

comprehensive plan that addresses the development of the bay and shoreline. BCDC's jurisdiction includes the San Francisco Bay and the land within 100 feet of the shoreline, as provided. Since 2008, BCDC has been the state agency responsible for leading the San Francisco Bay area's preparedness for, and resilience to, rising sea levels, tides, and storm surge due to climate change. BCDC is required to address emerging issues and keep the Bay Plan up-to-date. In December 2024, BCDC approved guidance in order to comply with SB 272's directive.

The Coastal Commission was established by voter initiative in 1972. The Legislature later made the Coastal Commission permanent through the adoption of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act) (Public Resources Code (PRC) §§30000 *et seq.*). The Coastal Commission plans for and regulates the use of land and water in the coastal zone (which excludes BCDC's jurisdiction in the San Francisco Bay).

Development activities in the coastal zone generally require a coastal development permit (CDP) issued by the Coastal Commission or by a local government with a LCP certified by the Coastal Commission. Coastal Act policies are the standards the Coastal Commission uses to determine the permissibility of proposed developments subject to its jurisdiction.

In November 2024, the Coastal Commission adopted an updated Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance. The Guidance includes guiding principles for addressing sea level rise in the coastal zone, a discussion of the best available science, step-by-step guidance for addressing sea level rise in LCPs and CDPs, including implementation of SB 272, and possible adaptation strategies, and other provisions.

Permitting requirements for coastal projects.

According to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee, as many as 16 federal and state permitting agencies may have a role in the permitting for coastal projects.¹ Federal and state agencies involved may include the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), regional water quality control boards, the Coastal Commission, BCDC, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the State Lands Commission, and others, with overlapping, but distinct, jurisdictions.

Permit streamlining.

Given the complexity of navigating permitting from multiple agencies, in 2024 the Assembly investigated permitting in California through its Select Committee on Permitting Reform. In its final report, the Select Committee identified several best practices, including frontloading planning, providing a clear and straightforward process, maximizing consistency across permitting agencies, and pre-determining mitigation measures.

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team (BRRIT).

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, with support from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, convenes dedicated staff from six permitting agencies (USACOE, USFWS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, the San

¹ The number of agencies involved is from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's North-Central California Coastal Sediment Coordination Committee's Efficient Permitting Roadmap.

Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, CDFW, and BCDC) to improve the permitting process for multi-benefit habitat restoration projects and associated flood management and public access infrastructure. The resulting coordinating group, BRRIT, uses pre-application consultation to accelerate the permitting process. Of the 11 fully-permitted projects identified in the BRRIT 2025 Annual Report, 100% had all permits issued within the target timeline. Where some partially-permitted projects have not met the target timeline, this has been due to late changes to conditions (for example, changes to listed species under the federal Endangered Species Act).

Mitigation, advance mitigation, and self-mitigation.

According to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee, mitigation is mandated by California Environmental Quality Act guidelines whenever a project may result in significant impact to the environment. These requirements exist to ensure that California's natural resources are preserved and protected into the future, for the benefit of all. When habitat (such as a wetland) is damaged by a project, the required mitigation for that damage frequently includes the restoration, enhancement, and/or preservation of comparable habitat. In "advance mitigation," efficiencies can be obtained by compensating for impacts before they occur. This allows for landscape-level planning, more efficient permitting, and no temporal loss of habitat. Programs for advance mitigation through CDFW include conservation and mitigation banking and the Regional Conservation Investment Strategies (RCIS) program which is a voluntary program that encourages conservation assessments and planning at a landscape level in order to provide opportunities for large-scale conservation and mitigation projects resulting in higher ecological benefits than project-by-project efforts, according to CDFW.

"Self-mitigation," in order to avoid the requirement for off-site compensatory mitigation, can be accomplished by implementing habitat features and incorporating nature-based solutions in project design and construction.

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Coastal Act which:
 - a) Establishes the Coastal Commission in the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA).
 - b) Requires each local government in the coastal zone to prepare a LCP for that portion of the coastal zone within its jurisdiction, as provided. Requires the precise content of each LCP to be determined by the local government in full consultation with the Coastal Commission and full public participation. (PRC §30500)
 - c) Provides for the planning and regulation of development within the coastal zone.
 - i) A person planning to perform or undertake any development in the coastal zone is required to obtain a CDP from the Coastal Commission or local government enforcing a LCP certified by the Coastal Commission.

