

# CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

## CONSERVATION VOTING CHART

### 2006

Prepared By:

California Coastkeeper Alliance  
Coastal Protection Network,  
League for Coastal Protection,  
Sierra Club Coastal Programs,  
&  
Surfrider Foundation

ANY AND ALL REPRODUCTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ENCOURAGED AND  
FULLY PERMISSIBLE BY LAW IN THE INTEREST OF  
COASTAL PROTECTION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION



Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (December 2006)

All photographs courtesy of Ken & Gabrielle Adelman, California Coastal Records Project

[www.californiacoastline.org](http://www.californiacoastline.org)

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION CONSERVATION VOTING CHART 2006

The legislature hereby finds and declares:

- (a) That the California coastal zone is a distinct and valuable natural resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people and exists as a delicately balanced ecosystem
- (b) That the permanent protection of the state's natural and scenic resources is a paramount concern to present and future residents of the state and nation.

-The California Coastal Act of 1976, Public Resources Code Section 30001

### **INTRODUCTION:**

The California Coastal Commission ("CCC") Conservation Voting Chart is a joint enterprise of the California Coastkeeper Alliance, Coastal Protection Network ("CPN"), League for Coastal Protection ("LCP"), Sierra Club Coastal Programs and Surfrider Foundation. These voting charts have been prepared for the last 23 years.

The CCC voting chart for 2006 examines 46 separate votes. Votes analyzed were selected in consultation with coastal conservation activists based on their likely impact on coastal resources and their potential to set important statewide precedent. The CCC reviews approximately 1000 projects each year and approves the vast majority of them; this Voting Chart is designed to highlight only the most important votes, where the stakes are high. In most cases, these are projects where the applicant has hired one or more paid agents to lobby Commissioners to vote in favor of development. Direct lobbying between agents and Commissioners is required by law to be publicly disclosed and recorded as ex parte communications, though most lobbying expenditures go unreported.<sup>1</sup>

A description of the issues and resources affected by each vote, as well as a record of individual Commissioners' votes and their alternates, appears in Appendix A. These votes have been compared with the official records kept by Coastal Commission staff. However, any errors are the sole responsibility of the preparers. For in-depth discussion of key votes on a regular basis, the Sierra Club publishes blog information regarding coastal resources at "California Coast-Watcher", ([www.coastwatcher.com](http://www.coastwatcher.com)) and maintains a website at <http://www.sierraclub.org/ca/coasts/>. For additional information regarding California coastal protection issues, visit [www.surfrider.org](http://www.surfrider.org) and <http://www.cacoastkeeper.org/> and <http://www.coastaladvocates.com/>

### **BACKGROUND**

The California Coastal Commission is an independent state agency created by the California Coastal Act of 1976 (<http://www.coastal.ca.gov/ccatc.html>). The mission of the Coastal Commission is to protect, conserve, restore, and enhance environmental and human resources of the

---

<sup>1</sup> AB 771, authored by Assemblywoman Lori Saldana (D-San Diego), would have dramatically improved recording requirements and public disclosure of lobbying contacts involving Coastal Commissioners. AB 771 passed the California Legislature in 2005 but was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger on October 7, 2005.

California coast and ocean for environmentally sustainable and prudent use by current and future generations.

The Commission itself is comprised of 12 voting members and 4 non-voting members. Of the 12 voting members, 6 are local elected officials and 6 are public citizens. In order to ensure state-wide representation, each of the following geographical areas is designated to have one 'local elected' seat: San Diego, South, South Central, Central, North Central, and North Coast regions.

The Commissioners meet monthly in different coastal communities to deliberate the merits of proposed coastal development projects within the 1.5 million acre, 1100-mile long California coastal zone. More information regarding coastal commission members, staff, staff analysis and upcoming meetings and agendas can be found on the Commission's website at <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/>

The independence, balance and integrity of the Commission are dependent upon the appointment process. California's Governor, the Senate Rules Committee under the leadership of the President Pro Tem of the State Senate, and the State Assembly Speaker are each authorized to select four Commissioners. Each Commissioner may also have an alternate, subject to the approval of their appointing authority.

Until 2003, appointments were normally made shortly after an appointing authority either assumed office (as in the case of the Governor), or a legislator ascended to the leadership of the Senate or the Assembly, and all appointments served at the pleasure or will of their appointing authority.

However, in 2003, the law concerning commission appointments and terms was amended, and now all eight Legislative appointments (four appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly and four appointed by Senate Rules Committee) are considered "tenured" appointments. That is, once a Commissioner is appointed, he/she will sit on the Commission for a fixed four-year term and in general cannot be removed until the expiration of the full appointment term. In contrast, the Governor's four appointments continue to serve 'at will' and can be removed at any time.

In addition to the twelve voting Commission members, there are also four non-voting members designated by law who are appointed by their respective state agencies: Trade and Commerce, Resources Agency, State Lands Commission, and Business, Transportation, and Housing.

