2022 California Coastal Commission Report Card

This report card offers a coastal conservation, environmental justice and public access oriented summary of the Commission’s voting record throughout the year.

In 2019, the California Legislative Analyst reported that by 2100, roughly 6 feet of sea level rise and recurring annual storms could impact over 480,000 California residents and cause $119 billion in property damage and loss. In the wake of the extraordinary atmospheric river storms that hit California over the winter of 2022-23, the worsening threat posed to lives, livelihoods and property from coastal hazards such as rising seas becomes all too real.

The state’s success or failure in responding to this reality will hinge on the planning and permitting decisions made by the Coastal Commission today. This makes tracking its key votes—which the Act Coastal coalition has upheld continuously since 2012—an important contribution to ensuring transparency and accountability in coastal governance, and advancing the goals of protecting and restoring the coastal environment, and preserving equitable public access.

The 2022 edition of the Act Coastal Report Card reveals welcome news: on average the Coastal Commission’s voting for environmental protection, environmental justice, and public access improved substantially from prior years. In addition, the Commission’s voting record became more balanced, with the lowest scoring commissioner still near the overall average and substantially more aligned with conservation, justice and access than the lowest scorers in years past.

California’s advocates, policymakers, and commissioners themselves now must sustain this trend if we hope to preserve the ecological, recreational and cultural value of our coast in the face of this century’s rising seas and other natural and human-caused threats.

Methodology

The 2022 report card reflects 14 scored votes. 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. These projects and issues are selected by member organizations of the Act Coastal coalition in advance of the Commission’s votes.

California Coastal Commission 2022 Voting Scores

In 2022, the Commission began to meet in person again for the first time in two years. Overall, 2022 scores improved from the previous two years.

The average score for the Commission was 74% in 2022.
The average score of 74% is slightly up from 72% in 2021. The average of all scores since 1988 is 56%. The Commission also appears to be in a more balanced era; with the lowest scoring commissioner of 2022 still near the overall average, and substantially more aligned with conservation, justice and access than the lowest scorers in years past, for example, in 2015 commissioners scored as low as 32%. The higher average score also reflects success in efforts to overcome industry capture that has plagued the Commission in years past. Several illegal unreported lobbying meetings were brought to light in 2016, for example, indicative of pro-development, anti-coast biases. The average Commission score was 47% in 2015 and 65% in 2016. With more balanced appointees in recent years, the Commission has been able to carry out coastal planning and permitting that advances the mission and vision of the Coastal Act, and helps address California’s challenges of climate change and rising seas. The following data takes a deeper dive into specific voting scores and trends.

Commissioners Sara Aminzadeh, Carole Groom and Linda Escalante ranked in the top three scores – with a tie between Aminzadeh and Groom.

Commissioner Groom’s last meeting was in 2022, having served since 2012. Commissioner Aminzadeh’s last meeting was in March 2023 due to her new appointment as Deputy Secretary of External Affairs at the California Natural Resources Agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Pro-Coast Votes</th>
<th>Anti-Coast Votes</th>
<th>Absences</th>
<th>Alternate Votes</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aminzadeh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*Groom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Escalante</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Wilson</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Uranga</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*Harmon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bochco</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Turnbull</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*Padilla</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*Rice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brownsey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Appointment</th>
<th>Assembly Appointment</th>
<th>Governor Appointment</th>
<th>* Elected Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The average scores from all three appointing authorities were close to equal in 2022.

Governor appointments: Averaged a score of 77%, slightly down from 81% in 2021.

- Commissioner Effie Turnbull-Sanders scored 67%, up from 57% in 2021. *Turnbull-Sanders was also absent for 8 of the 14 scored votes.
- Chair Donne Brownsey scored 64%, slightly down from 67% in 2021.
- Commissioner Mike Wilson scored 80%, up from 73% in 2021.
- Commissioner Meagan Harmon scored 73%, down from 100% in 2021. * Harmon was appointed mid-way through 2021 and cast only four votes that year

Senate Rules Committee appointments: Averaged a score of 75%, up from 66% in 2021.

