

A Capitolan wants to add something to this lovely scene—a hotel at the base of the cliff in the back-

ground, below the Crest Apartments, and a yacht harbor just east of the groin on Capitola Beach.

— Photo by Chris Stewart

# *Erosion* **Board shy on coast plan**

The Santa Cruz County board of supervisors supports quick action to establish a strong coastal protection plan — sort of.

Board members Tuesday debated whether to throw their support behind Senate Bill 1579, a much - amended measure to make the plan drawn by the coastal commission state law. With various supervisors expressing various objections to this measure, the board voted instead on a policy statement urging the legislature to pass strong coastal legislation this year.

The vote was not unanimous. Supervisors Dale Dawson, Gary Patton and Ed Borovatz voted in favor of the motion. Supervisors Cecil Smith dissented and Dan Forbus abstained, saying he wanted to hear discussion of coastal legislation later this week at a meeting of the county supervisors' association in Sacramento.

Smith complained after the vote that Dawson's motion had "muscle me into a position I don't like . . . I simply have some concerns about it."

Smith particularly objected to provisions in SB 1579 relating to

preservation of prime agricultural land. He branded as "unrealistic" a provision in the bill defining as prime agricultural land farm property with \$200 annual gross receipts or a carrying capacity for one animal per acre.

Patton, on the other hand, said he had reservations about SB 1579 because of amendments which, in the eyes of some, have weakened the coastal legislation.

Ed Brown, executive director of the Regional Coastal Commission, agreed that "some important aspects have been amended out of SB 1579. But it's still a workable bill," he said.

Forbus said he has heard from

Sacramento that there will be further amendments. He said one reason for his abstention was that he wished to see the measure in its final form before voting on it.

Dawson led the move to endorse strong coastal protection without actually endorsing SB 1579.

Saying he believed the recent amendments addressed concerns about local control, Dawson said that it was in the best interests of the people of California to protect the coast line.

Smith said he thought the policy approved by the board "will just be put in the 'yes file' ~ it will look like we support SB 1579."

"I disagree," Patton said. "It could be used to support some weak-kneed legislation which would betray the trust of the people."

Patton noted that Proposition 20, approved by California voters in 1972, mandated that the legislature "shall adopt" a plan drawn by the coastal commission.

Smith and Dawson wrangled briefly after the vote until Patton, the chairman, told Smith to stop interrupting Dawson. Dawson had been saying he wondered whether Smith was expressing concerns as a "delaying tactic" to keep the board from taking a stand on coastal legislation. Smith denied this was the case.