For a complete list of current members of the Coastal Commissioners, Alternate Commissioners and Non-voting Commissioners, and their appointment dates and terms, go to <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/roster.html>

#### **AN IMPORTANT NOTE:**

When reviewing this Voting Chart, it is important to remember that some Commissioners have only served on the Commission for a relatively short time, while others have served for many years. For example, Commissioner Sara Wan is in her 11<sup>th</sup> year on the Commission while Commissioner Khatchik Achadjian had served just seven months when this vote tally was calculated. Commissioner Achadjian, who is a San Luis Obispo County Supervisor, joined the Commission in June, upon his appointment by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, and re-

placed Commissioner Dan Secord, who had retired by the Santa Barbara City Council and was no longer eligible to serve on the Commission as an elected official. Then in July 2006, Secord rejoined the Commission when Governor Schwarzenegger appointed him to serve on the Commission as an alternate to Commissioner Steven Kram.



Moss Landing Power Plant/Cal-Am "test" Desalination Facility (December 2006)



Ventura Surfer's Point Beach Restoration Project Area (November 2006)

## **KEY FINDINGS**

- Since 1985, the California Coastal Commission's voting scores have ranged from a low of 25% in the latter half of 1996 to a high of 76% in 1997. The average conservation voting score for the Coastal Commission over the intervening 21 years was 50%. The average score for the entire Commission during 2006 dipped to 43%
- The overall Commission's conservation score for 2006 was 43%, a full 17% points lower than 2005's overall score of 60%, and a dramatic 33% points lower than the all time high of 76% in 1997.
- The all-time high Commission conservation score of 76% in 1997 is attributed primarily to the high visibility of coastal protection in the 1996 election, and the transition of the Assembly from a Republican majority under Speaker Curt Pringle to a Democratic majority under Speaker Cruz Bustamante. Speaker Pringle's appointments, at 6%, had the lowest Conservation voting score for any appointing authority over the last 18 years and were largely responsible for the Commission's all-time low conservation score of 25% in the latter half of 1996.<sup>2</sup>
- The Commission's 2006 overall voting score (43%) represents their lowest conservation rating since 2001, when the Commission scored just 41%. Prior to that, the Commission hadn't scored as low since the all-time low score of 25% in the second half of 1996.
- Conservation voting scores also vary by appointing authority. In general, Senate Rules appointments have maintained the highest conservation scores over the years, followed by the Speakers' appointments, and then the Governor's. In 2004, those Commissioners appointed by the Senate Rules Committee under the leadership of State Senator John Burton earned the highest conservation score (58%), Assembly Speaker Herb Wesson's appointees earned a conservation score of 38%, and Governor Gray Davis' appointees earned a conservation score of 47% placing them for the first time ahead of the Speakers' appointments. This trend reversed again when Governor Schwarzenegger's appointees were seated; they earned a conservation score of just 29% in 2004. That mark improved in 2005 to 46%, but slipped in 2006 when gubernatorial appointments mustered an overall conservation score of just 35%. Meanwhile, legislative appointments were similarly uninspiring, with Senate Rules appointments in 2006 scoring an overall conservation score of just 54% (their lowest score since record since 1986), followed by Assembly Speaker appointments at just 42%, only 7% points ahead of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's appointments.
- 2005 was the first year in which Governor Schwarzenegger had appointments on the Coastal Commission during the entire 12 months of the year. A trend that began in 2004, in which Commission Chair Meg Caldwell maintained a relatively high conservation score (75% in 2004 and 73% in 2005), continued in 2006 when Commissioner Caldwell scored a Governor's high score of 58%. Caldwell's conservation score, stands in marked contrast to

---

<sup>2</sup> Recent polling data and public interest survey analysis continue to demonstrate significant interest among voters and all Californian's for increased coastal protection, with a particular desire to see members of the Coastal Commission and politicians act more stringent in protection of coastal resources and be less lenient regarding coastal development proposals. To review the latest data, go to [www.ppic.org](http://www.ppic.org)

Schwarzenegger other three appointments, who together averaged just 36% in 2005 and only 35% in 2006.

- There is a wide range in scores between individual Commissioners as well. Only three Commissioners managed pro-coast conservation scores over 50% in 2006: Commissioner Wan (73%), Commissioner Shallenberger (63%) and Commissioner Caldwell (58%).
- Once interesting trend in 2006 was the way in which both elected officials and citizen Commissioners scores both fell. In 2005 it was notable that the high score Commissioners list contained three local elected officials, Commissioner Aldinger (Manhattan Beach City Council), with a score of 90%, Commissioner Padilla (Mayor of Chula Vista), with a score of 85%, and Commissioner Clark (Rancho Palos Verdes City Council), with a score of (83%). At the time none of the three elected Commissioners had yet to serve an entire full year on the Commission (and, indeed, Commissioner Aldinger resigned after just three months). In any event, improving pro-coast conservation scores among elected officials appeared to be a promising trend. That trend, however, did not hold. Commissioners Padilla and Clark both served the entire year during 2006, but unfortunately both experienced dramatic declines in their conservation voting scores: Padilla dropped to 48% and Clark to 42%.
- Only two Commissioners received conservation scores below 35% in 2005 (Commissioner Potter, 31% and Commissioner Iseman, 33%) as compared with eight Commissioners below 35% in 2004 (Commissioner Iseman, 34%, Commissioner McClain-Hill, 33%, Commissioner Kruer, 33%, Commissioner Potter, 25%, Commissioner Hart, 20%, Commissioner Neely, 8%, Commissioner Kram, 0%, and Commissioner Secord, 0%). In 2006, four Commissioners earned scores lower than 35%: Commissioner Kram scored 34%, Commissioner Potter scored 33%, Commissioner Neely scored 30% and Commissioner Secord scored 13%.
- Typically, 'local elected' Commissioners have tended to have lower conservation scores than Commissioners drawn from the public-at-large and 2006 was no exception. Public members had a conservation voting score of 52% (down from 69% in 2005), while local elected officials who serve as Commissioners had a conservation voting score of 35% (down from 55% in 2005).
- Of the 7 'elected' members that served on the Commission during 2006, Chula Vista Mayor Steve Padilla had the highest conservation voting score at 48% (down from 85% in 2005), while Santa Barbara City Council member Dan Secord had the lowest score at 13% (while serving on the Commission only 3 months).
- Of the 6 'public' members, Commissioner Sara Wan (appointed by Senate Rules Committee) had the highest conservation voting score at 73% (down from 93% in 2005), while Commissioner Steven Kram (appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger) had a Conservation score of 34 (down from 35% in 2005). Interestingly, both Wan and Kram, respectively, were the high and low scorers among public member Commissioners during 2005 as well.