- Commissioner Dayna Bochco scored 69%, up from 58% in 2021.
- Commissioner Sara Aminzadeh scored 83%, up from 79% in 2021.
- Commissioner Roberto Uranga scored 80%, up from 64% in 2021.
- Commissioner Katie Rice scored 67%, equal to 67% in 2021.

Assembly Speaker appointments: Averaged a score of 75%, up from 70% in 2021.

- Commissioner Carole Groom scored 83%, up from 67% in 2021. *Groom was absent for 8 of the 14 scored votes.
- Commissioner Linda Escalante scored 80%, down from 92% in 2021.
- Commissioner Steve Padilla scored 67%, up from 57% in 2021.
- Commissioner Caryl Hart scored 79%, up from 67% in 2021.

Best of 2022 – Brookfield-Poseidon Desalination Plant in Huntington Beach Denied!

The Coastal Commission's unanimous denial of the Brookfield-Poseidon Huntington Beach desalination plant at the April meeting earned the 'Best of 2022' position. Poseidon proposed to construct and operate a privately-owned, for-profit seawater desalination plant to produce 50 million gallons per day of potable water - what would be one of the largest in the nation.

Independent assessments showed that the project would have driven up household water rates, an impact that would fall most heavily on middle and low-income households—a serious environmental justice concern. In addition, the project’s open ocean intakes and concentrated brine discharge would have killed ocean wildlife and degraded protected habitats. The Coastal Commission staff report recommended denial based on coastal hazard, environmental justice, energy use and marine life impacts.
Just as we must thoughtfully move forward with clean energy development to avoid the mistakes of the past and ensure a sustainable, equitable and healthy future, we must also carefully consider our future water supply projects. Developing local, sustainable water supplies and investing in conservation, efficiency and water recycling is the pathway forward to protect the coast and ocean, and keep water rates affordable. California has made important progress in updating laws and policies to build a sustainable and equitable economy and society. By denying this project, the Coastal Commission affirmatively protected this progress and upheld the critical goals of the Coastal Act and the Coastal Commission’s Environmental Justice Policy.

**Worst of 2022 – Cayucos Blufftop Development**

In June, the Commission narrowly approved construction of a new blufftop residence in Cayucos that would rely on an existing riprap seawall in a 5-4 vote - landing the 'Worst of 2022' position. The Coastal Act and the County's LCP both expressly prohibit armoring to protect new development. This prohibition is one of the primary mechanisms we have to protect the coast and public trust resources from erosion and rising seas.

The new home would replace an existing home and more than triple the size. Originally, the staff recommendation precluded repair and maintenance of the existing wall, ensuring it would erode over time. At the last minute, staff posted an addendum that removed that requirement. Coastal Commission technical staff concluded that when factoring in sea level rise, the minimum bluff setback for the proposed development may be 35-40 feet, however, only a 25-foot setback was required by the permit.
California must stop building in harm’s way if we are to preserve public beaches, wildlife habitats, and equitable public access to the coast. By allowing new development to rely on a seawall and failing to factor sea level rise into the setback calculation, this approval undermines the extensive and costly efforts the state is making toward planning and protecting the coast from rising seas, and will accelerate erosion of nearby beaches. Each permitting and planning decision the Coastal Commission makes today is pivotal, and will affect whether we preserve or lose the coast as climate change accelerates sea level rise and pushes storms to ever more destructive extremes in the decades to come.

**Policy Issues**

Several major policy issues dominated Commission discussions in 2022: environmental justice, water quality, coastal preservation and sensitive habitat protections.