- ii) The coastal zone means the coastal land and waters of California, and includes the lands that extend inland generally 1,000 yards from the mean high tide line, as specified, with various exceptions including the San Francisco Bay.
 - iii) Development means, among other things, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure on land or in water.
 - d) Requires the Coastal Commission to take into account the effects of sea level rise in coastal resources planning and management policies and activities in order to identify, assess, and, to the extent feasible, avoid and mitigate the adverse effects of sea level rise. (PRC §30270)
- 2) Establishes BCDC: (GOV §§66600 *et seq.*)
- a) BCDC, among other things, is required to address emerging issues and to implement comprehensive plans for the preservation and protection of San Francisco Bay and the Suisun Marsh, including preparedness for, and resilience to, rising sea levels, tides, and storm surge due to climate change. BCDC has adopted the San Francisco Bay Plan, which is a comprehensive plan that addresses the development of the bay and shoreline.
- 3) Requires a local government lying within the coastal zone or the San Francisco Bay shoreline to develop a sea level rise plan as part of a LCP or subregional San Francisco Bay shoreline resiliency plan subject to BCDC's approval.
- a) Requires the sea level rise plan to include the use of best available science, a vulnerability assessment to ensure equity for at-risk communities, sea level rise adaptation strategies and recommended projects, identification of lead planning and implementation agencies, and a timeline for updates to the plan. Requires that the timeline include economic impact analyses of costs to critical public infrastructure and recommended approaches for implementing sea level rise, as provided.
 - b) Requires local governments to comply by January 1, 2034.
 - c) Requires the Coastal Commission and BCDC to establish guidelines for the sea level rise plan, as provided.
 - d) Requires local governments that receive Coastal Commission or BCDC approval of their sea level rise plans be prioritized for funding, subject to appropriation, for the implementation of sea level rise adaptation strategies and recommended projects in the approval sea level rise plan. (PRC §§30985, 30985.2, 30985.5)

PROPOSED LAW

This bill would:

- 1) Require the Secretary of the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA Secretary) to develop a Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap (Roadmap) with recommendations for process improvements and legislative reforms to enable efficient and timely delivery of environmental approvals by January 1, 2028.

- 2) Require the CNRA Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), to convene a Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group (Working Group) for the purpose of developing the Roadmap.
- 3) Require that the Working Group consist of representatives from federal, state, and local agencies, including but not limited to:
 - a) The Coastal Commission;
 - b) CalEPA;
 - c) The San Francisco Bay, North Coast, and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Water Boards);
 - d) CDFW;
 - e) The Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation;
 - f) CNRA;
 - g) The Ocean Protection Council;
 - h) BCDC;
 - i) The State Coastal Conservancy;
 - j) The State Lands Commission;
 - k) The State Office of Historic Preservation; and
 - l) The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board).
- 4) Require that the Roadmap include, at minimum, recommendations that address:
 - a) Administrative reforms that can be implemented by state agencies within their existing authority to improve permit issuance timelines, including:
 - i) Streamlining the process for determining that applications are complete, including limits on additional information requests when applicants submit complete applications consistent with permit guidelines and timelines for initial and successive reviews;
 - ii) Unified applications with a predictable sequence and timeline;
 - iii) Statewide or regional interagency project management teams for multiagency permitting, modeled on the BRRIT;
 - iv) Methods to standardize compensatory mitigation across agencies, including the consideration of engineering with nature features to enable projects to self-mitigate and a potential de minimis fill policy that allows de minimis fill within defined thresholds without the need to mitigate;
 - v) Delegating permit issuance to executive officers or using consent calendars when appropriate and applicable;
 - vi) Expanded use of regional general permits and programmatic agreements for known categories of coastal resilience projects;
 - vii) Process improvements that allow for permit approval when the design is complete or during the preapplication process, and for subsequent design changes arising from field conditions and in-depth engineering analysis;