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION  
CONSERVATION VOTING SCORES: 1985-2006**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Senate</b>	<b>Assembly</b>	<b>Governor</b>	<b>Commission</b>
1983-84	63%	66%	13%	47%
1985	53%	54%	6%	29%
1986	50%	57%	14%	38%
1987	71%	64%	26%	66%
1988/89	63%	50%	14%	60%
1990/91	89%	55%	19%	58%
1992	83%	59%	30%	53%
1993	65%	38%	32%	34%
1994	68%	43%	31%	38%
1995	79%	42%	35%	50%
1996 (1-5/96)	85%	31%	21%	41%
1996 (6-11/96)	87%	6%	20%	25%
1997	78%	87%	42%	76%
1998	66%	66%	24%	44%
1999	72%	62%	54%	64%
2000	59%	46%	42%	50%
2001	56%	35%	28%	41%
2002	64%	44%	44%	50%
2003	65%	45%	45%	52%
2004	58%	38%	Davis: 47% Schwarzenegger: 29%	46%
2005	74%	55%	45.5%	60%
2006	54%	42%	35%	43%

**OBSERVATION:**

Environmentalists began tracking the Coastal Commission's Conservation Voting Record in 1983. The highest overall Conservation voting score for the Commission was in 1997 when the overall Conservation voting score for the Commission stood at 76%. Eight years later, that score had dropped 30 points to 46% in 2004. 2006 represents an upward trend at 60%, while 2006 indicated a precipitous negative trend in slipping to just 43%, despite continued strong public support for increased coastal protection.

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION  
CONSERVATION VOTING CHART 2006  
RANKINGS BY APPOINTING AUTHORITY**

<b>Assembly Appointments</b>	
<b>Burke</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>Kruer</b>	<b>38%</b>
<b>Padilla</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>Potter</b>	<b>33%</b>

<b>Senate Appointments</b>	
<b>Clark</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>Reilly</b>	<b>39%</b>
<b>Shallenberger</b>	<b>63%</b>
<b>Wan</b>	<b>76%</b>

<b>Governor Appointments</b>	
<b>Achadjian</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>Secord</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Caldwell</b>	<b>58%</b>
<b>Kram</b>	<b>34%</b>
<b>Neely</b>	<b>30%</b>

<b>Average by Appointing Authority</b>	
<b>Senate Pro Tem Don Perata</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez</b>	<b>42%</b>
<b>Governor Schwarzenegger</b>	<b>35%</b>

**OBSERVATION:**

Coastal Commissioners appointed by the Senate Rules Committee earned a Conservation score of just 55% in 2006, a decline of 19% points from their 2005 score of 74%. Assembly Speaker appointees earned a Conservation score in 2006 of just 42%, a decline of 13% points from their 2005 score of 55%, and gubernatorial appointees earned a Conservation score in 2006 of just 35%, a decline of 11% from their 2005 Conservation score of 46%.



**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION  
CONSERVATION VOTING CHART 2006  
OVERALL COMMISSIONER RANKING**

Overall Commissioner Ranking						
2006 Rank	Commissioner	#Months on the Commission	#Total Votes Cast	#Pro-Coast Votes Cast	#of Absences	Final Pro-Coast Voting Score
1	Wan	12	41	31	5	76%
2	Shallenberger	12	40	25	5	63%
3	Caldwell	12	36	21	10	58%
4	Burke	12	25	12	21	48%
5	Padilla	12	40	19	6	48%
6	Clark	12	42	18	3	42%
7	Achadjian	6	17	7	11	41%
8	Reilly	12	41	16	5	39%
9	Kruer	12	39	15	7	38%
10	Kram	12	32	11	14	34%
11	Potter	12	27	9	19	33%
12	Neely	12	40	12	6	30%
13	Secord	3	8	1	0	13%

Average Voting Score:

43 %

**OBSERVATION:**

There is a wide variation in conservation voting scores between individual Commissioners. Only three Commissioners managed to achieve a pro-conservation score above 50% in 2006, including Commissioner Wan (76%), Commissioner Shallenberger (63%) and Commissioner Caldwell (58%).