**Environmental Justice**

ActCoastal scored three votes by the Commission in 2022 with major environmental justice implications. Those include storm drains at Dockweiler State Beach, the Brookfield-Poseidon desalination plant (discussed above) and the California American Water desalination plant and offshore wind.
Dockweiler Storm Drains

The Commission approved an application by Los Angeles County to reconstruct a 380-foot-long concrete storm drain on the beach at Dockweiler State Beach. While approval regrettably maintains a large stormwater drain on the beach, the permit is appropriately limited to ten years and requires a long-term adaptation plan. This area is vulnerable to flooding and sea level rise and adjacent to low-income communities of color – presenting environmental justice and coastal access impacts.

The permit falls short of true justice that would restore equitable coastal access by removing the structure and finding an alternative solution for stormwater - but it does mark progress towards improving coastal access and climate resiliency at Dockweiler beach with the temporary approval and requirement for an adaptation plan. As sea levels rise, this infrastructure will block a narrowing beach and accelerate the erosive forces that already narrow it, thereby preventing equitable public access. Dockweiler Beach is a beloved, highly used southern California beach. However, it is also subject to the effects of industrial waste, sewage, and is the drainage site for parts of LAX and other major coastal districts. A better and more equitable solution must be found for the long term, such as removing the structure from the beach and capturing the stormwater runoff for recycling. It is hard to imagine this type of structure on the beach in Santa Monica, Newport Beach or other affluent communities.

Cal-Am Desal

The Coastal Commission approved a coastal development permit for California American Water (Cal-Am) to construct and operate a 4.8 million-gallon-per-day desalination facility in Marina. The facility will use subsurface intake wells which minimizes marine life impacts in compliance with the California Ocean Plan. However, the environmental justice community of Marina, along with local water
agencies, stood in strong opposition to the project due to expected impacts to the coast from industrial infrastructure and brine discharge, potential aquifer drawdown and the increased cost of water supplies. Stakeholders and Commissioners hotly debated the project’s need because a less impactful alternative – the Pure Water Monterey water recycling facility - is due to come online in the next few years. Pure Water Monterey would be less costly, use less energy, eliminate brine disposal altogether, and have a smaller footprint.

The Cal-Am desalination plant was the only “anti-coast” environmental justice outcome in 2022. The vote was split 8-2. Hart and Escalante voted against the project. During deliberations, Commissioner Aminzadeh stated that the proposal did not adequately mitigate the environmental justice impacts. Commissioners then negotiated with the applicant and increased project mitigation by $3 million for community engagement and a public access plan, and added funding for a full-time staff person for the City of Marina to work on all permitting and planning needs for the desalination plant over a period of ten years. In contrast, the Commission unanimously denied the Brookfield-Poseidon desalination facility in May partly due to the environmental justice impacts. It is important that the Commission remain consistent and strong in applying the environmental justice policy it adopted in 2019.

**Offshore Wind Energy**

In 2022, the Coastal Commission grappled with the environmental and justice concerns regarding development of offshore wind resources off California’s coast. With the Newsom and Biden administrations both supporting large scale development of the technology as a potentially major contributor to decarbonization, the planning and permitting of offshore wind development is expected
to be a defining issue area for the Commission in the years and decades ahead. The Commission approved Consistency Determinations by the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) for future offshore wind development in the Morro Bay and Humboldt County Wind Energy Areas, each roughly 20 miles offshore.

The commission ultimately approved BOEM’s determination of the consistency of the two lease sales with the state’s coastal management policies, but added several binding conditions to protect the marine environment and reinforce consultation with affected Tribes and environmental justice communities. BOEM later incorporated these conditions as lease sale stipulations. BOEM held its lease auction for the two Wind Energy Areas in December, with five companies winning development rights. The Commission will later review the construction and operation plan for each of the five projects, and will again need to conduct thorough and stringent review to ensure that developers uphold standards for environmental protection, equity and justice that define the California Coastal Act and protect the state’s coastal environment.

