The California Coastal Commission Report Card offers a conservation-oriented summary and analysis of the commission’s voting record throughout the year. The report card does not include all votes, but focuses on high-priority, high-stakes coastal development projects and issues of significant consequence to environmental protection and equitable public access to the California coast. The ActCoastal coalition announces votes that will be scored in advance of the commission meeting where the vote is to take place.

The California coast is the state’s most beloved, iconic natural feature, yet faces severe threats from ill-considered development, pollution, and climate change. The state’s success or failure in responding to these threats often comes down to project-by-project decisions by the Coastal Commission. This makes tracking commission votes an important contribution to ensuring transparency and accountability in coastal governance, toward the goals of coastal preservation and equitable coastal access for all.

The 2021 Report Card reflects 15 scored votes. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, each monthly meeting was conducted virtually.

**California Coastal Commission 2021 Voting Scores**

Overall, 2021 vote scores are up from 2020. However, the 2020 scores may have been artificially low due to the minimal number of votes scored. This was a reflection of the COVID 19 pandemic as many controversial items were postponed. The Governor’s appointments average, however, was down ten points from 2020 due to several contributing factors. First, Commissioner Turnbull-Sanders was absent for eight of the fifteen votes scored, which amplified “bad” votes cast. Second, Commissioner Meagan Harmon’s votes were not included in the overall average as she was appointed midway through the year, as noted. The following discussion takes a deeper dive into issue specific voting trends.
Average conservation score for the Commission: 72%, up from 65% in 2020, and down from 82% in 2019.

Governor appointments: Averaged a score of 81%, up from 75% in 2020.
- Commissioner Effie Turnbull-Sanders scored 57%, down from 100% in 2020. *Turnbull Sanders was absent for two controversial votes of the seven total votes in 2020, which affected her score.
- Commissioner Donne Brownsey scored 67%, down from 83% in 2020.
- Commissioner Mike Wilson scored 73%, down from 86% in 2020.
- Commissioner Meagan Harmon scored 100% in 2021. *Harmon was appointed mid-way through the year and cast only four votes and had two absences.

Senate Rules Committee appointments: Averaged a score of 66%, up from 62% in 2020.
- Commissioner Dayna Bochco scored 58%, similar to 57% in 2020.
- Commissioner Sara Aminzadeh scored 79%, slightly down from 83% in 2020.
- Commissioner Roberto Uranga scored 64%, slightly down from 67% in 2020.
- Commissioner Katie Rice scored 67%, up from 43% in 2020.

Assembly Speaker Appointments: Averaged a score of 70%, up from 58% in 2020.
- Commissioner Carole Groom scored 67%, up from 57% in 2020.
- Commissioner Linda Escalante scored 92%, up from 89% in 2020.
- Commissioner Steve Padilla scored 57%, up from 33% in 2020.
- Commissioner Caryl Hart scored 67%, slightly down from 57% in 2020.

**COVID 19 Pandemic Response**

The virtual meeting format presented continuing problems and opportunities to ensure transparency and engage the public in decision making. The ban on in-person large gatherings continued throughout 2021. It’s broadly recognized that virtual civic engagement has come with its own set of pros and cons — increasing participation for obvious accessibility reasons but also tempering public engagement because of “Zoom fatigue.” It’s possible these circumstances had an impact on controversial projects such as the Belmont Beach Aquatic Center and Oceano Dunes off highway vehicle phaseout. However, these potential impacts from virtual meeting-based decision making seem to negate each other; the long durations of hearings on controversial issues such as Oceano Dunes due to the volume of public participants, and the commission’s demonstrated capacity to still take strong votes in the public interest despite being online, indicate that public process has not been overly
affected by the commission’s web-based hearings. The commission, its staff, and the public deserve commendation for their efforts to sustain transparent coastal management while implementing vital measures to protect public health.

As the Coastal Commission returns to in-person meetings, there will be a hybrid virtual and in-person participation format. It will be important that the commission find ways to allow adequate time for the public to convey their comments, given that participation numbers may remain high as people take advantage of the opportunity to weigh in without the need to travel. In order to facilitate the public process, the commission should continue the practice of dedicating full, special days to controversial and highly consequential items. In addition to these practices, the commission should consider implementing the recommendations in the UCLA Emmett Institute’s law and policy brief entitled The California Coastal Commission: Increasing Transparency, Accountability, and Opportunities for Effective Public Participation authored by Ralph Faust, who served as the Coastal Commission’s Chief Counsel for twenty years. Specifically, they should establish a firm deadline for accepting new information into the public record prior to the hearing and hold phased hearings for complex and controversial projects in order to substantially increase agency transparency and accountability.