It should be noted that length of terms in 2006 varies, with Commissioner Achadjian serving 6 months and Commissioner Secord serving 3 months as a primary Commission member (for which 8 votes were considered, and then serving another six months (July-December 2006) as an alternate Commissioner member for primary Commissioner Steven Kram. Secord's six votes as Kram's alternate (only one a pro-coast vote) are, for purposes of this analysis, considered to be votes of the primary Commission member (as are all votes by alternate Commission members). For perspective, we have included the number of months Commissioners sat and the total number of votes cast during that time.

And while the Conservation Voting Chart analyzed 46 separate votes during 2006, no single Commissioner (or their alternates) were present and voted on all 46. For those Commissioners casting less than 46 votes, the discrepancy is related to time served on the Commission or absences and abstentions, none of which are counted or included in a Commissioners overall pro-conservation score.

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION  
CONSERVATION VOTING CHART 2005-2006  
COMPARISON OF ELECTED & PUBLIC MEMBERS**

<b>Elected Members</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Padilla	85%	48%
Clark	83%	43%
Achadjian	n/a	41%
Reilly	59%	39%
Neely	36%	30%
Potter	31%	33%
Secord	38%	13%
Average Voting Score - Elected Officials	54%	35%

<b>Public Members</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Wan	93%	76%
Shallenberger	87%	63%
Caldwell	73%	58%
Kruer	63%	38%
Burke	60%	48%
Kram	35%	34%
Average Voting Score - Public Members	69%	53%

**OBSERVATION:**

'Local elected' Commissioners trailed 'public' Commissioners by 14% points in 2005, and 18% points in 2006. Commissioners appointed from the public-at-large had an average Conservation voting score in 2006 of 53%, compared to only 35% for 'local elected official' Commission members. Interestingly, in 2005, elected officials, who often lack inspiring conservation scores, scored 54%, a pro-coast score that exceeds the score achieved by public members of the Commission in 2006, due to the public members' dismal score of just 53%.

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION  
CONSERVATION VOTING CHART 2005  
COMPARISON OF 2003 vs 2004 vs 2005 vs 2006**

<b>Senate Appointments</b>	2003	2004	2005	2006
Wan	84%	78%	93%	76%
Shallenberger		75%	87%	63%
Reilly	52%	43%	59%	39%
Clark			83%	42%

<b>Assembly Appointments</b>	2003	2004	2005	2006
Burke	50%	54%	60%	48%
Padilla			85%	48%
Kruer	42%	33%	63%	38%
Potter	38%	25%	31%	33%

<b>Governor Appointments</b>	2003	2004	2005	2006
Caldwell		75%	73%	58%
Secord		0%	38%	13%
Achadjian				41%
Neely		8%	36%	30%
Kram		0%	35%	34%

<b>Average by Appointing Authority</b>	2003	2004	2005	2006
Senate	65%	58%	74%	54%
Assembly	45%	38%	55%	42%
Governor Davis	45%	47%		
Governor Schwarzenegger		29%	46%	35%

<b>Overall Coastal Commission Score:</b>	<b>2003: 52%</b>	<b>2004: 46%</b>	<b>2005: 60%</b>	<b>2006: 43%</b>
--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

**OBSERVATION:**

After an overall decrease in the Commission's coastal conservation voting score in 2004 to 46%, the rating increased 14% in 2005 to 60%, a promising upward trend consistent with the desire of the public for more coastal protection in California. Unfortunately, that upward trend did not continue in 2006 and the overall Coastal Commission pro-conservation score fell 17% points to just 43%.

Coastal Commission Conservation  
Voting Chart  
2006

For More Information Call:

Mark Massara, Sierra Club Coastal Program: 805-895-0963

Chad Nelsen, Surfrider Foundation: 949-492-8170

Mel Nutter, League for Coastal Protection: 562-432-8715

Linda Sheehan, California Coastkeeper Alliance: 510-770-9764



SIERRA  
CLUB  
FOUNDED 1892



California Coastal Protection Network

### **Technical Notes:**

**Overall Conservation Voting Score** = Total Number of Pro Conservation Votes Cast Divided by Total Number of Votes Cast

**Commissioner Voting Score** = Total Number of Pro Conservation Votes Cast Divided by Total Number of Votes Cast

**Votes by Alternates** are counted as part of the Primary Commissioner's Conservation Voting Score

#### **Definitions:**

ALT – Alternate, meaning the Alternate Commission member cast the vote.

ABS – Absent, meaning the Commission was not present at the time of the vote.

Abstain- Meaning the Commission chose not to cast a vote.

+ Vote: Positive Vote for Coastal Conservation

- Vote: Negative Vote against Coastal Conservation

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart January 2006

January 2006	Camden Newport Beach 11-Jan. 5-04-466	Klien Malibu 13-Jan. A-04-05-196
Burke	-	+
Caldwell	-	Absent
Clark	-(Alt.)	-
Kram	Absent	-
Kruer	-	-
Neely	-	-
Padilla	Absent	-(Alt.)
Potter	Absent	-
Reilly	-	-
Secord	-	-
Shallenberger	-	-
Wan	-	+
<b>Outcome</b>	-	-

**Camden, Newport Beach, Orange Co.:** Commission approved a 9,540 sq. ft. home with no bluff setback, against the advice of their staff and sound coastal planning (several Commissioners wanted to go even further, and supported allowing the house to hang out over the bluff).

