

+

jects did not evidence any deterioration of mental or social functioning which could be attributed solely to marijuana use."

Marijuana users in America include middle-aged legislators, housewives, businessmen and policemen. These people are not criminals and the law should recognize that reality.

Help yourself, help police, and reduce drug abuse. VOTE YES.

**JOEL FORT, M.D.**  
Public Health Specialist and Criminologist; former Consultant on Drug Abuse for the World Health Organization  
**MARY JANE FERNANDEZ**  
Educator  
**GORDON S. BROWNELL, J.D.**  
Former Member of White House Staff (1969-1970)

<b>20</b>	<b>COASTAL ZONE CONSERVATION ACT. Initiative.</b> Creates State Coastal Zone Conservation Commission and six regional commissions. Sets criteria for and requires submission of plan to Legislature for preservation, protection, restoration and enhancement of environment and ecology of coastal zone, as defined. Establishes permit area within coastal zone as the area between the seaward limits of state jurisdiction and 1000 yards landward from the mean high tide line, subject to specified exceptions. Prohibits any development within permit area without permit by state or regional commission. Prescribes standards for issuance or denial of permits. Act terminates after 1976. This measure appropriates five million dollars (\$5,000,000) for the period 1973 to 1976. Financial impact: Cost to state of \$1,250,000 per year plus undeterminable local government administrative costs.	<b>YES</b>	
		<b>NO</b>	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 27, Part II)

**General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

A "Yes" vote on this initiative statute is a vote to create the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission and six regional commissions; to regulate, through permits issued by the regional commissions, development within a portion of the coastal zone (as defined); and to provide for the submission of a California Coastal Zone Conservation Plan to the Legislature for its adoption and implementation. The statute would terminate on the 91st day after final adjournment of the 1976 Regular Session of the Legislature.

A "No" vote is a vote against adopting the measure.

For further details, see below.

**Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

This initiative statute would enact the "California Coastal Zone Conservation Act of 1972." The principal provisions of the act would:

1. Create the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission and six regional commissions. The regional commissions would be composed of members of the boards of supervisors, city councilmen, and members of regional agencies, plus an equal number of knowledgeable members of the public. The state commission would consist of a representative from each of the regional commissions, plus an equal number of knowledgeable members of the public.

2. Require the state commission to submit to the Legislature, by December 1, 1975, a California Coastal Zone Conservation Plan based on studies of all factors that signifi-

(Continued on page 52, column 1)

**Cost Analysis by the Legislative Analyst**

This initiative declares that the California coastline is a distinct and valuable resource and it is state policy to preserve, protect and, where possible, restore the natural and scenic resources of the coastal zone for present and succeeding generations. The coastal zone generally includes the land and water area extending seaward about three miles and inland to the highest elevation of the nearest coastal range. In Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego Counties the inland boundary can be no more than five miles.

The initiative would create one state and six regional commissions to:

1. Study the coastal zone and its resources,
2. Prepare a state plan for its orderly, long-range conservation and management, and
3. Regulate development by a permit system while the plan is being prepared.

The commissions begin February 1973. They must adopt the plan by December 1975 and terminate after adjournment of the 1976 Legislature which presumably would establish a permanent commission based on the plan. Commission membership would be balanced between local government officials and state appointed members.

The initiative requires the commission to study a broad range of subjects pertaining to the coastal zone. The final plan must include recommendations on:

1. Ecological planning principles and assumptions for determining suitability and extent of development.
2. Land use.

(Continued on page 52, column 2)

## Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

(Continued from page 51, column 1)

cantly affect the "coastal zone," generally defined as land and water area extending seaward to the outer limit of the state jurisdiction and inland to the highest elevation of the nearest coastal mountain range.

3. Require each regional commission, in cooperation with appropriate local agencies, to make recommendations to the state commission relevant to the coastal zone plan by April 1, 1975.

4. Beginning February 1, 1973, require a permit from a regional commission for any proposed development (with specified exemptions) within the "permit area," defined, generally, as that portion of the coastal zone lying between the seaward limit of the jurisdiction of the state and 1,000 yards landward from the mean high tide line, subject to various exceptions. Provision is made for appeals to the state commission and to the courts.

5. Define "development" to include the following activities when conducted on land or in or under water:

(a) Placement or erection of any solid material or structure.

(b) Discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste.

(c) Grading, removing, dredging, mining, or extraction of any materials.

(d) Change in the density or intensity of use of land, including, but not limited to, subdivision of land and lot splits.

(e) Change in the intensity of use of water, ecology related thereto, or access thereto.

(f) Construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public, or municipal utility.

(g) Removal or logging of major vegetation.

6. Provide criminal penalties for violation of provisions relating to conflict of interest and specify civil fines for violation of other provisions of the act.

In addition, the initiative statute would add provisions to:

1. Require each county and city to transmit to the state commission a copy of each tentative map of any subdivision located in the portion of the coastal zone within its jurisdiction.

2. Appropriate \$5,000,000 to the state commission to support it and the regional commissions for the fiscal years 1973 to 1976, inclusive.

3. Terminate the initiative statute on the 91st day after final adjournment of the 1976 Regular Session of the Legislature.

4. Authorize the Legislature, by two-thirds vote, to amend the initiative statute "in order to better achieve the objectives" of the statute.

## Cost Analysis by the Legislative Analyst

(Continued from page 51, column 2)

3. Transportation.
4. Public access.
5. Recreation.
6. Public services and facilities including a powerplant siting study.
7. Ocean mineral and living resources.
8. Maximum desirable population densities.
9. Reservations of land or water for certain uses or prohibited uses.
10. Recommendations for governmental policies, powers and agencies to implement the plan.

