Revista TOMO, São Cristóvão, v. 44, e22912, 2025
DOI:10.21669/tomo.v44.22912
Special Issue - Coastal Squeeze: Beaches under Socio-Economic and Ecological Pressure
E-ISSN:2318-9010 / ISSN:1517-4549

REVIEW REPORT (C)

ID number: 22912
Completed on: 2025-07-30 04:48 AM
Decision: Accept

This is a stimulating article in many respects. The California case is not only particularly interesting in itself, but also reveals broader global trends. The article successfully tackles numerous aspects and strives to consider the issue comprehensively. It maintains an interdisciplinary character, drawing on both social sciences and environmental sciences depending on the feature addressed. Moreover, the article fits very well within the framework of TOMO's special issue. Overall, it fully merits publication.
That said, it could perhaps be improved or completed on certain points. We hope the following suggestions may help in this regard.

1/ The decision to provide a short introduction appears relevant and allows readers to get straight to the heart of the matter. However, the subsequent structure—two short sections followed by a long section containing several subsections—is slightly disturbing. It might be beneficial to merge the first two sections into one, thus rebalancing the overall structure.

2/ A non-California reader would expect more elements to get the importance/significance of the California Beach Resiliency Plan (CBRP). At first glance, the article seems centered on this plan, but as it stands, (foreign) readers cannot easily form a precise understanding of the plan's scope and content. What is the origin of this plan? Besides the OPC, by whom is it promoted or supported? To what extent is it currently being implemented, or does it remain a general framework? Is it threatened by budgetary cuts in the current political context, which seems hostile to such initiatives? It would also be valuable to understand the author's position regarding this plan: actor or observer? Involved or not (and if so, to what extent)?

3/ The article clearly shows that the CBRP's goal is to encompass various and even disparate aspects ("including ecology, risk mitigation, public access, cultural and tribal significance, economics, and social equity", p. 7), since it "challenges single-purpose management" (p. 17). However, despite opening with the idea of conflict (based on Low's edited volume on "beach politics"), it does not clearly address the probable tensions and contradictions between these different aspects. Reconciling all these elements plausibly represents a significant challenge. For example, from a social perspective, generalizing public access to beaches might encourage the creation of affordable coastal housing development, yet from an environmental standpoint, stopping construction along the shoreline appears crucial. How does the compatibility problem between heterogeneous logics manifest? Is it genuinely possible to reconcile all these different aspects without establishing priorities? The article occasionally suggests some options (e.g., "In some cases, preserving more remote or undeveloped beaches may be appropriate", p. 11) but without elaboration. Similarly, it mentions "managed retreat" but does not imply its controversial nature. While this may not reflect the author's perspective, scholarship in so-called green/environmental political theory has highlighted subjective and objective tensions between social and environmental objectives.

4/ The article might suggest that the concept of “planning” poses no particular problem in the United States, at least in California. Is it the case? From a European perspective, one may expect that this notion is not consensual in the United States and arouse reluctance or opposition. Even in Europe, the idea of planning remains far from universally accepted, having been discredited from a neoliberal standpoint. Perhaps adding context about this term’s connotations in California would be valuable.

5/ The bibliography could be strengthened in several areas:
- (p. 5) Vitousek et al., 2017: Are more recent references available?
- (p. 11) “Access-shed analyses use tools, including geospatial models and cell-phone mobility data, to map visitation patterns...” Consider adding a reference.
- (p. 14) “racialized history of coastal development” Consider referencing Alison Rose Jefferson and/or Andrew Kahrl’s work.
- (p. 15) “perpetuate a coastal aesthetics of exclusion and privilege” Consider adding a reference (Sara Fingal).

Some additional specific observations:

- “California experienced rapid growth after World War II.”

While World War II represents a major turning point, it was probably not a starting point. Maybe adding one sentence about the earlier period (especially in Southern Cal) would provide helpful context.

- “Studies suggest that in 2025, the non-market value of an average beach day in California is $62, adding up to billions annually across the state, including $2 billion in San Diego County alone (Pendleton and Kildow, 2006)."

The reference to a 2006 study when discussing 2025 values may create confusion and needs clarification.

- The Nollan decision is mentioned (p. 4) as “a landmark case in property law”, but non-California readers may need more context. As presented, readers might assume it favored public access. But wasn’t this decision actually a setback for public access?

- It seems that the article overlooks beaches’ increasing role as refuges/shelters/safe places during heat waves and wildfires, which may merit inclusion.

- (p. 19) "where beach ownership ranges from more public (e.g., Brazil and New Zealand) to more privatized or commodified (e.g., United States)."

These examples may appear surprising. Brazil’s leadership in public access legislation requires verification. On the other hand, some U.S. states, including California, may appear more advanced than Brazil in this respect. The analysis could distinguish among U.S. states regarding privatization and commodification. Southern European countries, particularly Italy and Greece, would probably better exemplify advanced privatization-commodification processes compared to certain U.S. states.

These observations are intended solely to enhance accessibility for readers that may not be familiar with the California case. The article already stands as a valuable contribution to TOMO’s special issue.