**Klien, Malibu, Los Angeles Co.:** Commission approved an office building and parking lot on steep canyon slope within 50-ft riparian canopy and adjacent stream on Pt. Dume, in violation of the required 100-ft ESHA setback. In setting a disastrous precedent, Commission found that streams and canyons on Pt. Dume are not entitled to ESHA protections, which will adversely impact economic and environmental values on Pt. Dume in the future.

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart February 2006

February 2006	Humboldt Bay Eureka 9-Feb. 1-05-39	North Co. Transit Del Mar San Diego Co. 9-Feb. CC-48-04	Fargo La Jolla San Diego Co. 9-Feb. A-6-05-71 F6200-A2
<b>Burke</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Caldwell</b>	-	-	+
<b>Clark</b>	+(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	+(Alt.)
<b>Kram</b>	Absent	-(Alt.)	+(Alt.)
<b>Kruer</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Neely</b>	-	-	+
<b>Padilla</b>	+	-	+
<b>Potter</b>	-	-	+
<b>Reilly</b>	-	-	+
<b>Secord</b>	-	-	+
<b>Shallenberger</b>	-	-	+
<b>Wan</b>	+	-	+
<b>Outcome</b>	-	-	+

**Humboldt Bay Harbor, Eureka:** In an unprecedented decision (that would not have been allowed in Southern California), the Commission allowed officials in Humboldt Harbor to dump more than 200,000 yards of toxic dredge spoils on the public beach at Samoa Peninsula.

**North County Transit, Del Mar, San Diego Co.:** Commission allowed a seawall for train tracks on a consistency determination (CD), without requiring a coastal development permit (CDP) and without analyzing alternatives such as moving the tracks inland, thereby sacrificing the coastal bluff and public beach.

**Fargo, La Jolla, San Diego Co.:** Commission denied an after the fact permit for illegal construction and grading for pool and deck extending over, intruding into and causing severe damage to steep hillside natural preserve area.

# California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart March 2006

March 2006	Holmgren Ventura Co. 7-March 4-04-71	KSL Resorts Encinitas San Diego Co. 7-March 6-92-203-A4	Brinton Miramar San Mateo Co. 9-March A-2-SMC-05-016
<b>Burke</b>	+	Absent	-
<b>Caldwell</b>	-	-	-
<b>Clark</b>	-	-	-
<b>Kram</b>	-	+	-
<b>Kruer</b>	-	+	-
<b>Neely</b>	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)
<b>Padilla</b>	-	-	Absent
<b>Potter</b>	-	-	-
<b>Reilly</b>	+	+	-
<b>Secord</b>	-	-	-
<b>Shallenberger</b>	-	+	-
<b>Wan</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Outcome</b>	-	-	-

**Holmgren, Ventura Co.:** In violation of Coastal Act policies limiting seawalls to 'existing structures,' the Commission approved a new seawall for a brand new home, inappropriately sited on the public sandy beach, with no setback, which was still under construction at Solimar Beach.

**KSL Resorts, Encinitas, San Diego Co.:** Commission voted to allow conversion of a public overnight visitor serving hotel to a private residential 'condotel,' thereby undermining coastal visitor serving land use zoning protections and initiating a stampede to convert coastal hotels to private condominium resorts that reduce public opportunities to visit and stay along the coast and artificially inflate coastal land values.

**Brinton, Miramar, San Mateo Co.:** Ignoring staff and legal recommendations, the Commission approved subdividing a single parcel into three lots to insure residential sprawl, without protecting sensitive resources, steep slopes, ESHA, and without mitigating for water supply constraints, severe traffic or beach access.



## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart April 2006

April 2006	Dockweiler, LA Dept. Beaches & Harbors 11-April 5-05-179	US Navy San Diego Co. 11-April CC-8-06	Sunridge Views Monterey Co. 12-April A-3-04-54	Pescadero Con- servation Alli- ance 13-April A-2-04-5
<b>Burke</b>	-	-	-	Absent
<b>Caldwell</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Clark</b>	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-
<b>Kram</b>	Absent	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)
<b>Kruer</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Neely</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Padilla</b>	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	Absent
<b>Potter</b>	Absent	Absent	-	Absent
<b>Reilly</b>	-	-	+	-
<b>Shallenberger</b>	+	-	+	-
<b>Wan</b>	-	+	-	+
<b>Outcome</b>	-	-	-	-

**Dockweiler Beach, LA Dept. Beaches & Harbors, LA Co.:** Commission ignored staff recommendations and allowed construction of a 9,000 sq. ft. youth center on the public beach, with a garage and beach driving, ignoring alternative upland sites for the facility at Dockweiler State Beach.

**US Navy, San Diego Co.:** Commission approved construction of four 18-story residential towers and a 6-story parking garage, blocking views and establishing a new adverse Miami Beach style development precedent for area.

**Sunridge Views, Monterey Co.:** Reversing itself and a previous Commission denial, the Commission approved destruction of a 25-acre strawberry farm to allow construction of 10 mansions, despite contaminated and insufficient freshwater/groundwater supplies, merely because the landowner had sued the Commission for the initial denial.

**Pescadero Conservation Alliance:** Commission allowed development of a youth campground on State Park land purchased specifically to protect marbled murrelets, despite evidence that the proposed Gazos Mt. Camp would adversely impact the endangered birds.

