ways if existing easements or corridors are lost or inaccessible due to sea level rise or other coastal hazards.

**Policy 7-8:** For unavoidable adverse impacts to public access or recreation from new shoreline protection devices or new development, mitigation of adverse impacts through the addition of new public access, recreation opportunities, visitor-serving accommodations, Coastal Trail segments, or payment of fees to fund such improvements shall be required.

**Policy 7-9:** New public access and public recreation uses and facilities (e.g., overlooks, trails, stairways and/or ramps, parks, and visitor-serving accommodations) may be allowed provided that such uses and facilities are consistent with all applicable LCP policies and standards, including those that do not require shoreline protective devices and will not cause, expand, or accelerate instability of a bluff. Adaptive management measures specifying how maintenance, retrofit, removal, or relocation will take place over time as conditions change as a result of sea level rise shall be a condition of permit approval.

**Policy 7-10:** As County beach park development plans are updated, they shall incorporate measures to adapt to sea level rise over time and provide for the long-term protection and provision of public improvements, coastal access, public opportunities for coastal recreation, and coastal resources including beach and shoreline habitat. Where feasible, any facilities that are removed or reduced should be replaced at an appropriate location, to ensure public access and recreational resources are protected and enhanced.

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section except renumbering of policies as required.*

### 3.9 ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREAS

#### 3.9.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE HABITAT AREA OVERLAY DESIGNATION

##### Habitat Type: Streams

**Policy 9-37:** ~~The minimum buffer strip for major streams and their associated riparian vegetation in rural areas, as defined by the land use plan~~ Land Use Element of the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan, shall be presumptively 100 feet, and for streams and their associated riparian vegetation in urban areas, 50 feet. These minimum buffers may be adjusted upward or downward increased on a case-by-case basis when necessary to prevent significant disruption of habitat values given site-specific evidence provided in a biological report prepared by a qualified biologist. The minimum buffer strip may be decreased only to avoid precluding reasonable use of property. The buffer shall be established An increase to the buffer strip shall be based on an investigation of the following factors and after consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game Wildlife and Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to. All buffers shall be sufficient to protect the biological productivity and water quality of streams, avoid significant disruption of habitat values, and to protect the habitat area, including the following habitat area characteristics:

- 1) existing vegetation, soil type and stability of stream and riparian corridors;
- 2) how surface water filters into the ground;
- 3) slope of the land on either side of the stream; and
- 4) location of the 100-year flood plain boundary-;
- 5) consistency with adopted plans, particularly biology and habitat policies; and
- 6) landscape-scale habitat connectivity.

The required buffer shall extend from the outer extent of development (including fuel clearance required by the Fire Department) to the outer extent of the stream's riparian canopy, or the top of the stream bank if there is no riparian vegetation. Riparian vegetation shall be protected and shall be included in the buffer. Where riparian vegetation has previously been removed, except for channelization, inconsistent with (1) any policies or other applicable provisions of the LCP or (2) any provisions and conditions of existing, approved permits for the subject lot, the buffer shall allow for the reestablishment of riparian vegetation extend to it's the prior extent of the riparian vegetation to the greatest degree possible feasible.

*Note: No changes are proposed to other policies in this section.*

**APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS**

**CHAPTER 3**

**3.3 HAZARDS**

**Bluff (or Cliff):** A scarp or steep face of rock, weathered rock, sediment and/or soil resulting from erosion, faulting, folding or excavation of the land mass, with at least 10 feet of vertical relief. (See Figure 1.) In the Coastal Zone, the toe of a bluff is or may be subject to marine erosion.




Figure 1. Diagram of a Generalized Bluff

**Bluff Edge:** The upper termination of a bluff, cliff, or sea cliff. In cases where the top edge of the bluff is rounded away from the face of the bluff, the bluff edge shall be defined as that point nearest the bluff face beyond which the general gradient changes downward more or less continuously to the base of the bluff. (See Figure 2 below.) In a case where there is a step-like feature at the top of the bluff, the landward edge of the topmost riser shall be considered the bluff edge. (See Figure 3 below.) In cases where bluffs are undercut, the most undercut portion shall be considered as the defined bluff edge. (See Figure 4 below.) Artificial fill placed near the bluff edge, or extending over the bluff edge does not alter the position of the bluff edge. (See Figure 5 below.) Where a coastal bluff curves landward to become a canyon bluff, the termini of the coastal bluff edge shall be defined as a point reached by bisecting the angle formed by a line coinciding with the general trend of the coastal bluff line along the seaward face of the bluff, and a line coinciding with the general trend of the bluff line along the canyon facing portion of the bluff. (See Figure 6 below.)