The commission must also improve the process moving forward so that speakers are able to access a list of speakers and locate themselves in order to have an estimate when their turn will be up. Otherwise, members of the public wanting to participate may have to wait 8+ hours, not knowing when their turn may arise. This severe inefficiency causes high attrition among stakeholders that have important information to share, increases public frustration with state government, and erodes trust in- and therefore the effectiveness of– public process. If local barbershops and restaurants can provide names and wait times on a publicly viewable screen, agencies of the California state government should be able to as well.

**Best of 2021 – Oceano Dunes Off-Highway Vehicle Phase-Out**

At the March 18 special meeting, the Coastal Commission unanimously voted to phase out Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use at Oceano Dunes over the next three years, opening new opportunities for conservation and public recreation on the beach. This decision is the culmination of efforts spanning decades to protect the habitats and species of the area, as well as the public health and environmental justice of adjoining communities.

California State Parks operates the nearly 5,000-acre Oceano Dunes State Park in San Luis Obispo County. It is the only State Park in California where vehicles are allowed on the beach and dunes. The Coastal Commission retains the ability to make changes to Park operations through periodic review of its coastal development permit, originally permitted in the 1980s, due to changes in intensity of use. In 2019, the commission found that offroad vehicles driving at the Park have degraded dune habitats, harmed native species, caused air quality and public health issues, and made it difficult for the public to walk, swim and enjoy other non-vehicular activities at the beach and dunes. The issues directly conflict with the Coastal Act’s policies on environmental and Tribal justice, public access, and sensitive habitat protections.

For decades, State Parks has failed to enforce its own rules and regulations at Oceano Dunes due to the popularity of OHVs, and the nearby communities and coastal wildlife have been paying the price. The area has some of the worst air quality in the nation and OHVs such as side-by-sides and dune buggies regularly crush snowy plovers under their tires while speeding up the beach and dunes. Additionally, the people who live in Oceano have been unable to enjoy the sort of restorative recreational experience most of us take for granted in California because the beach there is, in essence, a highway of offroad vehicles.
The 2020 closure of Ocean Dunes to offroad vehicles during a portion of the COVID-19 provided a window into what Oceano Dunes might look like without OHVs. Low-impact recreation thrived, natural dunes formed, seals and sealions used the newly peaceful area to haul out and rest and snowy plovers expanded their breeding grounds. People from all walks of life were able to enjoy the State Park in its natural state.

The staff recommendation included a ban on OHV use at the park, with a five-year transition and a new vehicular beach camping area between West Grand and Pier Avenues, including for ADA vehicle access as well as an allowance for low-key interpretive hike-in or bike-in camping in the southern portion of the park.

Following several hours of comments from members of the public on all sides of the issue, the commission unanimously approved the staff recommendation. It then further strengthened the decision when Commissioner Caryl Hart proposed an amendment, seconded by Commissioner Sara Aminzadeh, to reduce the transition period from 5 to 3 years, which passed in a 6-4 vote. This item resulted in two vote charts.

After this historic decision, Oceano Dunes State Park can now permanently become the environmental gem that has been hidden beneath tire tracks and dust clouds for all these years.

**Worst of 2021 – Belmont Beach Aquatic Center**

In February, the Coastal Commission approved an appeal of a City of Long Beach coastal development permit for construction of a swimming pool complex with indoor components, a cafe, and public restrooms covering 5.8 acres of sandy beach space on Belmont Beach. The project raised important environmental justice, coastal access and beach preservation issues. First, the proposed site is directly atop public beach space. Second, the site will be subject to hazards from sea level rise and extreme weather in the coming decades. Finally, the location of the public facility will be easily accessible to high income coastal residents but less accessible to lower income residents from inland neighborhoods, raising important equity and justice concerns.
Many local residents, along with the Surfrider Foundation and Citizens About Responsible Planning, raised these concerns in public comments on the project. Commissioners expressed concerns about the environmental justice implications of the project location but were generally satisfied with the City’s proposed public transportation plan. Ultimately, the commissioners approved the project with the caveat that the City complete a robust public transportation plan to be presented to the commission, leaving important considerations regarding sea level rise and beach access largely unaddressed. The vote was 10-1 with Commissioner Shelley Luce (alternative for Commissioner Linda Escalante) the lone dissenting vote against the project.

