**COASTAL PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY**

**Talking Points for meetings with the County Board of Supervisors**

**Regarding Essential Changes needed in the County’s proposed LCP**

* We urge the County Board of Supervisors **not to vote on the proposed LCP on 10/8/19**, but to send the LCP Amendments back to the Planning Department for revisions to more adequately address the concerns of the Property Owners, Coastal Commission, and other major stakeholders.
* There has been a lack of adequate opportunity given for public input into the County’s proposed Local Coastal Plan, and less than 200 of the over 2,000 identified Coastal Property Owners have been officially notified by the County of the proposed LCP. Since this is such an important document which will affect the property values, permit requirements, and ability to maintain structures along the coastline, the County MUST officially notify all coastal property owners of the proposed LCP before it is approved by the Board of Supervisors.
* The approval of the LCP by the Planning Commissioners on March 13, 2019 was premature and ignored input from the public, property owners and the Coastal Commission. The LCP was then sent to the Board of Supervisors for approval.
* Delayed vote on the proposed LCP: The Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors will delay the vote on the proposed Local Coastal Program (LCP) originally scheduled for June 11th, deferred until September 24th, and now delayed again until October 8, 2019, to allow time for staff to meet with the Coastal Commission to get more feedback on the proposed LCP. **The reason given for the initial delay by the County was to allow additional time to refine the proposed policy amendments to address concerns of Coastal Commission staff and local property owners. However, this has not happened.** Planning Department staff have met several times with Coastal Commission staff over the summer, but has not met with the Coastal Property Owners Association to address their concerns regarding the proposed LCP. On 9/24/19 Board of Supervisor’s meeting Consent item to delay the vote on the LCP, Steve Forer, CPOA President will ask the Board of Supervisors to direct Planning Committee staff to **meet with CPOA to discuss requested changes to the proposed LCP**, and any additional changes requested by CCC, before it is presented to the Board of Supervisors on 10/8/19.
* CPOA-SC members shall be **provided with a copy of the revised LCP at least 10 days prior to the 10/8/19 Board of Supervisor’s meeting**.
* **Coastal Property Owners have the right to protect their property and structures from further damage due to coastal erosion** with appropriate shoreline protection (armoring devices such as sea walls, revetment rocks, etc) to prevent further erosion, endanger public safety, prevent injuries, as long as the shoreline protection does not restrict access to public beaches. In many cases these shoreline protection devices actually enhance public access, and protect public safety.
* Those critical areas of the coastline which are in immediate danger of further coastal bluff erosion, within the next 10 years, such as Opal Cliffs and Depot Hill near Capitola, shall be granted permits to install appropriate armoring devices before it becomes an emergency situation.
* We not only want to protect coastal properties, but prevent dangerous rock slides which could injure or kill people on the beaches below, such as occurred in Encinitas in Southern California.
* The term and condition for pre-existing shoreline protection devices **shall NOT be altered.** Those permits issued years ago, prior to or following the coastal act, or more recently issued by the County and Coastal Commission, shall NOT be changed.
* The concept of an “all cause and unlimited” release of liability, indemnification of the County and Coastal Commission, and “hold harmless” has recently been ruled unlawful in San Diego. The coastal property owner’s of Santa Cruz are not willing to sign an “all cause and unlimited” release of liability, indemnification, and hold harmless document to be recorded on our property deeds. It is unreasonable to require coastal property owners to sign a release of liability, indemnification, and hold harmless document for future, undetermined and unlimited events. We have proposed alternative language.
* Only **new permits** for new coastal development or re-development (more than 50% of major structural components), and requests for new shoreline protection (armoring devices) shall be required to complete a coastal hazards assessment, file a release of liability, indemnification, and hold harmless document to be recorded on the property deeds, or may be subject to sand mitigation fees.
* “Managed Retreat” is not a viable option for most coastal properties in Santa Cruz County.
* The proposed “Sand Mitigation fees” are unreasonable, not based on proven scientific principles, and amount to excessive tax without representation. Therefore any Sand Mitigation fees must be based on hard science and estimates of the actual potential sand loss which will occur at the site of the proposed armoring devices. The quality of the dirt from erosion of coastal cliffs will not generate quality sand to replenish the beaches.
* Coastal Hazards assessments shall only be required for new or substantially modified structures and new armoring devices.
* Maintenance and Repair of existing permitted armoring shall not be subject to the required Geologic/Coastal Hazard, Acceptance of Risk, and Liability Release.
* If no substantial structural improvements, redevelopment, or reconstruction are required, permits for existing armoring devices shall be renewed according to provisions in the original permit.
* Recognize the negative impact of the Santa Cruz Harbor and jetties on the downstream beach sand supply and seasonal sand migration.