Figure 2. Rounded Bluff Edge




Figure 3. Bluff Edge with Step-like Feature




Figure 4. Diagram of an Undercut Bluff




Figure 5. Bluff Edge with Artificial Fill






Figure 6. Coastal Canyon Bluff Edge

**Coastal Hazards:** Natural hazards that adversely impact the coastline, including but not limited to:

Coastal Erosion: Short- and long-term shoreline changes caused by erosion related to storm events, wave action, currents, water, wind, or other natural events.

Coastal Flooding: Temporary flooding due to high water level events caused by one or more of the following: high tides, storm surge (a rise above normal water level during storms), and sea level rise.

Extreme Monthly Tidal Inundation: Routine tidal inundation expected at least once a month.

Sea level rise: Change in the mean sea level due to an increase in the volume of ocean water.

Wave run up: The maximum vertical extent of wave action on a beach or structure, above the still water line.

### **Existing Structure**

A structure that was legally established on or before [effective date of the proposed sea level rise/coastal hazard LCP amendment].

### **Existing Principal Structure**

See “Existing Structure” and “Principal Structure.”

### **Floodway and Floodway Fringe**

The floodway is the channel of a stream, plus any adjacent flood plain area, that must be kept free of encroachment in order that the 100-year flood can be carried without substantial increase in flood height. As minimum standards, the Federal Insurance Administration limits such increases in flood heights to 1.0 foot, provided that hazardous velocities are not produced.

The area between the floodway and the boundary of the 100-year flood is termed the floodway fringe. The floodway fringe thus encompasses the portion of the flood plain that could be completely obstructed without increasing the water-surface elevation of the 100-year flood more than 1.0 foot at any point.

### **Hillside**

Hillsides are defined as lands with slopes exceeding twenty percent.

**Principal Structure:** A structure (e.g., residential dwelling, accessory dwelling unit, or public recreation facility) in which is conducted the principal use of the lot on which it is situated. In any

residential, agricultural or estate district, any dwelling shall be deemed to be the principal structure on the lot on which it is situated.

### **Redevelopment**

Development that consists of alterations to an existing structure that results in one or more of the following conditions:

1. Fifty percent or more of the structural components of exterior or interior walls (or vertical supports such as posts or columns when a structure has no walls) of a structure are replaced, structurally altered, reinforced, or removed.
2. Fifty percent or more of the foundation system is replaced, structurally altered, reinforced, or removed, including, but not limited to: perimeter concrete foundation, retaining walls, post and pier foundations, or similar element(s) that connect a structure to the ground and transfer gravity loads from the structure to the ground.
3. Fifty percent or more of the structural elements of the roof or floor framing are replaced, structurally altered, reinforced, or removed.
4. Alterations that do not individually meet one or more of the thresholds in subsections 1, 2, or 3, above, where those alterations combined with previous alterations undertaken on or after [effective date of the proposed Coastal Resiliency Project LCP amendment] would cumulatively meet or exceed one or more of the thresholds in subsections 1, 2, or 3, above.

### **Shoreline Protective Devices**

Constructed features such as seawalls, revetments, riprap, earthen berms, cave fills, and bulkheads that block the landward retreat of the shoreline and are used to protect structures or other features from erosion, waves, and other coastal hazards.

### **Watershed**

Watersheds are defined as regions or areas drained by a network of surface or subsurface watercourses and, due to their connectivity, have the potential to adversely impact coastal streams, wetlands, estuaries, and groundwater basins through runoff and percolation.

## **APPENDIX C: REFERENCES**

### **SECTION 3.3: HAZARDS**

American Society of Planning Officials, Planning Advisory Service, Performance Controls for Sensitive Lands - A Practical Guide for Local Administrators, Report #307, 308, prepared by Charles Thurow, William Toner, and Duncan Erley. June 1975.