Commissioner Effie Turnbull-Sanders led the discussion about the importance of accessibility for all community members and noted that the City needed to “bake environmental justice into the project”, rather than “sprinkling it on top” with an undefined public transportation plan. She suggested that the City include a program to help elevate inland swimmers to the elite competition level and to include more community services that will ensure the entire City can benefit from the pool. The City promised to incorporate those suggestions leading a majority of commissioners to approve the project.

Nobody opposes building a new public pool. But the proposed location is clearly the wrong place - on the public beach and far from low-income communities most in need of the benefits from large public investments in recreation, and who have most often endured inequitable underinvestment in access to the outdoors. While the City’s public transportation system may help some inland residents to access the pool, the distance will remain a barrier for many. Finally, competitive swimming is not a coastal dependent use, a key criterion established in the Coastal Act for deliberations on development proposals. Sacrificing California’s open beaches and public coastal recreational opportunities for activities and projects that can occur inland is particularly ill-advised and shortsighted as sea level rise threatens to drown our remaining beaches, and the public’s opportunity to enjoy them.
Several major policy issues dominated commission discussions in 2021: coastal preservation, sea level rise planning and sensitive habitats, wildlife and cultural resources. The commission also made several important coastal access decisions.

Coastal Preservation

This year, seven of the fifteen votes tracked for the vote chart involved coastal preservation from sea level rise and coastal hazards. Four of those votes resulted in “bad” conservation outcomes. While three outcomes were favorable, two of those votes were for planning documents that primarily reflect the Commission staff’s strong, science-driven work in service of the public interest.

Among the lowest scoring on sea level rise related votes were Commissioners Steve Padilla, Dayna Bochco and Effie Turnbull Sanders, all with only two out of seven votes supporting coastal resilience. Notably, Commissioner Turnbull Sanders was absent for two of the seven votes and Commissioner Padilla was absent for five. Commissioners Turnbull Sanders and Padilla were absent for eight of the fifteen total votes scored. This is an important issue to address, especially on behalf of Commissioner Turnbull Sanders, who is nominated as the commission’s leader for environmental justice. Coastal preservation has far reaching environmental justice implications as the nature of seawalls and accelerating beach erosion is often done to protect private property at the expense of the public’s access to open space. On the other hand, Commissioners Sara Aminzadeh, Mike Wilson and Linda Escalante each had four of seven favorable coastal preservation votes.

One disappointing outcome was a new home approved in San Clemente on beach space in the Capistrano Shores Mobile Home Park that would rely on an existing seawall. Commissioner Aminzadeh was one of the sole “good” votes to deny this development, and pointed out the urgent need to take California’s sea level rise adaptation policies seriously and stop approving new development in harm's way. This approval was the first in
several subsequent requests for new development or major remodels in the mobile home park, likely perpetuating the life of the seawall and the associated degradation and privatization of publicly owned sandy beach space.

The California Legislature and the administrations of Governors Brown and Newsom have established climate resilience and adaptation programs to address sea level rise and coastal hazards over the past decade. In September 2021, Governor Newsom signed SB 1 (Atkins), codifying sea level rise as an explicit priority for the Coastal Commission’s planning, enforcement and permitting activities. The bill also established a new mechanism for development of statewide standards for sea level rise planning, and authorized the creation of a new capital investment fund to support sea level rise planning and adaptation projects statewide. This fund will be extremely important for the California Legislature to operationalize through new appropriations during its 2022 session, so local governments are equipped with the technical support and funding they need to begin on-the-ground resilience projects as soon as possible.

State and local planning efforts are important to lay the groundwork for the coming decades, however, the Coastal Commission and local governments through the coastal development permit (CDP) process are making permitting decisions each month that will have lasting impacts for decades to come, including for shoreline armoring projects. If local governments had more resources to begin implementing nature-based adaptation and coastal resiliency projects, the state will benefit by building a knowledge base on the range of innovative nature-based solutions available, averting the inevitably higher future costs of adaptation. These efforts will also increase habitat for wildlife and open space for the public, in line with the state’s goal of protecting 30% of its lands and waters by 2030.

Unfortunately, the commission continues to make important permitting decisions at its monthly meetings that do not reflect these urgent priorities. Each permitting decision on coastal land use, public access, and development made today will have impacts for decades to come. These decisions can either maintain the status
quo of sacrificing our beaches and coast to private interests and rising seas, or help to save California’s beloved coast for generations to come.

The commission voted on seven key coastal preservation issues, three of which had “good,” pro-coast conservation outcomes, and four had “bad” outcomes that undermine the long-term health and accessibility of the coast.