The regional commissions, cooperating with local agencies, prepare plan recommendations to the state commission, which shall prepare and adopt the plan for submission to the Governor and Legislature.

During the four years the initiative would be in effect, new developments by any person or state or local agency in the permit area of the coastal zone would be severely restricted. The permit area includes generally the sea and 1,000 yards inland but excluding area under the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Certain urban land areas may also be excluded. No development permit shall be issued unless the regional commission, or the state commission on appeal, has found that the development will not have any substantial adverse environmental or ecological effect and will be consistent with objectives of the initiative which specify orderly, balanced preservation and utilization of coastal zone resources, maintenance of quality of the coastal zone environment, avoidance of irreversible commitments and other stated considerations.

The Legislature may amend the initiative by a two-thirds vote to achieve the objectives of the measure.

The direct state cost is \$5 million appropriated to support the commission through 1976 from a fund created in 1971 with \$40 million of the one-time revenue from withholding state personal income taxes.

Although staff and funds for the Comprehensive Ocean Area Plan (COAP) are to be transferred to the commission, no funding was provided for COAP in 1972-73.

The state plan must propose reservation of land or water in the coastal zone for certain uses or prohibition of certain uses. The acquisition of such land would probably be necessary but would require additional legislation. However, stringent application of the permit processes could result in unknown damages from inverse condemnation suits on lands not acquired. Oil and gas extraction would probably be restricted, reducing revenues to the state from extraction and possibly resulting in damages for loss of oil production.

(Continued on page 53, column 2)

### Argument in Favor of Proposition 20

Save California's beaches and coastline for the people of California, vote YES on this proposition.

#### THE PROBLEM

Our coast has been plundered by haphazard development and land speculators. Beaches formerly open for camping, swimming, fishing and picnicking are closed to the public. Campgrounds along the coast are so overcrowded that thousands of Californians are turned away. Fish are poisoned by sewage and industrial waste dumped into the ocean. Duck and other wildlife habitats are buried under streets and vacation homes for the wealthy. Ocean vistas are walled off behind unsightly high rise apartments, office buildings, and billboards. Land speculators bank their profits, post their "no trespassing" signs and leave the small property owner with the burden of increased taxes to pay for streets, sewers, police and fire protection. The coast continues to shrink.

#### THE REASONS FOR THE PROBLEM

Massive construction projects are often approved solely to benefit corporate landowners. We need a coastal plan, but responsibility is fragmented among 45 cities, 15 counties and dozens of government agencies without the resources to evaluate and prevent developments whose destructive effects may overlap al boundaries.

#### THE SOLUTION?

Your YES vote!

#### YOUR YES VOTE WILL:

- (1) Give the people direct participation in planning. No important decisions will be made until commissions hold public hearings and the citizen is heard. Coastal commissions are composed in equal number of locally elected officials and citizens representing the public;
- (2) Furnish immediate protection of California's beaches from exploitation by the corporate land grab;
- (3) Prevent tax increases resulting from irresponsible developments;
- (4) Stimulate growth of the \$4.2 billion annual tourist industry and make new jobs;
- (5) Stop our beaches from becoming the exclusive playground of the rich;
- (6) Bring a runaway construction industry back to the cities where jobs and new homes are needed;
- (7) Use the coast to enrich the life of every Californian;
- (8) Prevent conflicts of interest. Tough provisions modeled after federal law will keep coastal commissioners from planning for personal profit.
- (9) Develop a fair Statewide Plan for balanced development of our coast.
- (10) Increase public access to the coast.

(Continued in column 2)

### Cost Analysis by the Legislative Analyst

(Continued from page 52, column 2)

The commission may, in its discretion, require a reasonable filing fee to permit applications and the reimbursement of expenses. Therefore, the revenues received depend on fee schedules established by the commission.

Local agencies would have some additional costs assisting the regional commissions in planning and forwarding applications for permits. There are 15 counties within the coastal zone and an estimated 40 cities. The size of their workload would depend largely on the precise location of permit area boundaries and the exclusion of urban areas as determined by the regional commissions. Deferral of developments along the shoreline would also defer local property revenues.

(Continued from column 1)

#### THE SAFEGUARDS:

(1) This act will not impose a moratorium or prohibit any particular kind of building, but ensures that authorized construction will have no substantial adverse environmental effect;

(2) Homeowners can make minor repairs and improvements (up to \$7,500) without any more permits than needed now;

(3) The Legislature may amend the act if necessary.

#### YOUR YES VOTE ENACTS A BILL:

(1) Supported by more than 50 Republican and Democratic state legislators;

(2) Almost identical to legislation killed year after year by lobbyists in Sacramento;

(3) Modeled after the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission established by the Legislature in 1965, which has operated successfully to plan and manage the San Francisco Bay and its shoreline;

(4) Sponsored by the California Coastal Alliance, a coalition of over 100 civic, labor, professional and conservation organizations.

#### VOTE YES TO SAVE THE COAST

JOHN V. TUNNEY

United States Senator

DONALD L. GRUNSKY

State Senator

(R—Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo and San Benito Counties)

BOB MORETTI

Assemblyman

Speaker—California State Assembly

#### Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 20

The proponents' Argument for Proposition 20 is a textbook example of circumvention of the facts.

It is filled with such misleading statements as "protection of California's beaches from exploitation by the corporate land grab";