City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities Areas, Environmental Protection: Model Ordinances for Use by Local Governments, March 1977.

Conservation Foundation, Physical Management of Coastal Floodplains. December 1977.

County of Santa Barbara. Coastal Resiliency Project. Sea Level Rise & Coastal Hazards Vulnerability Assessment. July 2017.

County of Santa Barbara, Engineering and Geologic Investigation - Cliff Stability and Related Problems in Isla Vista. 1963, prepared by Dames and Moore.

County of Santa Barbara, Seismic Safety and Safety Element, January 1979. County of Santa Barbara, Conservation Element, April 1979.

Griggs, G, Árvai, J, Cayan, D, DeConato, R, Fox, J, Fricker, HA, Kopp, RE, Tebaldi, C, Whiteman, EA (California Ocean Protection Council Science Advisory Team Working Group). Rising Seas in California: An Update on Sea-Level Rise Science. California Ocean Science Trust, April 2017.

National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, Sea Level Rise for the Coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, Present, and Future. The National Academies Press. 2012.

State of California, Coastal Commission, Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, August 2015.

State of California, Coastal Commission, Residential Adaptation Policy Guidance, revised draft report, March 2018.

State of California, Coastal Commission, Planning for an Eroding Shoreline, draft report, June 1978.

State of California, Natural Resources Agency and Ocean Protection Council. "State of California Sea-Level Rise Guidance." 2018 Update.

State of California, South Central Regional Coastal Commission, Geology, April 1974.

State of California, Department of Navigation and Ocean Development, Assessment and Atlas of Shoreline Erosion Along the California Coast, July 1977.

United States. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Carpinteria Valley Watershed Project - Draft Environmental Impact Statement, October 1977.

United States, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Beach Erosion Study - Santa Barbara County, May 1973.

United States, Department of Commerce, Office of Coastal Zone Management, Natural Hazard: Management in Coastal Areas, November 1976.


United States, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Insurance Administration, Flood Insurance Study - Santa Barbara County. September 1978.

**APPENDIX J: MEDIUM SEA LEVEL RISE COASTAL HAZARD SCREENING MAP**

**[See Next Page]**



# SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY



Rancho  
Guadalupe  
Dunes  
County  
Park

W Main St

Guadalupe

Brown Rd

Pt.  
Sal

Pt. Sal  
State Beach

Point Sal Beach Rd

Brown Rd

Dardo Rd

Abordo Rd

Ocullo Road

Combar Rd

Point Sal Rd

Lado Rd

Vandenberg  
Air Force Base

## Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Guadalupe Dunes / Pt. Sal Area



- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- County Boundary
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Vandenberg Air Force Base (Not in County Jurisdiction)
- Incorporated City (Not in County Jurisdiction)

Note: This Screening Map is based on the Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used to identify coastal areas where proposed development requires additional review and development standards, in accordance with Policy 3-6.

# Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Vandenberg Coast

- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Vandenberg Air Force Base  
(Not in County Jurisdiction)




Note: This Screening Map is based on the Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used to identify coastal areas where proposed development requires additional review and development standards, in accordance with Policy 3-6.




# Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Vandenberg to Gaviota

- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Vandenberg Air Force Base (Not in County Jurisdiction)



Note: This Screening Map is based on the Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used to identify coastal areas where proposed development requires additional review and development standards, in accordance with Policy 3-6.





**Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario  
 Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise  
 Coastal Hazard Screening Areas  
 Gaviota to Goleta**




- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Incorporated City (Not in County Jurisdiction)



Note: This Screening Map is based on the Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year.  
 It is to be used to identify coastal areas where proposed development requires additional review and development standards, in accordance with Policy 3-6.

**Goleta**





Note: This Screening Map is based on the Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used to identify coastal areas where proposed development requires additional review and development standards, in accordance with Policy 3-6.