Water Quality

This year, the Commission cast six important votes on issues with major water quality implications. Three of those votes resulted in “anti-coast” conservation outcomes, suggesting that the Commission should strive to improve its planning and permitting practices regarding water quality. The six votes include:

- Point Reyes Water Quality Strategy (Anti-coast)
- Newport Bay Confined Aquatic Disposal (Anti-coast)
- California American Water Desalination Facility (Anti-coast)
- Poseidon Desalination Facility (Pro-coast)
- Reservation Ranch restoration (Pro-coast)
- Arcata Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrade (Pro-coast)

Among the lower scoring in water quality votes, Commissioners Brownsey, Padilla, Rice and Harmon casted “anti-coast” votes on the three “anti-coast” outcomes. The three “pro-coast” outcomes were unanimously approved.

Point Reyes Water Quality Strategy

In September, the Commission approved the National Park Service’s Water Quality Strategy for Point Reyes National Seashore. The strategy is an attempt to address dairy ranching and intensive grazing of coastal prairies that is causing a water quality emergency along the National Seashore. It calls for more frequent inspections of ranch sites and annual reporting, though falls short of committing to annual strategy updates. Several organizations, including Turtle Island Restoration Network and National Wildlife Federation, expressed concern that the Strategy will fail to hold polluters accountable. They note that the strategy lacks a firm, enforcement timeline or penalties for missed deadlines. The plan
also fails to commit to achieving water quality standards, provide a monitoring schedule, or identify a funding mechanism.

Commissioner Caryl Hart proposed an amending motion to reopen the General Management Plan hearing and ensure new long term ranching leases were not signed until water quality issues were resolved. This motion failed and the Commission ultimately approved the Water Quality Strategy as submitted by the National Parks Service.

Newport Bay Confined Aquatic Disposal

In October, the Commission approved the City of Newport Beach confined aquatic disposal (CAD) plan for toxic waste disposal in Newport Harbor. Lower Newport Bay requires periodic maintenance dredging to remove sediment that accumulates over time and impedes navigation. A portion of the sediment is contaminated and proposed for placement into the CAD facility within the Bay. Advocates argued that the CAD plan was flawed and may expose Bay users to toxicity. Alternate Commissioner O’Malley opposed the project and pointed out that there were land based disposal alternatives available not located in or near EJ communities and that the City only took a cursory review of alternatives.
By approving the CAD in an 8 to 1 vote, the Commission failed to push for innovative solutions. The status quo of attempting to throw away or bury contamination is unacceptable and must be challenged. Burying “away” unsuitable sediment, without full environmental protections, is not the best solution. Alternatives that would avoid impacting water quality where thousands recreate daily, such as dry storage or treating the contaminated sediment with zeolites before relocating was not thoroughly considered.

Reservation Ranch

In July, the Commission’s Enforcement Division brought forth a case to resolve Coastal Act and water quality violations against the owners of the 1,600-acre Reservation Ranch in Del Norte County. The property fronts the Smith River – a crown jewel of the national Wild and Scenic River program - for 3.5 acres. The restoration orders include:

- Removal of Levee Crossings and Opening of Tillas Slough to Public Access and Natural Tidal Flows
- Reforestation of one and a half miles along the west fork of Tillas Slough, parts of the slough and cattle fencing to protect the slough
- 10+ Acre Riverfront Public Access Easement, 14 Acre Riverfront Forest Land Dedication, and 2 Acre Oceanfront Blufftop Land Dedication, 17 Acre Forest Land Conservation Easement
- Cultural survey of Tillas Island

Reservation Ranch is part of sacred, unceded Tribal territory of Native Americans including the Tolowa Dee-ni’ Nation, stolen as local, state and federal governments conducted colonization and
genocide in California throughout the 19th century. Sacred cultural resources continue to exist there. In 1908, this farm was deeded to cattle ranchers. The list of offenses at Reservation Ranch includes chronic dumping of manure, trash and cow carcasses into the Smith River estuary, diverting water, and blocking public access.