**Note:** Dan Secord retired from the Commission in March 2007

# California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart May 2006

May 2006	Inyaha (Fargo) La Jolla San Diego Co. 10-May F6200-A3	Huntington Harbour Bay Club Huntington Beach OC Co. 10-May HNB-MAJ-1-04	Palmero Newport Beach OC Co. 10-May 5-05-328	Long Pt. Rancho Palos Verdes LA Co. 10-May A-5-02-324-A6	North Pacifica San Mateo Co. 11-May A-2-05-18	Vintage Marina Channel Isle Harbor PWP Ventura Co. 105 NID 1-06
Burke	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	+	-
Caldwell	-	+	+	-	+	-
Clark	-	-	-	-	Absent	Absent
Kram	-	-	-	-	Absent	-
Kruer	-	+	-	-	Absent	-
Neely	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	+(Alt.)	-(Alt.)
Padilla	-	+	-	-	+	-
Potter	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Reilly	-	-	-	-	+	-
Shallenberger	-	+	+	-	+	-
Wan	+	+	+	+	+	-
<b>Outcome</b>	-	+	-	-	+	-

**Inyaha (Fargo), La Jolla, San Diego Co.:** Merely because the landowner sued, the Commission reversed itself and allowed illegal construction above, over and into an adjacent nature preserve.

**Huntington Harbour, Huntington Beach, Orange Co.:** In protecting public recreation, the Commission denied a proposal to allow residential development on one of only two public recreation areas in entire Harbor.

**Palmero, Newport Beach, Orange Co.:** Reserving a previous denial, Commission allowed 2-story addition and pool on bluff face above ocean in violation of LCP resource protection policies.

**Long Pt. Development, Rancho Palos Verdes, LA Co.:** Commission approved dramatic reduction in public hotel rooms (400 to 294) in new resort ("Terranea"), allowing 106 rooms to be converted to private residential 'condotel' units, thereby increasing private profits and adversely impacting public coastal zone overnight room availability.

**North Pacifica, Pacifica, San Mateo Co.:** To protect rare sand dune vegetation and habitat, the Commission denied a proposal to pave the Pacifica Bowl and construct 19 houses and 24 townhouses.

**Vintage Marina, Channel Islands Harbor, Ventura Co.:** In an outrageous decision, the Commission voted with lobbyists to allow construction of a Boating & Safety Instruction Center (BISC) that would destroy a public lawn and picnic area, as well as trees used by Herons for nesting, despite the fact that other, more appropriate and environmentally less damaging sites existed for the BISC.

**NB: This decision has since been invalidated by court decree based upon a lawsuit brought by local citizens.**

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart June 2006

June 2006	Mar Vista Laguna Beach OC Co. 13-June 5-05-29-EDD	Yandow Shell Beach San Luis Co. 15-June A-3-PSB-06-2	Khaloghli Cambria San Luis Co. 15-June A-3-SLO-00-118-A3
<b>Burke</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Caldwell</b>	+	+	-
<b>Clark</b>	+(Alt.)	+	-
<b>Kram</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Kruer</b>	+	+	-
<b>Neely</b>	-(Alt.)	+	-
<b>Padilla</b>	+(Alt.)	+(Alt.)	+(Alt.)
<b>Potter</b>	Absent	+	-
<b>Reilly</b>	Absent	+	-
<b>Achadjian</b>	-	Absent	-
<b>Shallenberger</b>	+	+	+
<b>Wan</b>	+	+	+
<b>Outcome</b>	+	+	-

**Mar Vista, Laguna Beach, Orange Co.:** Finding that the City of Laguna had illegally approved and sought to assist a private mansion developer, the Commission voted to take jurisdiction over the project and to stop development in a creek.

**Yandow, Shell Beach, San Luis Obispo Co.:** To protect public beach access, the Commission denied the proposal by a property owner to fence and block off a popular public beach access trail.

**Khaloghli, Cambria, San Luis Obispo Co.:** Property owner sought to revise permit to allow for illegally having planted 38 huge non-native palm trees in lieu of the native plants that had been promised.

**Note:** Khatchik Achadjian was appointed to the Commission in June 2007.

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart July 2006

July 2006	Goodell Huntington Beach OC Co. 12-July 5-05-479	Burke Torrance LA Co. 12-July 5-05-503	Driftwood Prop. (Athens Group) Laguna Beach OC Co. 13-July CCC-06-RO-03	City of San Diego La Jolla 13-July 6-05-140
<b>Burke</b>	+	+	Absent	Absent
<b>Caldwell</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Clark</b>	+(Alt.)	+	+(Alt.)	+
<b>Kram</b>	+(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	+	+
<b>Kruer</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Neely</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Padilla</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Potter</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Reilly</b>	Absent	+	+	+
<b>Achadjian</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Shallenberger</b>	Absent	+	+	+
<b>Wan</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Outcome</b>	+	+	+	+

**Goodell, Huntington Beach, Orange Co.:** Finding that a property owner had illegally cut down a tree with endangered nesting birds to facilitate a real estate development scheme, the Commission ordered staff to bring an enforcement matter, and required restoration and permanent protection of the site.

**Burke, Torrance, Los Angeles Co.:** Commission rejected an effort by adjacent property owners to continue to maintain a fence on the public sandy beach in order to privatize the bluffs above, between Palos Verdes and Rondo Beach.