- viii) Standard measures that can be applied to pile driving and fill placement techniques, and other practices that are known to safeguard marine resources, including the types of conditions under which these measures should be utilized and can be scaled to varying project scope and footprint, taking into consideration variability across the ocean floor topographies;
 - ix) Recommendations for how to expedite and streamline the permitting of projects included in local sea level rise adaptation plans, as an incentive to complete and implement local plans; and
 - x) Consideration of project-based permit streamlining.
- b) A state process to align agency mitigation requirements and enable in-lieu fees or advance mitigation through which applicants can contribute funding to eligible restoration or mitigation initiatives, thereby avoiding temporal loss of habitat and associated increased mitigation requirements, and reducing the need for individual applicants to develop and implement project-specific compensatory mitigation;
 - c) Legislative reforms that have the greatest potential to further accelerate permitting for projects that increase coastal resilience, with a focus on current legislative requirements that result in extensive analysis that could be avoided by application of standardized compensatory mitigation, advance mitigation, or standard construction practices, as well as identification of regulatory gaps and frictions that could lead to maladaptation over time;
 - d) A coastal resilience project pilot program and any required legislative authorizations, if needed to test alternative approaches;
 - e) An evaluation of whether consolidated coastal resilience permits, similar to those provided for offshore wind, would facilitate timely permits; and
 - f) Workforce assessment and funding options for regulatory staffing positions and as-needed permitting support contracts to supplement staff, including a specific analysis of recommended pay scales needed to recruit and retain permitting staff that reflects the educational requirements for these positions, the cost of living in areas where these staff live and work, and private sector compensation for similar skills.
- 5) Require, on or before April 1, 2027, the CNRA Secretary, in collaboration with the commission, BCDC, CDFW, and the Regional Water Boards, convene a Coastal Resilience Permit Advisory Group (Advisory Group), consisting of representatives from at least the following:
- a) State Department of Transportation, State Coastal Conservancy, and other relevant state agencies that seek permits for projects in coastal areas;
 - b) Local governments required to update their LCPs for sea level rise;
 - c) California ports;
 - d) Local transportation agencies and wastewater treatment agencies;
 - e) California Native American tribes that are on the contact list administered and maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission; and

- f) Other members of the public, including businesses, home and affordable housing builders, commercial and recreational fishers, environmental organizations, and environmental justice organizations.
- 6) Require the CNRA Secretary, in consultation with the Coastal Commission, BCDC, CDFW, and the Regional Water Boards to conduct a series of public workshops with the Advisory Group or subgroups thereof to:
 - a) Solicit feedback regarding challenges with existing permitting processes, and recommendations and concerns from permittees and other interested parties regarding streamlining proposals; and
 - b) Review and seek comment on draft reform proposals from the Working Group's Roadmap.
 - 7) Define "coastal resilience project" as a project that maintains, protects, restores, or enables coastal ecosystems, infrastructure, or communities to withstand and adapt to sea level rise and other natural hazards amplified by climate change.
 - 8) Make relevant legislative findings and declarations.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT

According to the author, "AB 2051 directs the Natural Resources Agency to convene a Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group, who will meet to develop a Roadmap for projects proposed along California's coast and in the San Francisco Bay."

"Under current law, a project sponsor on the coast may need to secure more than ten separate permits from state, federal, and local agencies. The process is beset by redundant and inconsistent application requirements, no aligned review timelines, sequential rather than concurrent permit processing, no single lead agency to coordinate or resolve conflicts, and chronic staffing vacancies in agencies that require highly specialized expertise."

"Decades worth of well-meaning permitting processes are overlaid on top of one another, and it is still too expensive and time-consuming to move with the speed and cost efficiency our coastline is going to need to adapt to sea-level rise and an altered climate."

"AB 2051 does not change existing permitting requirements or weaken any environmental protection. An advisory group mandated in the bill is specifically charged to ensure that streamlining efforts do not weaken protections for fish and wildlife habitat, tribal cultural resources, or public access. The bill sets California on a path that will lead to actionable recommendations that improve permit issuance timelines, align mitigation requirements, accelerate permitting, and assess how to recruit and retain essential permitting staff."

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION

None received

COMMENTS

Benefits of early agency coordination. As noted in the background, the potential impacts of sea level rise on the state's coastline are anticipated to be extensive with significant damage, loss, and expense anticipated to public safety, infrastructure, and

the environment, among other things. Facilitating early discussions and coordination among project proponents and permitting agencies can help identify challenges before a permit from one agency becomes delayed with cascading impacts to subsequent approvals (in other words, certain agency permitting decisions rely upon permits issued by other agencies).

The BRITT, described in the background, appears to be an effective model for coordination among agencies to spur permitting for certain projects. Additionally, both BCDC and the Coastal Commission have accelerated permitting pathways for projects with a nominal impact on the surrounding environment.

Clarifying amendments. The author proposed largely clarifying and technical amendments to the Committee after the Committee deadline. Upon review and discussion among the author, stakeholders and Committee staff, additional nominal changes were agreed to. Of particular note, the author proposed the addition of language promoting the use of nature-based solutions, where feasible, as proposed by Save the Bay and others.