Commissioners, including Sara Aminzadeh and non-voting Commissioner Kristina Kunkel, expressed discomfort with moving forward with the enforcement orders given the concerns by Tribal representatives, including their desire to reclaim and repatriate this unceded ancestral land. After much back and forth, the ranch owners agreed to a last-minute addition of 17 acres of river front forested land for a conservation easement and cultural surveys of Tillas Island. Following several hours of deliberation, the Commission unanimously approved the Orders and restoration plan. This represents one of the largest restoration projects in Northern California and will greatly enhance water quality for recreational use at the Smith River Mouth and improve public access to the coast and river. While these Orders represent a very small step towards justice for the Tribal Nations, true restorative justice for the atrocities committed towards the Native Nations and their ancestors would include resolutions beyond the scope of staff and the Coastal Act. The state, at the highest levels, must proactively support land-back efforts here and throughout California.

The California Coastal Act requires the protection and restoration of marine and coastal water resources, including water quality. The cumulative impacts of pollution affect the overall health of coastal users and marine life. Studies show that coastal areas with better water quality and less pollution are more resilient to the impacts of climate change.

This issue is particularly relevant given sea level rise and the increase in coastal storms. Extreme weather events, especially slow moving and large coastal storms, not only cause severe flooding that puts public safety and property at risk, but also generate huge surges of urban runoff that pollutes our beaches and nearshore waters.

We know that climate related hazards will get worse as time goes on, and this will especially impact environmental justice communities where legacy contamination may be mobilized due to flooding and rising seas.

Coastal Preservation

The Commission made six important votes on issues with major coastal preservation implications. Out of six votes, half resulted in “anti-coast” outcomes. Commissioner Escalante has the best record on coastal preservation votes with 6/7 “pro-coast” votes, followed by Aminzadeh and Hart with 5/7. The votes include;

- Broad Beach New House (Pro-coast),
- Brookfield-Poseidon desalination plant (Pro-coast),
- Del Mar bluffs stabilization project (Pro-coast),
- Santa Cruz County local coastal program (LCP) update (Pro-coast),
- Capistrano Beach Park nature-based project (Anti-coast),
- Blufftop development in Cayucos (Anti-coast).

**New House at Broad Beach**

In February, the Commission approved appeal of a City of Malibu issued CDP for a new home on Broad Beach with additional special conditions. Coastal Commission staff recommended several key improvements to the project to reduce coastal hazards on the site including moving the house 4 feet landward, elevating the home, removing retaining walls that would have acted as shoreline armoring and a lateral public access easement along the beach. Special Condition 2 protects the beach and public coastal resources from a future seawall and - critically - requires the landowner to remove the home or any development if deemed necessary upon government agency orders due to coastal hazards. Importantly, Special Condition 2 also requires the applicant to conduct a mean high tide line survey and seek to retain, relocate or remove the development within 180 days if a survey determines the new home is occupying public tidelands as sea levels rise and the high tide line migrates landward. Special Condition 3 requires disclosure of coastal hazards risks for current and future property owners.

Without the special conditions imposed in the Coastal Commission permit, Broad Beach – and equitable access to it - would be traded for private benefit. This CDP represents a step forward in protection for California’s coastal public trust resources and an important template of conditions for future blufftop development permit applications.

**Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization**

In June, the Commission approved a major public works project proposed by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to construct bluff stabilization structures and over half a mile of seawall along the Del Mar Bluffs to protect the blufftop railway. The permit duration is limited to 30 years, at which time the shoreline armoring must be entirely removed. SANDAG has committed to relocating the railway by 2035.
The project also includes substantial public access improvements as mitigation for the project including addressing the longstanding need for a designated rail crossing and formal beach accessway in the project area. The commitment to relocating the rail is so dramatic and so well documented in the permit that the Surfrider Foundation supports the project as a special case study in phased relocation in light of sea level rise. SANDAG has expressed the consistent message and firm commitment that it is a willing partner in this plan for managed retreat. The project was approved unanimously. This project is a positive example of phased sea level rise adaptation.