**Driftwood Properties (Athens Group) Laguna Beach, Orange Co.:** Following multiple citizen complaints against Athens Group, Commission took initial enforcement steps to restore massive hillside and watercourse destruction at Hobo Aliso in South Laguna. The destruction of high value habitat and endangered Big-leaved Crownbeard was to facilitate a luxury residential development scheme. Although much more enforcement and restoration are necessary, coastal staff assured the Commission that additional legal action will be undertaken.

**City of San Diego, San Diego Co.:** Following a lawsuit by Sierra Club, the Commission ordered that swim safety buoys be allowed offshore of the private La Jolla Beach & Tennis Club, and that "Public Access Permitted" signs be required to be placed on the beach in front of the club, and that mechanical beach grading be prohibited.

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart August 2006

August 2006	Laing Homes Port Hue- neme Ventura Co. 9-August No. MAJ-1- 2-06	Lerner Malibu LA Co. 9-August A-4-MAL-06- 043	Gaviota Bridge Public Works Santa Barbara Co. 9-August A-4-STB-06-056	HDC Hotel Del Co- ronado San Diego Co. 10-Aug. A-6-COR-06-46
<b>Burke</b>	-	+	+	-
<b>Caldwell</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Clark</b>	-	+	+	-
<b>Kram</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Kruer</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	-
<b>Neely</b>	-	+	+	-
<b>Padilla</b>	-	+	+	-
<b>Potter</b>	-	Absent	+	-
<b>Reilly</b>	-	+	+	-
<b>Achadjian</b>	-	+	+	-
<b>Shallen- berger</b>	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
<b>Wan</b>	+	+	+	-(Alt.)
<b>Outcome</b>	-	+	+	-

**Laing Homes, Port Hueneme, Ventura Co.:** Under pressure from lobbyists and developers, the Commission approved a plan to convert 17-acres dedicated to harbor uses to residential use for speculation, sprawl and over 125 new houses.

**Lerner, Malibu, Los Angeles Co.:** To protect a creek and environmentally sensitive riparian habitat, the Commission denied a proposal to construct a swimming pool.

**Gaviota Bridge, Santa Barbara Co.:** In order to stop a reckless plan pushed by Santa Barbara Co., the Commission denied a proposal to construct a new bridge over Gaviota Creek that would have destroyed over 3-acres of wetlands, finding that much less environmentally damaging alternatives existed for nearly the same construction costs, which the County had inexplicably failed to consider or utilize.

**Hotel Del Coronado, San Diego Co.:** Bowing to speculators seeking to subvert visitor serving zoning uses, the Commission approved a plan to convert 11 hotel units into 37 'condo-tel' residential units, damaging the public's ability to stay along the coast in order to facilitate profits for hoteliers.

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart September 2006

September 2006	Lands End Pacifica San Mateo Co. 14-Sept. A-2-PAC-06-007	Garrison Mendocino Co. 15-Sept. A-1-MEN-94-A3
<b>Burke</b>	Absent	Absent
<b>Caldwell</b>	-	+
<b>Clark</b>	-(Alt.)	+(Alt.)
<b>Kram</b>	Absent	Absent
<b>Kruer</b>	-	+
<b>Neely</b>	-	+
<b>Padilla</b>	-(Alt.)	+(Alt.)
<b>Potter</b>	-	+
<b>Reilly</b>	-	-
<b>Achadjian</b>	-	+
<b>Shallenberger</b>	-	+
<b>Wan</b>	-	+
<b>Outcome</b>	-	+

**Lands End, Pacifica, San Mateo Co.:** Commission approved a new pool and clubhouse on a crumbling bluff edge despite evidence of landslides and severe erosion.

**Garrison, Mendocino Co.:** Commission supported development of alternative energy systems and approved a project consisting of free standing photovoltaic solar panels, and protected views by denying part of the project consisting of a 60-ft high wind turbine along Highway One outside of Albion that would have been visible for miles along a designated scenic coastline.

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart October 2006

October 2006	Pardee Homes San Diego 11-October 6-03-98/A-6- NOC-05-50	UCSC De- sal City of Santa Cruz 11-October 3-06-34	Huntington LCP City of Hunting- ton Beach 12-October HNB-MAJ-2-6	St. Catherine School Laguna Beach 12-October 5-06-349-EDD	Malibu LCP City of Malibu 12-October 1-06
Burke	-	-	-	Absent	+
Caldwell	+	-	-	+	Absent
Clark	-	-	-	+	+
Kram	-	-	-	+	+
Kruer	-	-	-	+	+
Neely	-	-	-	+	+
Padilla	-	-	-	+	+
Potter	-	Absent	-	+	+
Reilly	-	-	-	+	+
Achadjian	Absent	-	-	+	+
Shallen- berger	+	-	-	+	+
Wan	+	-	-	+	+
<b>Outcome</b>	-	-	-	+	+

**Pardee Homes, City of San Diego, San Diego Co.:** Commission approved over 250 housing units on just 9 legal lots, allowing for destruction of ESHA, and then voted to eliminate even 100-ft buffers around remaining sensitive resources.

**UCSC Desalination Plant, City of Santa Cruz Water Department, Santa Cruz Co.:** Commission voted to allow an unnecessary bluff edge 'experimental' desal plant despite evidence that permanent facility would not be located in vicinity and pilot test results would not be useful in developing a permanent offsite facility.