The Committee may wish to amend the bill to incorporate these agreed-upon changes. [Amendment #1]

Further, the author may wish to consider whether the deadlines required for the study are workable in view of the looming transition with the election of a new governor in November. The author may also wish to consider placing a cap on the number of Advisory Group members to help ensure that it remains an efficient size.

Recent related legislation

AB 996 (Pellerin, Chapter 286, Statutes of 2025) establishes an early consultation framework between a local government and the Coastal Commission prior to a local government's submission of a LCP or LCP amendment in order to facilitate Coastal Commission certification of the LCP or LCP amendment, including to meet sea level rise planning requirements, as provided.

SB 272 (Laird, Chapter 384, Statutes of 2023) requires a local government in the coastal zone or within the San Francisco Bay to develop a sea level rise plan as part of either a LCP or a shoreline resiliency plan that includes certain information, including sea level rise adaptation strategies and recommended projects; requires local governments to comply by January 1, 2034, as specified; and prioritizes funding for implementation of sea level rise adaptation strategies in approved plans, among other things.

SB 867 (Laird, 2022) would have required local governments in the coastal zone or within the jurisdiction of BCDC to implement sea level rise planning and adaptation, as specified, and would have prioritized funding for local government projects implementing an approved sea level rise adaptation plan, among other things. (*This bill was vetoed by Governor Newsom.*)

SB 1 (Atkins, Chapter 236, Statutes of 2021) establishes the California Sea Level Rise State and Regional Support Collaborative at the Ocean Protection Council to help coordinate and fund state efforts to prepare for sea level rise associated with climate

change, and provides up to \$100M state funding annually to address sea level rise, among other things.

AB 72 (Petrie Norris, Chapter 369, Statutes of 2021) promotes the use of natural infrastructure to attenuate coastal hazards as part of climate adaptation, among other things.

AB 65 (Petrie-Norris, Chapter 347, Statutes of 2019) requires the State Coastal Conservancy to prioritize projects that provide natural infrastructure and multiple public benefits when allocating certain state monies.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT 1

Revise AB 2051 according to the mock-up below:

30990. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) The Ocean Protection Council's 2024 State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance includes a projection that by the year 2100, statewide averaged sea levels are expected to rise between 1.6 feet and 3.1 feet under the Intermediate-Low and Intermediate Scenarios.

(2) The Ocean Protection Council's guidance also notes that higher amounts of up to 6.6 feet or more of sea level rise in very high risk, low-probability cases cannot be ruled out.

(3) In 2023, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission of the San Francisco Bay area, in consultation with the Association of Bay Area Governments and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, published the Sea Level Rise Adaptation Funding and Investment Framework Final Report with an estimate of one hundred ten billion dollars (\$110,000,000,000) to adapt San Francisco Bay communities and critical infrastructure to sea level rise by 2050.

(4) In 2024, the Legislature adopted Division 20.6.9 (commencing with Section 30985) requiring the California Coastal Commission and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission to publish guidelines for the preparation of sea level rise plans and for local communities to seek review and approval of these plans by 2034 to remain eligible for resilience funding from the state.

(5) Construction activities along the California coast and in the San Francisco Bay in federal waters are regulated by a wide range of state and federal agencies operating under a comprehensive set of state and federal environmental laws.

(6) California promotes the use of "natural infrastructure," where feasible, to build coastal resilience, which is described in Section 71154 of the Public Resources Code as using natural ecological systems or processes to reduce vulnerability to climate change related hazards, or other related

climate change effects, while increasing the long-term adaptive capacity of coastal and inland areas by perpetuating or restoring ecosystem services.

(6) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's North-Central California Coastal Sediment Coordination Committee published a 2024 Efficient Permitting Roadmap that provides a description of permitting roles for state and federal agencies and preferred approaches for habitat restoration projects.

(7) Together, these laws and the work of these agencies, provide critical protection for the health of the Pacific Ocean and the San Francisco Bay.

(8) The combination of overlapping, ~~and sometimes duplicative~~, federal and state authorities, requirements for project-specific studies, limited regulatory agency staffing, interagency coordination needs, and inconsistency and uncertainty regarding mitigation requirements can ~~results~~-in extended permitting timelines for all projects in or adjacent to federal waters, including coastal resilience projects.

(9) Permitting staff positions at relevant agencies require extensive education and experience regarding complex ecosystems and marine environments, and related expertise such as knowledge of historic and cultural resources.