**Good Outcomes**
- Capistrano Beach Mobile Home Park - Substantial Issue (February)
- Morro Bay Land Use Plan (August)
- Critical Infrastructure Sea Level Rise Guidance (November)

**Bad Outcomes**
- Belmont Beach Aquatic Center (February)
- Capistrano Beach Mobile Home Park - De Novo (May)
- Mirada Bridge in Half Moon Bay (May)
- Santa Cruz Rail Trail - Seawall (December)

The Coastal Commission and its staff have done significant, laudable work to protect the coast and coastal recreation from armoring, private developers, and rising seas. Yet preserving our coastline and the public’s opportunity to equitably access and enjoy it will require more. The commission must redouble its efforts and sustain them with unflinching leadership in the face of inevitable backlash against decisions that may be unpopular among select special interests. Advocates for protection and restoration of the coast, and equitable access to, must remain vigilant and vocal in public hearings, in the courts, and in the State Capitol. And lawmakers must increase the policy reforms and funding available for the state to address sea level rise, through local and regional planning, implementation of nature-based resilience projects, the realignment of critical infrastructure out of harm’s way, and the acquisition and restoration of coastal lands facing rising seas. True resilience that preserves California’s iconic coastline for future generations will require progress on all these fronts.

Every decision the commission makes about armoring and development contributes or detracts from this challenge, affecting the future existence of our coastline.

**Sea Level Rise and Local Coastal Planning**

In December, the Coastal Commission adopted the [Local Government Working Group’s 2021 Work Plan](#) for updating local coastal programs to address sea level rise. The Work Plan is a product of collaboration between a subcommittee of Coastal Commissioners (Carole Groom and Mike Wilson) and the California League of Cities, the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), and local government officials and builds off the 2020 [Joint Statement on Adaptation Planning](#).

Throughout two years of collaboration, the group developed several work products, including a framework for a phased approach to LCP updates; a call for regional approaches to vulnerability assessments and adaptation plans; an elevation and concurrence process; and a reference document of policies that are useful for sea level rise planning.
Local government groups supported adoption of the work products and expressed interest in collaboratively tackling the pressing issues facing the California Coast. Commissioners Mike Wilson and Carole Groom both supported the work products and noted that this was the beginning of a better working relationship between the commission and local governments. Commissioner Sara Aminzadeh noted that she hopes this will serve as a starting point to raise the bar on what we can do to protect communities from sea level rise and coastal dependent economies.

Collaboration across agencies and with local governments will continue to be essential in 2022. Commissioners must stand firm in their direction for local governments to avoid hard armoring in response to sea level rise and to implement nature-based adaptation solutions for interim and long-term coastal resiliency as urgently as possible. Commissioners must make every effort to convey this urgent need to legislators and partner agencies.

Next Steps

In 2021, the Coastal Commission approved its Critical Infrastructure at Risk: Sea Level Rise Guidance for California’s Coastal Zone, which helps guide local governments in critical infrastructure planning. The commission must acknowledge and apply these principles in its votes in 2022 and beyond. Coastal advocates will be watching closely to ensure that they do.

At the November 2021 meeting, Dr. Charles Lester, Director of the Ocean and Coastal Policy Institute at UC Santa Barbara, presented findings from his recently released report, Protecting Public Trust Shoreline Resources.
in the Face of Sea Level Rise. Following analysis of existing legal and policy frameworks, Lester provided 20 key policy recommendations that the commission can begin applying in its decision making.

Top priorities in the report include taking a “zone of concern approach” to identifying the boundary between public and private lands, recognition of the affirmative duty to consider the cost of shoreline armoring decisions to public land, and the need for further collaboration with the State Lands Commission on lease rates and plans for tideland protection.

Dr. Lester stated, “We all know what happens if you fix the back of the shoreline […] completely losing our tidelands is not the right balance [between public resource protection and private property].” Commissioner Sara Aminzadeh expressed her support for the recommendations and noted the need for the commission and State Legislature to institutionalize the priorities. Attorney with the Ocean Institute, Ralph Faust, underscored the need for implementation, “Public trust lands are being lost, and the commission has a duty to protect them in its implementation of the Coastal Act.” The commission should implement these recommendations in all its deliberations going forward. This issue was also prioritized in a recent Ocean Protection Council action plan, State Agency Sea Level Rise Action Plan (Key Action 2.7, page 14).