**Condominium Timeshares, City of Huntington Beach, Orange Co.:** Commission voted allow zoning change that will allow 650 new private residential condo and timeshare ownership resort rooms on oceanfront land previously dedicated for public visitor overnight accommodations, thereby adversely impacting future public beach access in Huntington Beach.

**Saint Catherine of Siena Catholic School, City of Laguna Beach, Orange Co.:** Commission voted to acknowledge impending destruction of two creeks and accept jurisdiction over school development project to prevent Laguna Beach and Catholic Diocese from destroying sensitive resources.

**Local Coastal Plan (LCP), City of Malibu, Los Angeles Co.:** Commission rejected an effort by the City of Malibu to significantly weaken environmental resource protections, bluff setback and public beach access provisions of their LCP.

## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart November 2006

November 2006	IV Parking Plan Santa Barbara Co. 15-Nov. A-4-STB- 04-124	Malibu Valley Inc. LA Co. 15-Nov. 4-00-279- VRC	Pacific Jew- ish Center Santa Monica/ Marina Del Rey 16-Nov. 5-06-042	Surfer's Pt. Managed Retreat City of Ven- tura 16-Nov. 4-05-148	Goleta Beach SB Co. 16-Nov. 4-02-251-A2	UCSB Housing SB Co. 17-Nov. 4-06-097
Burke	+	+	-	Absent	Absent	+
Caldwell	+	+	-	+	+	+
Clark	Absent	+	+	+	+	+
Kram	+	Absent	-(Alt.)	+	-	+
Kruer	+	+	-	+	-	+
Neely	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Padilla	+	+	Absent	Absent	Absent	+
Potter	+	+	Absent	+	-	Absent
Reilly	+	+	-(Alt.)	Absent	Absent	Absent
Achadjian	Absent	Absent	Absent	+	-	+
Shallen- berger	+	+	+	+	+	+
Wan	+	+	-	Absent	Absent	+
<b>Out- come</b>	+	+	-	+	-	+

**Isle Vista Parking Plan, Santa Barbara Co.:** Commission voted to deny a permit parking plan that would have eliminated over 2,000 free public beach access street parking spaces in Isle Vista.

**Malibu Valley Inc., Los Angeles Co.:** Commission voted to deny a vested rights claim that would have allowed significant recent unpermitted equestrian development on ESHA and adjacent to riparian areas in the Santa Monica Mts.

**Pacific Jewish Center, Santa Monica/Marina Del Rey, Los Angeles Co.:** In approving a religious string development ("ERUV") with view, land use and wildlife impacts, the Commission established a new less rigorous development standard for faith based development proposals.

**Surfer's Pt., City of Ventura, Ventura Co.:** In advancing good science and land use, the Commission approved a managed retreat plan to reconfigure shoreline to relocate public parking, realign public bikeway and restore dune habitat.

**Goleta Beach, Santa Barbara Co.:** In contrast to positive development at Surfer's Pt., at Goleta Beach Commission again allowed SB Co. to allow California's longest illegal 'temporary' seawall (950-ft) to remain in place yet another 18 months, despite evidence of bad faith on part of SB Co. that County intends to leave the wall forever.

**North & West Campus Housing, UCSB, Santa Barbara Co.:** Working for many years, the Commission approved a plan by UCSB that insures permanent protection of significant ESHA & wetlands and two creeks, and will also allow over 300 units of faculty and student family housing.



## California Coastal Commission Conservation Voting Chart December 2006

December 2006	Sand City Monterey Co. 13-Dec. 3-05-62	PBC Monterey Co. 13-Dec. 3-06-33	PG&E Diablo Canyon San Luis Co. 14-Dec. A-3-SLO-06-017	CalAm Desal Monterey Co. 14-Dec. A-3-MCO-06-384 E-05-005
<b>Burke</b>	Absent	Absent	-	+
<b>Caldwell</b>	+	+	-	+
<b>Clark</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Kram</b>	+(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)	-(Alt.)
<b>Kruer</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Neely</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Padilla</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Potter</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>Reilly</b>	-	-	-	+
<b>Achadjian</b>	Absent	Absent	-	-
<b>Shallenberger</b>	+	Abstain	+	-
<b>Wan</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Outcome</b>	-	-	-	-

**Sand City, Monterey Co.:** In seeking to appease a local government acting in bad faith, six Commissioners voted to allow dozens of tall, illegally developed urban style lights along a bike path and Highway One that shine nigh light into sand dunes and disrupt wildlife.

**Pebble Beach Co., Monterey Co.:** In seeking to appease resort owner, eight Commissioners voted to permit a new 175-ft long seawall that will destroy scenic Stillwater Cove Beach, without any mitigation whatsoever, and establishing a new adverse precedent allowing seawalls to protect golf course fairways in California.

**PG&E, San Luis Obispo Co.:** In one of the most important votes of the year, 10 Commissioners abandoned their staff and the California coast and sided with PG&E's lobbyists in voting not to require any mitigation or conservation of over 9,000-acres of environmentally sensitive lands adjacent to PG&E's Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, in connection with approval of new steam generators that will extend the environmental impacts and life of the nuke plant.

**California-American Water Co., Monterey Co.:** Eight Commissioners voted to allow a 'test' desal plant using environmentally destructive once-through cooling technology at Moss Landing Power Plant, despite the fact that that technology will not be allowed for any permanent facility and despite the fact that the desal promoters admit they intend to try to permanently use such environmentally destructive technology.