(10) Numerous reports, including the California Coastal Commission 2021–2025 Workforce Plan, the University of California Berkeley Labor Center's "Civil Service Vacancies in California: 2022–2023," the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board's 2022 Executive Officer's Report, and the 2025 National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officer's Workforce Report, document the challenge of recruiting and retaining qualified staff to process complicated permit applications.

(11) The Governor and the Legislature have previously addressed permitting timelines and processes related to rebuilding after natural disasters such as the January 2025 wildfires, and to facilitate timely development and permitting of offshore wind and transmission facilities in the state.

(12) **The Assembly Select Committee on Permitting Reform issued a report in 2025 documenting the permitting challenges that most project face trying to navigate the 7 to 12 agencies that have regulatory jurisdiction over resiliency projects. This report recommended eliminating uncertainty in the application process, enhancing interagency coordination and consistency, and creating distinct permitting pathways for drought resilience and flood risk reduction projects.**

(b) Given the myriad of benefits from coastal resilience projects to California communities, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency shall develop a Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap with recommendations for process improvements and legislative reforms that will enable efficient and timely delivery of environmental approvals for these projects, as provided in Section 30991.

30991. (a) (1) The Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, in consultation with the Secretary for Environmental Protection, shall convene a Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group for the purpose of developing a Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap for coastal resilience projects proposed along the California coast and in the San Francisco Bay, and in and adjacent to state and federal waters.

(2) The Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group shall consist of representatives from federal, state, and local agencies, including, but not limited to, representatives from all of the following entities:

(A) The California Coastal Commission.

(B) The California Environmental Protection Agency.

(C) The California Regional Water Quality Control Boards, San Francisco Bay, North Coast, ~~and~~ Central Coast, **Los Angeles, Santa Ana, and San Diego.**

(D) The Department of Fish and Wildlife.

(E) The Governor's Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation.

(F) The Natural Resources Agency.

(G) The Ocean Protection Council.

(H) The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

(I) The State Coastal Conservancy.

(J) The State Lands Commission.

(K) The State Office of Historic Preservation.

(L) The State Water Resources Control Board.

(3) Development of the Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap shall incorporate, but not delay, progress to advance responsible permitting and development of coastal resilience projects.

(b) (1) On or before January 1, 2028, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency shall submit the Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap to the Governor and the relevant fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature.

(2) The plan submitted to the Legislature pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

(3) Pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, this subdivision shall become inoperative on January 1, 2032.

(c) The Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap developed pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) shall include, at a minimum, recommendations that address all of the following:

(1) Administrative reforms that can be implemented by state agencies, to the extent feasible, within their existing authority to improve permit issuance timelines, including all of the following:

(A) ~~Streamlining the process for determinations that applications are complete including limits on additional information requests when applicants submit complete applications consistent with permit guidelines, and timelines for initial and successive reviews.~~

Improving efficiency in the process for agencies to determine and communicate that permit applications are complete, through the use of tools such as pre-application consultations, publishing clear permit guidelines, minimizing additional information requests when applicants submit complete applications consistent with permit guidelines, and setting timelines for initial and successive reviews.”

(B) Unified applications with a predictable sequence and timeline of permitting information requests and interagency reviews.

(C) Statewide or regional interagency project management teams for multiagency permitting, modeled on the Bay Restoration Regulatory Integration Team.

(D) Methods to standardize compensatory mitigation across agencies, as applicable and feasible, including rewarding the consideration of engineering with nature features to enable projects to self-mitigate, and the consideration of types and thresholds for small amounts of fill that may not require mitigation because they may be beneficial or can be shown to have negligible impacts ~~and a potimal de minimis fill policy that allows de minimis fill within defined thresholds without the need to mitigate.~~

(E) Delegating permit issuance to executive officers or using consent calendars when appropriate and applicable.

(F) Expanded use of regional general permits and programmatic agreements for known categories of coastal resilience projects.

(G) Process improvements that allow for permit approval when the design is being developed or is complete ~~or during the preapplication process~~, and for permit approval to be maintained during subsequent non-substantive design changes arising from field conditions and in-depth engineering analysis.

(H) Standard measures and methods that can be applied to borings, pile driving and fill placement techniques, and other practices that are known to safeguard marine resources, including the types of conditions under which these measures should be utilized and can be scaled to varying project scope and footprint, taking into consideration variability across the ocean floor topographies.