**Capistrano Beach Nature Based Project**

In November, the Commission approved Orange County Parks’ interim plan to address severe erosion at Capistrano Beach County Park. The plan includes a nature-based adaptation pilot project with a buried cobble berm and vegetated sand dunes seaward of the coastal trail at the southeast end of Doheny Beach and north end of Capistrano Beach Park. This is an innovative step forward for managing the beach park after several emergency permits for armoring spanning back to 2008. The County’s plan also includes retention of shoreline armoring seaward of the parking lot.
While OC Parks and the Coastal Commission’s innovative nature-based solution is commendable, the amount of shoreline armoring compared to nature-based protection makes this project a double-edged sword. A better solution would be to remove the parking lot and restore the entire beach. We should not sacrifice our beaches to rising seas for the purpose of protecting parking lots and non-vital public infrastructure – especially in this location where adequate street parking already exists.

**Adapting to Sea Level Rise**

As the frontline agency on the issue, the Coastal Commission is doing a commendable job advancing the state’s response to rising seas despite challenges such as the politicization of the issue, substantial pushback from local governments and affluent coastal property owners.

*California’s beloved coast is facing the devastating reality of rising seas and intensifying extreme weather, and the state has only a small and rapidly narrowing window to protect coastal resources and the public trust for future generations.*

California must decide between two options. We can sacrifice our publicly owned beaches and coastal habitats to subsidize a small number of private property owners, or we can methodically realign coastal
development so that our beaches can naturally migrate landward as sea levels rise, and thereby continue to serve as the irreplaceable social and ecological assets that they are.

Local governments, left to their own politics, are highly influenced by property owners who have an interest in promoting coastal armoring to protect private beachfront and blufftop property.

The Coastal Commission’s job is to balance those interests with protecting the public trust and all Californians’ right to an accessible coast – a concept that will be lost if the coast is entirely eroded and submerged due to seawalls.

The Commission made substantial progress on coordinating interagency progress and hosting the Local Governments Workshop on sea level rise planning in August. At the workshop, Commissioners reinforced the importance of the Coastal Commission’s role in sea level rise planning – to uphold Coastal Act and ensure standard conditions and policies are adopted locally.

Emergency Permits

The railroad tracks in South Orange County were closed for seven months in 2022-2023 after being destabilized by erosion and bluff slippage. Since 2021, Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) has been issued 4 emergency armoring permits, totaling over 26,500 tons of boulders and an extensive bluff tie back mechanism at the problematic area, shown above. It is time to start planning to relocate the train tracks off South Orange County’s beaches, as was approved in Del Mar at the Commission’s June 2022 meeting. As part of the bluff stabilization project in Del Mar, the local rail authority and SANDAG agreed to relocate the railway off the bluffs by 2035 and entirely remove the
shoreline armoring. This decision can be a model for Orange County and other places along the California Coast that are facing erosion and extensive coastal armoring due to the coastal railroad.

About the Report Card

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 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 Report Card is designed to provide both, and has been published annually for decades by the coastal conservation community.

The 2022 Coastal Vote Chart reviews 14 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 2022 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.

2022 Meeting Reports and Vote Charts

- February, Public Trust and New House on Broad Beach (Pro-coast)
- April, Children’s Pool Seasonal Beach Closure (Pro-coast)
- April, Dockweiler Beach Storm Drain Structure Rebuild (Pro-coast)
- April, Humboldt Wind Energy Area Lease Sale (Pro-coast)
- May, Brookfield-Poseidon Huntington Beach Desalination Plant (Pro-coast)
- June, Cayucos Blufftop Redevelopment (Anti-coast)
- June, Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization (Pro-coast)
- July, Reservation Ranch Restoration Orders (Pro-coast)
- September, Arcata Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement Project (Pro-coast)
- September, Point Reyes National Seashore Water Quality Strategy (Anti-coast)
- October, [Newport Beach Confined Aquatic Disposal Facility](#) (Anti-coast)
- October, [Santa Cruz County Local Coastal Program Update](#) (Pro-coast)
- November, [California American Water Desalination Plant](#) (Anti-coast)
- November, [Capistrano Beach Park Nature Based Project and Seawall](#) (Anti-coast)