**Santa Barbara**







**Montecito**




**Toro Canyon**

**Summerland**

**Carpinteria**

# Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Santa Barbara to Rincon

-  Existing Condition
-  2030
-  2060
-  2100
-  Coastal Zone Boundary
-  Incorporated City (Not in County Jurisdiction)




Note: This Screening Map is based on the Medium Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used to identify coastal areas where proposed development requires additional review and development standards, in accordance with Policy 3-6.

**APPENDIX K: HIGH SEA LEVEL RISE COASTAL HAZARD SCREENING MAP**

**[See Next Page]**

**SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY**



Rancho  
Guadalupe  
Dunes  
County  
Park

Guadalupe

W Main St

W Main St

Brown Rd

Pt. Sal

Pt. Sal  
State Beach

**High Sea Level Rise Scenario  
Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise  
Coastal Hazard Screening Areas  
Guadalupe Dunes / Pt. Sal Area**

- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- County Boundary
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Vandenberg Air Force Base (Not in County Jurisdiction)
- Incorporated City (Not in County Jurisdiction)

**Vandenberg  
Air Force Base**

Note: This Screening Map is based on the High Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used for subdivisions and lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.








# High Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Vandenberg Coast

- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Vandenberg Air Force Base  
(Not in County Jurisdiction)


Note: This Screening Map is based on the High Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used for subdivisions and lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.




# High Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Vandenberg to Gaviota

-  Existing Condition
-  2030
-  2060
-  2100
-  Coastal Zone Boundary
-  Park or Reserve
-  Vandenberg Air Force Base (Not in County Jurisdiction)



Note: This Screening Map is based on the High Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used for subdivisions and lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.






**High Sea Level Rise Scenario  
 Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise  
 Coastal Hazard Screening Areas  
 Gaviota to Goleta**

- Existing Condition
- 2030
- 2060
- 2100
- Coastal Zone Boundary
- Park or Reserve
- Incorporated City (Not in County Jurisdiction)



Note: This Screening Map is based on the High Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used for subdivisions and lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.

**Goleta**



Note: This Screening Map is based on the High Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used for subdivisions and lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.



**Santa Barbara**







**Montecito**




**Toro Canyon**

**Summerland**

**Carpinteria**

# High Sea Level Rise Scenario Santa Barbara County Sea Level Rise Coastal Hazard Screening Areas Santa Barbara to Rincon

-  Existing Condition
-  2030
-  2060
-  2100
-  Coastal Zone Boundary
-  Incorporated City (Not in County Jurisdiction)



Note: This Screening Map is based on the High Sea Level Rise Scenario for each year. It is to be used for subdivisions and lot line adjustments in accordance with Policy 3-1.

3. All existing indices, section references, and figure and table numbers contained in the Coastal Land Use Plan are hereby revised and renumbered as appropriate to reflect the revisions enumerated above.
4. Except as amended by this Resolution, Chapter 3, The Resource Protection and Development Policies, Appendix A, Definitions of the Coastal Land Use Plan, and Appendix C, References, as well as all other components of the Coastal Land Use Plan, shall remain unchanged and shall continue in full force and effect.
5. In compliance with Government Code Section 65356, the above described change is hereby adopted as an amendment to the Coastal Land Use Plan of the Local Coastal Program and shall take effect and be in force upon the date that it is certified by the Coastal Commission pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30514.
6. In compliance with Government Code Section 65357(a), the Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to send copies of the documents amending the Coastal Land Use Plan of the Local Coastal Program, including the diagrams and text, to all public entities specified in Government Code Section 65352 and any other public entities that submitted comments on the amendment to the Coastal Land Use Plan of the Local Coastal Program during its preparation.
7. In compliance with Government Code Section 65357(b), the Clerk of the Board is hereby directed to make the documents amending the Coastal Land Use Plan of the Local Coastal Program, including the diagrams and text, available to the public for inspection.
8. The Chair and the Clerk of this Board are hereby authorized and directed to sign and certify all maps, documents, and other materials in accordance with this Resolution to reflect the above described action by the Board.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

---

DAS WILLIAMS, CHAIR  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

ATTEST:  
MONA MIYASATO, COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
CLERK OF THE BOARD

By \_\_\_\_\_

Deputy Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
MICHAEL C. GHIZZONI  
COUNTY COUNSEL

By   
Deputy County Counsel