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

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING

Board of Supervisors Agenda Item 14 (8532), 3/10/20

(Notes taken by Derric Oliver, do not necessarily represent the actual proceedings. Please refer to Transcript or video/audio tape of the BOS meeting item #14 (8532) 3/10/20 @ 1:30 p.m. for more details about the Public Testimony and discussions by the Board of Supervisors.)

LEOPOLD - BOS believes in climate change/SLR; trying to craft policy reflecting unique geology of the community; CCC’s SLR guidance caused concern about implications; one size does not fit all; need to look at geologic decisions and make policy that reflects that diversity; staff good job in creating nuanced policy document recognizing the need for differing treatment; sand is different depending on where you are in the county; not a lot of sand in his district, versus so county has lots of sand; dealing with impacts such as measure J (USL/RSL), meaning urban core has development, and on the ends (outside USL/RSL) not much development, and this policy reflects that; on Opal Cliffs, never going to regain beach, but can still support increased public access, which this policy does a good job of, as we should be supporting public access; county seeking grant funds to create SMPs, been asking CCC for grant sources; biggest area of concern is what happens with the “one-time only” language; i agree with repetitive loss provisions, as have to acknowledge the world is changing; but we have allowed remodeling and maintaining of properties; when changed non-conforming structures policy, we did so because it is an important community benefit; when i think of SLR policy, we should allow people to maintain properties so long as SLR doesn’t contribute to the problem; the “one and done” policy should be limited to those directly impacted by GH/SLR-related issues; can find the balance to allow private property development/protection while providing public beach access; have good examples of that (pleasure point); moves to add an additional goal that county seek to ensure public access is preserved when loss is due to property owners; 6.4.1 - modify 2nd paragraph re further info in 20 years; amend to clarify when shoreline protection will be allowed; amend (H)(1)(l); amend (H)(1)(b)-(c) re when shoreline armoring considered in calculating setback; amend one-time only to relate only to properties subject to GH

MCPHERSON - was prepared to continue this, but Leopold’s amendments address my concerns;

FRIEND – Supports need to revise 6.4 Safety Elements and 16.10 Safety Hazard Code Amendments

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS VOTE: (4:0:1) in favor of delaying any action of 6.4 Safety Elements and 16.10 Safety Hazard Code Amendments, and pass the following motion directing staff to revise these documents accordingly**. The Planning Director and staff will revise the documents according to the motion below, and reschedule for Board of Supervisor’s meeting in three months. In the meantime, the revised documents may need to be sent back to the Planning Commission for final review and approval.

**Supervisor Leopold’s Motion was seconded as passed by a vote of 4:0**