The commission continues to apply the $30 million it received from the State Legislature in 2021 to provide assistance with the Local Coastal Program Update Process. These funds should be prioritized for advancement of LCPs in tougher political climates, where special interests have stalled LCP Updates for years.

Finally, the commission has used the coastal development permit process as a means to enforce sea level rise and local planning policies, and pave adaptation pathways for long term resilience solutions that have traditionally been difficult, such as managed retreat. Moving forward, the commission will need to standardize the conditions it imposes, and accelerate the implementation of major managed retreat projects, to the greatest extent possible.

Sensitive Habitat, Wildlife and Cultural Resources

All coastal resources deserve equal protection under the Coastal Act. Public access – perhaps the most widely enjoyed example – is a cherished legal right of Californians and deserves vigilant safeguarding. But an array of others, such as coastal wetlands, streams, forests, endangered species habitat, agricultural lands, scenic viewsheds, cultural and archaeological resources, and low-cost recreational opportunities, also generate important benefits for the state and its people, and warrant the protections afforded by state law and the commission’s unique authorization to enforce it.

Habitat and Wildlife Votes

The commission’s vote to restrict OHVs at Oceano Dunes was a landmark win for sensitive habitat and sensitive coastal species. This issue resulted in two vote charts, as described above in the Best of 2021 vote summary. The commission also casted two other votes specifically addressing sensitive habitat concerns. Those include the denial of a mixed use development in Pacifica that would have disturbed ESHA and been subject to rising seas. The other includes environmental protective conditions and impact monitoring for a proposed kelp aquaculture pilot project known as the Ocean Rainforest off Santa Barbara. Each of the four votes on sensitive habitat were unanimously agreed upon, except for the Oceano Dunes vote that reduced the effective date of the OHV ban at the State Park from five to three years.
Enforcement Authority

One major problem with sensitive habitat protection is historical gaps in the commission’s authority to enforce violations of the Coastal Act’s environmental provisions. For example, if a developer had historically failed to comply with permit conditions or undertaken unpermitted activities such as bulldozing wetlands, diverting or discharging into coastal streams, or clearing endangered species habitat to build putting greens or gazebos, the Coastal Commission had been required to work through the state Attorney General’s office, an expensive and extremely time consuming process that resulted in a mounting backlog of violations going unaddressed for years. This bureaucratic backlog freed violators from accountability, eroded deterrence, and exacerbated damage to public resources, levying hundreds of thousands of dollars annually in unnecessary costs in staff time public resources.

In 2021, SB 433 (Allen) passed the Legislature and was approved by Governor Newsom, rectifying this dysfunction by authorizing the commission to levy fines directly on violators of any of the Coastal Act’s resource protection provisions, in addition to public access violations. This includes damage to wetlands, sensitive habitats and coastal water quality, and cultural resources. This authority portends a significant improvement to the commission’s efficiency and effectiveness in addressing violations, reduces the burden on state resources by no longer requiring the Attorney General’s office to participate in every enforcement action, and builds on the commission’s track record of judicious application of its enforcement authority in public access violation cases, where it resolves most through collaborative settlements.

In a recent report to the commission (see Item 7 on the March 2022 meeting record), Chief of Enforcement, Lisa Haage, detailed heroic efforts in the Enforcement Division to streamline response to Coastal Act
violations, taking advantage of recently granted administrative penalty authority and confirming that the authority does inspire cooperation on behalf of the violators and acts as deterrent. However, Haage acknowledged that the commission did not get any additional staff funding to handle an increase in workload that is required once a violation case is opened or reopened. Enforcement staff stated that they each have backlogs of hundreds of violation cases to resolve and detailed some of those cases in the report. While this new authority will undoubtedly improve efficiency, increased state funding for a surge in enforcement staff is desperately needed to finally clear the backlog of nearly 3000 violations. The Legislature should prioritize one time funding for this temporary enforcement surge.

**Hollister Ranch Coastal Access Program**
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In November, the commission held a public workshop regarding the recently released draft Hollister Ranch Coastal Access Program. Hollister Ranch is a gated subdivision in Santa Barbara County that encompasses 8.5 miles of shoreline and six sandy beaches along Gaviota Coast, all of which are largely obstructed from public access in violation of the Coastal Act.