(I) Recommendations for how to expedite and streamline the permitting of projects included in local sea level rise adaptation plans, as required by the Regional Shoreline Adaptation Plan (BPA 1-24) adopted by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission and by the Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance adopted by the California Coastal Commission, respectively, as an incentive to complete and implement local plans.

(J) Consideration of project-based permit streamlining.

(2) A state process to align agency mitigation requirements and enable in-lieu fees or advance mitigation through which applicants can contribute funding to eligible restoration or mitigation initiatives, thereby avoiding temporal loss of habitat and associated increased mitigation requirements, and reducing the need for individual applicants to develop and implement project-specific compensatory mitigation projects.

(3) Legislative reforms that have the greatest potential to further accelerate permitting for projects that increase coastal resilience, with a focus on current legislative requirements that result in extensive analysis that could be avoided by application of standardized compensatory mitigation, **as feasible and appropriate**, advance mitigation, or standard construction practices, as well as identification of regulatory gaps and frictions that could lead to maladaptation over time.

(4) If needed to test alternative approaches, a coastal resilience project pilot program along with any required legislative authorizations to evaluate the effectiveness of recommended reforms and environmental protection **methods**.

(5) An evaluation of whether consolidated coastal resilience permits similar to those provided in Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) for offshore wind projects would facilitate timely permits.

(6) A workforce assessment and funding options for regulatory staffing positions and as-needed permitting support contracts to supplement staff, including a specific analysis of recommended pay scales needed to recruit and retain permitting staff that reflect the educational requirements for these positions, the cost of living in areas where these staff live and work, and private sector compensation for similar skills.

(d) To support deliberations of the Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group, on or before April 1, 2027, the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, in collaboration with the California Coastal Commission, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards with jurisdiction over the California coast and San Francisco Bay, shall convene a Coastal Resilience Permit Advisory Group. Coastal Resilience Permit Advisory Group membership shall include, but not be limited to, representatives of each of the following:

(1) The Department of Transportation, the State Coastal Conservancy, and other relevant state agencies that seek permits for projects in coastal areas.

(2) Local governments subject to the requirements of Division 20.6.9 (commencing with Section 30985).

(3) California ports.

(4) Local transportation agencies, **special districts, stormwater management agencies,** and wastewater treatment agencies.

(5) California Native American tribes that are on the contact list administered and maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission.

(6) Other members of the public, including **academics,** businesses, home and affordable housing builders, commercial and recreational fishers, environmental organizations, environmental justice organizations, **professional associations,** and others.

(e) The Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency, in consultation with the California Coastal Commission, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Boards with jurisdiction over the California coast and San Francisco Bay, shall conduct a series of public workshops with the Coastal Resilience Permit Advisory Group or subgroups thereof to do all of the following:

(1) Solicit feedback regarding challenges with existing permitting processes, and recommendations and concerns from permittees and other interested parties regarding streamlining proposals.

(2) Review and seek comment on draft reform proposals from the Coastal Resilience Permitting Working Group's **for potential inclusion in the** Coastal Resilience Permitting Roadmap.

(f) When developing infrastructure to address adaptation, where feasible, a project alternative should be developed that uses existing natural features and ecosystem processes or the restoration of natural features and ecosystem processes to meet the project's goals.

(f) For purposes of this section, "coastal resilience project" means a project that maintains, protects, restores, or enables coastal ecosystems, infrastructure, or communities to withstand and adapt to sea level rise and other natural hazards, **including those** amplified by climate change.

SUPPORT

Bay Area Council (co-sponsor)

Bay Planning Coalition (co-sponsor)

AltaSea

California Broadband & Video Association (if amended)

California Coastal Protection Network (if amended)
California Shore & Beach Preservation Association
California State Association of Counties
City and County of San Francisco
City of Oceanside
City of Port Hueneme
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
Coastal Quest
County of Los Angeles
County of Marin
County of Monterey
East Bay Dischargers Authority
East Bay Regional Park District
ECONcrete
Filoli
Kiewit Infrastructure West Company
Marin Community Foundation
McFadden Finch Holdings Company
One Shoreline
Orange County Transportation Authority
Planning and Conservation League (if amended)
Port of Redwood City
Port of San Francisco
San Francisco Bay Ferry
San Francisco International Airport
Santa Clara Valley Water District
Save the Bay (if amended)
SPUR Bay Area (if amended)
The Exploratorium
The Honorable Todd Gloria, Mayor, City of San Diego
The Nature Conservancy
Wareham Development
WILDCOAST

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --