



2024 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.

The California coast stands at a perilous crossroads as it faces growing threats to its environmental protections and public access rights. As climate change impacts, such as sea level rise, erosion, and wildfires intensify, the need for a strong and independent California Coastal Commission (Commission) has never been greater. Compounding these challenges, 2024 saw an alarming surge of legislative attacks against the California Coastal Act (Coastal Act), California's foundational law for coastal access and protection, first enacted when California voters approved Proposition 20 in 1976. In 2025, the U.S. federal government itself has become a major new source of threats, through the decimation of agency scientists and resource managers, the elimination of coastal grant programs, its expansive offshore oil drilling agenda, and Congressional attacks on bedrock federal environmental laws. The need for a dedicated environmental watchdog like the Commission, whose statewide legal mandate is to protect the coast for this and future generations, has never been greater.

In 2024, four state bills—SB 951 (Weiner), SB 1077 (Blakespear), SB 1092 (Blakespear), and AB 2560 (Alvarez)—sought to weaken Coastal Act protections for the environment, public access, and sea level rise preparedness by introducing exemptions for certain development activities. One even sought to redraw the geographic boundaries of the Coastal Zone in San Francisco to eliminate Commission oversight entirely. Thanks to a diverse coalition of advocates, including ActCoastal partners, all four bills were successfully amended to remove the most damaging provisions. This outcome highlights the critical importance of vigilance and advocacy in defending California's coast from ill-conceived legislative initiatives formulated to benefit only select private interests.

While we strongly support expanding affordable housing opportunities in the Coastal Zone, such efforts must go hand-in-hand with safeguarding public access and environmental protections. Ensuring that all Californians—particularly those from underserved communities—can also live in or near and enjoy the coast requires innovative, inclusive policymaking designed to serve the public interest, not shortcuts and exemptions that erode the Coastal Act's core values.

The Commission continues to play a pivotal role in protecting the coast through its careful permitting, planning, and guidance. Over roughly five decades, the Commission has upheld the public trust by advancing environmental justice, addressing climate change impacts, and promoting sustainable development that respects coastal ecosystems and community needs. It serves as a global model for coastal resource management, safeguarding California's beaches, cliffs, and surf breaks for the benefit of all.

Methodology

The 2024 report card reflects 22 scored votes. The report card does not include all votes cast by the Commission. Instead, it captures the year's most important, precedential, and consequential coastal development projects, plans and issues for environmental protection and equitable public access in California's Coastal Zone. These projects and issues are selected by member organizations of the ActCoastal coalition after the monthly agendas are posted and in advance of the Commission's votes.

2024 Coastal Commission Voting Record Highlights

The 2024 voting records reflect a year of challenging decisions for the Coastal Commission. Coastal preservation and shoreline armoring were at the forefront of many key votes, with the Commission voting against the coast on several important issues. This trend is reflected in the decline of the overall average score from 90% in 2023 to 77% in 2024, a drop of 13%, that highlights the difficulty of balancing competing priorities in the face of climate change, rising sea levels and mounting political pressures.

The 2024 average score of 77% includes individual Commissioner scores that ranged from a low of 67% to a high of 93%. And while the results show continued support for conservation from many commissioners, they also underscore the need for strong leadership to uphold the Coastal Act's foundational principles even if decisions to defend public trust resources along the coast generate pushback from private interests.

The Commission consists of 12 members with Commissioners appointed by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee and the Speaker of the Assembly. Each of the three appointing authorities selects four Commissioners, two elected officials from specific geographic areas and two public members, for staggered four-year terms.

Governor Appointments: Average Score of 72%

- **Commissioner Mike Wilson** earned a 76% score with 13 pro-coast votes vs. four anti-coast votes. His score is down from 93% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Effie Turnbull-Sanders** earned a score of 73% with 11 pro-coast votes vs. four anti-coast votes. Her score decreased from 91% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Meagan Harmon** earned a score of 71%, with 10 pro-coast votes vs. four anti-coast votes. Her score decreased from 92% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Susan Lowenberg** earned a score of 67%, with 12 pro-coast votes vs. six anti-coast votes. This is her first year in the report card, so no 2023 comparison is available.

Senate Rules Committee Appointments: Average Score of 78%

- **Commissioner Dayna Bochco** earned a score of 86%, with 18 pro-coast votes vs. 3 anti-coast votes. Her score decreased from 94% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Ann Notthoff** earned a score of 85%, with 17 pro-coast votes vs. three anti-coast votes. Her score decreased from 93% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Roberto Uranga** earned a score of 74%, with 14 pro-coast votes vs. five anti-coast votes. His score decreased from 89% in 2023.

- **Commissioner Katie Rice** earned a 68% score, with 13 pro-coast votes vs. six anti-coast votes. Her score decreased from 81% in 2023.

Assembly Speaker Appointments: Average Score of 76%

- **Commissioner Linda Escalante** had the highest vote score at 93% with 13 pro-coast votes vs. one anti-coast vote. Her score is consistent with her 2023 score of 94%.
- **Commissioner Paloma Aguirre** earned a score of 79%, with 15 pro-coast votes vs. 4 anti-coast votes. Her score is down from 87% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Caryl Hart** earned a score of 79% with 15 pro-coast votes vs. four anti-coast votes. Her score decreased from 89% in 2023.
- **Commissioner Justin Cummings** earned a score of 76%, casting 16 pro-coast vs. five anti-coast votes. His score is down from 93% in 2023.

	Pro-Conservation Votes	Anti-Conservation Votes	Total Votes	Absences	Alternate Votes	Score
Escalante	13	1	14	7	0	93%
Bochco	18	3	21	1	6	86%
Notthoff	17	3	20	2	5	85%
Aguirre *	15	4	19	3	0	79%
Hart	15	4	19	3	0	79%
Wilson *	13	4	17	5	0	76%
Cummings *	16	5	21	0	0	76%
Uranga *	14	5	19	3	1	74%
Turnbull-Sanders	11	4	15	7	0	73%
Harmon *	10	4	14	8	0	71%
Rice *	13	6	19	3	0	68%
Lowenberg	12	6	18	4	0	67%
					AVERAGE	77%

This year's report card shows a strong commitment from many Commissioners. It also highlights areas where improved leadership is essential to safeguard California's irreplaceable coast for everyone, so that it remains the ecological and cultural treasure— and dynamic economic engine— so beloved by all.

	Senate Appointment
	Assembly Appointment
	Governor Appointment
*	Elected Official

Best of 2024: Objecting to SpaceX's Expansion Plan at Vandenberg Space Force Base



In October, the Commission overcame substantial external pressure to make a major pro-coast decision when it reviewed a federal consistency determination from the Department of the Air Force regarding SpaceX's proposed increase in Falcon 9 rocket launches at Vandenberg Space Force Base. The proposal sought to increase launches from 36 to 50 per year, alongside 50 additional at-sea landings without serious review of potential environmental impacts.

This decision carried significant implications for the California coast, with expanded launch operations risking serious impacts to ocean wildlife from sonic booms, coastal access, and water quality due to the potential for unmanaged marine debris. Recognizing these concerns and despite staff's recommendation to concur with the Air Force's consistency determination, a majority of the Commissioners present voted to object to the Air Force's determination. Commissioners emphasized the importance of obtaining environmental monitoring results from current launch activities before further expansion and determined that SpaceX should submit a separate Coastal Development Permit (CDP) to ensure compliance with the Coastal Act, especially given that most of the launches are for commercial, rather than national security related purposes.

Environmental organizations such as the Gaviota Coast Conservancy, Surfrider Foundation, and Audubon California voiced strong opposition to concurrence. Their advocacy emphasized the importance of prioritizing the protection of sensitive coastal ecosystems over hasty industrial expansion, irrespective of the political power of applicants. By objecting to the determination, the Commission upheld key Coastal Act policies, including Chapter 3 sections on coastal access (Section 30210) and marine resource conservation (Section 30230), setting a powerful precedent for environmental oversight in the face of pressure from special interests.

Worst of 2024: Ocean Beach Seawall Project



In 2024, the Commission approved a \$175-million seawall project at the southern end of Ocean Beach in San Francisco, despite strong community opposition. The project entails a 3,200-foot-long, 55-foot-deep buried seawall designed to protect wastewater infrastructure. While the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) proposed a strategy of managed retreat for the Great Highway, the seawall undermines the benefits of that approach by attempting to "hold the line" against the sea. Meanwhile, this large-scale armoring threatens public beaches, disrupts natural sediment flow, and could damage the iconic surf at Ocean Beach.

Surfrider advocated for a nature-based solution, calling for the relocation of vulnerable infrastructure and the restoration of dune systems. However, the Commission voted to approve the seawall, citing the high costs and challenges of relocating the infrastructure. The permit includes conditions for sand replenishment, annual reporting, and five-year reviews, but these measures do little to address the long-term issues posed by the seawall and sea level rise expected to continue through the end of the century and beyond.

While several commissioners voiced concerns about the project's impact on the beach and surf, they ultimately approved it due to pressure around the cost and complexity of relocating the Lake Merced sewage tunnel. This decision sets a troubling precedent, reflecting the Commission's reluctance to take the bold actions required for true long-term, resilient solutions in the face of climate change. Relocating critical infrastructure would both mitigate the impacts of sea-level rise and make San Francisco's coast more resilient over time.

This vote also exemplifies the Commission's ongoing failure to prioritize effective sea level rise adaptation, reinforcing the tension between hard infrastructure, like seawalls, and more sustainable, long-term, nature-based approaches. The approval of this seawall - one that will worsen coastal erosion

and restrict public access to the beach - also highlights the state's failure to invest in more adaptive, long-term solutions such as managed retreat and dune restoration.

Key Policy Issues

Several major policy themes dominated Commission decision-making in 2024: environmental justice, coastal preservation, and coastal access.

Environmental Justice

ActCoastal scored three votes in 2024 with major environmental justice implications. Those include the Magnolia Tank Farm Local Coastal Program (LCP) amendment, support for the emergency declaration for transboundary pollution from the Tijuana River, and the Venice Dell affordable housing project.

Each of these decisions underscores the critical role the Commission plays in navigating the delicate balance between development and environmental protection, especially for communities most vulnerable to coastal hazards, contamination, and the growing shortage of affordable housing. The outcomes of these votes serve as a powerful reminder of the Commission's responsibility to act decisively in safeguarding public health, the environment, and social equity—demonstrating that environmental justice must be a central focus in every aspect of coastal policy and development.

Magnolia Tank Farm (Anti-Coast)

In July, the Commission approved the City of Huntington Beach's LCP amendment for the Magnolia Tank Farm development, which proposes a luxury hotel and 250 residential units on a former oil storage site next to an un-remediated California Superfund site within a coastal hazard zone. While Commission staff recommended several modifications to address concerns about coastal hazards, affordable housing, and environmental justice, several environmental organizations, including Surfrider, Sierra Club, and others, pushed for further modifications, such as ensuring the ASCON Superfund site's remediation before construction, groundwater contamination investigations, flood protection measures, and stronger affordable housing provisions.

Despite concerns, the Commission approved the LCP amendment with some modifications, including extending affordable housing requirements into perpetuity, a 50-foot buffer around the un-remediated Superfund site, and additional details about affordable housing for hotel workers. However, the project still advanced with unresolved questions about sea level rise vulnerability and flood risks, persistent legacy contamination, and environmental justice issues tied to the development's proximity to the ASCON Superfund site. This vote highlights the ongoing tension between development interests and the need for stronger environmental protections and community safeguards.

Trans-Boundary Pollution Emergency (Pro-Coast)

In October, the Commission voted to send a letter to the federal government urging a declaration of emergency to address the ongoing environmental crisis in Imperial Beach caused by transboundary

pollution from the Tijuana River. The pollution continues to severely affect air and water quality, degrading the health of residents in Imperial Beach and the surrounding trans-border region.

The letter, approved by the Commission, was sent to the Biden administration and federal agencies, emphasizing the urgent need for federal intervention to protect public health and the coastal environment. This pro-coast vote exemplifies the Commission's commitment to addressing environmental justice and public health concerns in the Coastal Zone, even if they do not have primary jurisdictional authority.

This outcome, and progress made on the issue, are thanks in large part to the tireless efforts of Commissioner Paloma Aguirre, Mayor of Imperial Beach. Commissioner Aguirre has championed the fight to address the border sewage crisis, bringing much-needed attention and urgency to this long-standing environmental and public health emergency. Her leadership has been instrumental in securing solutions that prioritize clean water, coastal access, and community well-being.

By successfully pushing for real, lasting infrastructure improvements and government accountability, Aguirre modeled how commissioners can be powerful advocates for environmental justice, California's coastal communities, and the watersheds and ecosystems we depend on.

Venice Dell Community Housing Project (Pro-Coast)

In December, the Commission approved an LCP amendment and coastal development permit (CDP) for the Venice Dell Community Housing Project, which will include 120 deed-restricted affordable housing units, ground-floor retail, supportive services, and public parking. This project is a significant step toward addressing the housing crisis in the Coastal Zone in Venice and the larger Los Angeles area while meeting Coastal Act requirements for public access and environmental protection. The project was unanimously approved, reflecting the Commission's commitment to balancing affordable housing with coastal access and resource protection.

The approval highlights the Commission's dedication to providing affordable housing in the Coastal Zone despite ill-considered amendments to the Coastal Act instituted in the early 80s that have limited its authority to require affordable housing. Susan Jordan, Executive Director of ActCoastal partner California Coastal Protection Network, expressed strong support for the project, noting its importance of expanding affordable housing opportunities in the urbanized coastal communities where they are most acutely needed. Commissioners emphasized the project's alignment with the Coastal Act, with Chair Caryl Hart and Commissioner Paloma Aguirre noting their support for local coastal program updates that facilitate similar housing solutions in Venice and other coastal communities.

Coastal Access

Coastal access is one of California's most cherished rights, providing the public with opportunities to experience the state's breathtaking natural beauty, from its rugged cliffs to its sandy shores. Public coastal access for all Californians will only increase in importance as temperatures continue to rise due to climate change, and natural sanctuaries to cool off and enjoy fresh air— such as our state's coastal parks— become essential public health assets. The Commission plays a pivotal role in ensuring that

these public spaces remain accessible and protected for current and future generations. With millions of visitors, residents, and coastal economies relying on safe, unhindered access to the coast, the Commission's work in enforcing coastal access laws is not just a legal obligation - it is a critical safeguard for public enjoyment, health, community vitality, and environmental stewardship. As demonstrated below, for those who seek to illegally block public access, the Commission's Enforcement Division continues to be an indispensable force in safeguarding California's coast and equitable access to it. Its work in holding violators accountable for unpermitted development, habitat destruction, and public access violations shines through in these recent decisions, demonstrating the Commission's commitment to ensuring that the public's access rights are protected, no matter the challenges. This work is reflected in several key coastal access votes in 2024.

Pacific Palisades: HMBAP LLC Unpermitted Development (**Pro-Coast**)

In a significant enforcement action, the Commission held HMBAP, LLC accountable for unpermitted development in Pacific Palisades, which had threatened public access and sensitive coastal resources. The violations included illegal grading and vegetation removal near a popular trail that offers stunning views of Topanga State Park and the Pacific Ocean. As a result, the company agreed to a comprehensive restoration plan, including public access signage, the dedication of a nearby parcel for public use, and a \$500,000 fine. This enforcement highlights the Commission's role in protecting public access and holding violators accountable for environmental harm.

Gladstone's Restaurant Use of Public Parking Lot (**Pro-Coast**)

The Commission developed and approved a permit amendment for Gladstone's Restaurant in Pacific Palisades that allows for continued use by the restaurant of a state-owned public parking lot associated with Will Rogers State Beach, while implementing numerous mitigations to address the restaurant's past exclusionary practices such as eliminating public access signage, preventing access to a public viewing deck, and overuse of the public parking for restaurant customers. The new permit strengthens beach access protections for the public through increases to parking availability, caps parking rates, and ensures access to- and maintenance of public restrooms. The permit also commits the restaurant to a plastic pollution reduction plan. This decision exemplifies the Commission fulfilling its responsibility to balance the interests of private enterprises that benefit from public tideland resources while preventing impairment of general public access and coastal resources.

Rocky Point Restaurant Enforcement Orders (**Pro-Coast**)

The Commission issued cease and desist orders and imposed penalties for unpermitted development at Rocky Point Restaurant in Big Sur, which had illegally blocked public access to a coastal trail and impacted rare native plants. The resolution included the removal of the unlawful development, restoration measures, and the creation of new public access amenities, including parking spaces, EV chargers, and a scenic viewing area. The enforcement also established a conservation easement to protect the majority of the property. This enforcement action underscores the Commission's critical role in ensuring that private developments do not infringe on public trust resources and access.

Toes Beach Cease and Desist Order (Pro-Coast)

In response to significant habitat destruction at Toes Beach in Playa del Rey, the Commission approved Cease and Desist Orders for Legado Properties, which had bulldozed native dunes in direct violation of the Coastal Act. The mitigation package included dune habitat restoration, public access improvements to Dockweiler State Beach, and a \$600,000 contribution to the Violation Remediation Account at the California Coastal Conservancy for future conservation and public access projects. This decision demonstrates the Commission's commitment to protecting sensitive coastal habitats, both for wildlife and as vital buffers against climate change impacts while ensuring that public access is maintained.

Coastal Preservation

Shoreline armoring, such as seawalls, revetments, and other structures designed to protect coastal properties from erosion, have significant adverse implications for California's coast. While these measures can protect infrastructure, they often disrupt natural coastal processes, accelerate erosion downcoast, destroy public beaches, and degrade the state's remaining wildlife habitat areas. Reflecting these destructive impacts, the California Coastal Act restricts shoreline armoring to only protect existing structures and specific coastal-dependent uses, emphasizing the need for sustainable, nature-based solutions to address coastal hazards and continued sea level rise.

Indeed, the recent *Casa Mira Homeowners Association v. California Coastal Commission* case reaffirmed the Coastal Act's ability to limit shoreline armoring. The court ruled that "existing structures" refers to those built before the Coastal Act's effective date of January 1, 1977, thereby denying shoreline armoring for structures constructed after that date. This decision legally reinforced the scientific case for adherence to the Coastal Act's provisions, and prioritizing natural coastal processes and nature-based solutions over maladaptive hard armoring.

The Commission plays a critical role in protecting our coast from the shoreline armoring that is often sought by private property owners, regardless of their destructive effects. The 2024 coastal preservation votes discussed below highlight the need for the Commission to adopt more proactive and bold strategies to ensure the long-term resilience of California's coast.

Morro Bay Implementation Plan (Pro-Coast)

The Commission approved the comprehensive Morro Bay Implementation Plan update, aiming to enhance the city's resilience to climate change and sea level rise. The plan upholds important requirements for coastal protection, including limiting shoreline armoring to defense of structures built before Coastal Act enactment. It also incentivizes affordable housing and multi-modal transportation, with former power plant and wastewater treatment plant sites undergoing a master planning process to solicit public input. This update exemplifies the CCC's commitment to sustainable coastal development and environmental stewardship.

Carlsbad Bluff Retaining Wall Dispute (Pro-Coast)

The Commission upheld staff's rejection of a proposed permit amendment to construct multiple bluff improvements, including retaining walls, grading, and landscaping, for a 5,450 sq. ft. house in Carlsbad.

The original permit was conditioned to prohibit any future shoreline armoring. This decision reinforces the Commission's policy to prevent shoreline armoring for new development, promote natural coastal processes, and protect public resources.

Dana Point Beach Road Residence Approval (Pro-Coast)

The Commission approved a coastal development permit for a new 4,132 sq. ft. residence on a highly vulnerable, oceanfront lot in Capistrano Beach, Dana Point. The project includes an elevated caisson foundation to address flooding and sea level rise with strong conditions required to minimize impacts on public trust and coastal resources, including requiring removal of any part of the structure that comes to reside on public trust land - increasingly important as the mean high tide line that delineates public trust resources migrates landward with rising seas. This approval sets an important precedent for balancing private development with public coastal rights and commonsense sea level rise adaptation, preserving public beach access despite rising seas.

Ocean Beach Seawall Project Approval (Anti-Coast)

The Commission approved a controversial \$175-million seawall project at the south end of Ocean Beach, San Francisco, despite strong opposition, discussed above in the *Worst of 2024*. The project includes a 3,200-foot-long, 55-foot-deep buried seawall to protect wastewater infrastructure. While the project includes managed retreat of the Great Highway, it also involves hard armoring, which could disrupt natural sediment flows and degrade Ocean Beach's iconic surf. This decision highlights the ongoing tension between protecting infrastructure projects in situ, the need for both nature-based solutions to combat the impacts of sea-level rise, and courageous leadership willing to make the hard choices required for sustainable adaptation, including relocation of infrastructure.

About the Report Card

The ActCoastal Report Card is produced by the Surfrider Foundation, Azul, California Coastal Protection Network, Salted Roots, the Environmental Action Committee of West Marin, and Environment California, in consultation with California's coastal 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 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 2024 Coastal Vote Chart reviews 22 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, which is legally protected by the Coastal Act;
- Potential economic impacts; and
- Potential to set statewide precedent.

The following is a list of each individual vote that determined the 2024 scores. Detailed descriptions of these votes can be found at [ActCoastal.org](https://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.

- February: Oceanside: Rio Del Mar Armoring Appeal (**Pro-Coast**)
- February: Stinson Beach Appeal (**Anti-Coast**)
- February: Trafalgar Canyon in San Clemente (**Anti-Coast**)
- February: Oppose SB 951 (**Pro-Coast**)
- February: Beacon's Beach Appeal (**Pro-Coast**)
- March: Rio Del Mar Appeal (**Pro-Coast**)
- March: Morro Bay Implementation Plan (**Pro-Coast**)
- March: Toes Beach Cease and Desist Order (**Pro-Coast**)
- April: Carlsbad Dispute Resolution for Bluff Retaining Wall (**Pro-Coast**)
- June: Morro Bay-Cayucos Coastal Trail (**Anti-Coast**)
- July: Magnolia Tank Farm LCP Amendment (**Anti-Coast**)
- July: Rocky Point Restaurant Enforcement Orders (**Pro-Coast**)
- August: Chumash Heritage National Marine Sanctuary Designation (**Pro-Coast**)
- August: Gladstone's Restaurant Use Of Public Parking Lot in Pacific Palisades (**Pro-Coast**)
- August: SpaceX Rocket Launch Increases at Vandenberg Space Force Base (**Pro-Coast**)
- October: SpaceX Launch Increase - 36 to 50 (**Pro-Coast**)
- October: Dana Point Beach Road Residence Approval (**Pro-Coast**)
- October: Emergency Declaration for Trans-Boundary Pollution Crisis (**Pro-Coast**)
- November: Ocean Beach Seawall Project (**Anti-Coast**)
- December: Venice Dell Community Housing Project (**Pro-Coast**)
- December: Agua Hedionda Dredge Project and Surf Monitoring (**Pro-Coast**)
- December: Pacific Palisades Action Enforcement (**Pro-Coast**)

<u>Issue Area</u>	<i>Coastal Access</i>	<i>Legislation</i>	<i>Coastal Access</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Access/ Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Access</i>
	February	February	February	February	February	March	March	March	April	June
	Beacon's Beach Appeal	Oppose SB 951	Trafalgar Canyon in San Clemente	Stintson Beach Appeal	Rio Del Mar Armoring Appeal	Rio Del Mar Appeal	Morro Bay Implementation Plan	Toes Beach Cease and Desist	Carlsbad Bluff Retaining Wall	Morro Bay-Cayucos Coastal Trail
Bochco	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Turnbull-Sanders	+	+	-	-	+	A	A	A	+	-
Uranga	+	+	-	A	A	-	+	+	+	-
Lowenberg	+	+	-	-	+	A	A	A	+	-
Cummings	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Wilson	+	+	+	A	A	A	A	+	A	-
Rice	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Hart	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	A	+	-
Escalante	A	A	A	A	A	+	Abstain	+	+	+
Harmon	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	A	A
Aguirre	+	+	-	-	+	+	A	+	+	A
Notthoff	+	+	+	A	A	+	+	+	+	-
Outcome	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Anti-Coast	Anti-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Anti-Coast

<u>Issue Area</u>	<i>Coastal Preservation /Environmental Justice</i>	<i>Coastal Access</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Access</i>	<i>Sensitive Habitat</i>	<i>Environmental Justice</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Sensitive Habitat</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Environmental Justice</i>	<i>Coastal Preservation</i>	<i>Coastal Access</i>
	July	July	August	August	August	October	October	October	November	December	December	December
	Magnolia Tank Farm LCP Amendment	Rocky Point Restaurant Enforcement Orders	Chumash Heritage NMS Designation	Gladstone's Restaurant Parking Lot in Pacific Palisades	SpaceX Rocket Launch Increases at Vandenberg	Emergency Declaration for Trans-Boundary Pollution Crisis	Dana Point Beach Road Residence Approval	SpaceX Rocket Launch Increase from 36 to 50 per year	Ocean Beach Armoring Project	Venice Dell Affordable Housing	Agua Hedionda Dredge Project	Pacific Palisades Enforcement Orders
Bochco	-	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Turnbull-Sanders	A	+	+	+	+	A	A	A	-	+	+	+
Uranga	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	A	+
Lowenberg	-	+	+	A	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Cummings	Abstain	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Wilson	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Rice	-	+	A	A	A	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Hart	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	A	A
Escalante	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	A	+	+
Harmon	-	A	+	+	A	A	A	A	-	+	+	A
Aguirre	-	A	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Notthoff	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Outcome	Anti-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Anti-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast	Pro-Coast