The Coastal Conservancy and the Coastal Commission attempted to implement an access program over the last several decades but have been unable to overcome vehement landowner opposition. To address this long-standing delay, Assembly Bill 1680 (Limón) was signed into law in 2019, requiring the Coastal Commission, the Coastal Conservancy, the State Lands Commission and State Parks to prepare an updated contemporary Public Access Program for Hollister Ranch beaches that includes provisions for initial public access by April 1, 2022.
ActCoastal partners strongly supported the draft Public Access Program. A contingent of Hollister Ranch homeowners turned out to the meeting arguing that the public should continue to be excluded from this stretch of publicly-owned coast, citing concern that visitors might degrade the beach. However, the Public Access Program proposes a thoroughly considered plan based on the state’s decades of experience in adaptive management that balances public access with habitat and resource protection. The Public Access Program would also institute a dedicated Chumash Cultural Access program, including enshrined access to sacred sites, and prioritize access measures for environmental justice communities. Representatives from the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation commented at the hearing that it felt unjust to be invited back to their native land and sacred sites in this way.

Coastal Commissioners engaged in a lengthy discussion regarding Access Program priorities, agreeing that adaptive management was a priority as well as the need to focus on justice for nearby communities and Tribes. The Access Program will return in the future for final commission adoption after continued stakeholder input and development of specific technical details.

### About the Vote Chart

The ActCoastal Report Card is produced by the Surfrider Foundation, Azul, California Coastal Protection Network and Environment California, in consultation with California’s conservation community.

The ActCoastal Report Card focuses on high-priority, high-stakes coastal development projects and issues. Such votes often pit the commercial interests of coastal developers – and their experienced and well-connected paid lobbyists – against public values and interests, and California state law. Given the intense political pressure commissioners often face, transparency and public accountability are critical elements of good governance. The Coastal Vote Chart is designed to provide both. The 2021 Coastal Vote Chart reviews 15 votes on the most important projects and issues that came before the commission last year. Votes were selected for review based on:

- Potential impacts on coastal resources or well-established coastal values, such as public access;
- Potential economic value and impacts with respect to project proponents and/or the communities that would be affected by the vote; and
- Potential to set statewide precedent.

The following is a list of each individual vote that determined the 2021 scores. Detailed descriptions of these votes can be found at ActCoastal.org. These voting records have been compared with the official records kept by the commission; any errors are the sole responsibility of the preparers.

### 2021 Meeting Reports and Vote Charts

- February, [Belmont Beach Aquatic Center](#) (Bad)
- February, [Capistrano Beach Mobile Home Park - Substantial Issue](#) (Good)
- February, [Dana Point Hotel - Cannon’s](#) (Good)
- February, [Ontario Ridge Trail Relocation](#) (Good)
- March, [Pacifica Mixed-Use Development in ESHA](#) (Bad)
- March, [Ocean Dunes Vehicle Ban - Amendment](#) (Good)
- May, [Capistrano Beach Mobile Home Park - De Novo](#) (Bad)
- May, [Mirada Bridge in Half Moon Bay](#) (Bad)
- August, [Morro Bay Land Use Plan](#) (Good)
- September, [Mission Bay Access at Campland Resort - Enforcement](#) (Good)
- October, Kelp Aquaculture - Ocean Rainforest (Good)
- November, Critical Infrastructure Sea Level Rise Guidance (Good)
- December, Santa Cruz Rail Trail - 24 Hour Access (Good)
- December, Santa Cruz Rail Trail - Seawall (Bad)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioners:</th>
<th>Item Th14a, Belmont Beach Aquatic Center</th>
<th>Item W7a, Capistrano Shores Mobile Park - Sl</th>
<th>Item W12a, Dana Point Hotel - Cannon's</th>
<th>Item F16a, Ondorario Ridge Trail Relocation</th>
<th>Item F16a, Pacifica Mixed Use in ESHA</th>
<th>Item Th3, Ocean Dunes OHV Use - Amendmen</th>
<th>Item Th3, Ocean Dunes OHV Use - Approval</th>
<th>Item W12c, Capistrano Shores Mobile Park - Home Park</th>
<th>Item F15a, Mirada Bridge in Half Moon Bay</th>
<th>Item Th16c, Morro Bay LUP Update</th>
<th>Item Th711, Mission Bay Campground Reservirtet</th>
<th>Item F11a, Keip Aquacultuere - Ocean Rainforest</th>
<th>Item W6e, Critical Infrastructure Sea Level Rise Guidance</th>
<th>Item Th11a, Santa Cruz Rail Trail - Nighttime Closure</th>
<th>Item Th11a, Santa Cruz Rail Trail - Seawall</th>
<th>Scores:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bocho</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbull-Sanders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranga</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browneexy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padilla</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminzadeh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escultante</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>