

**CSMW Meeting  
10 November 2005  
San Francisco**

**Welcome/Introductions:**

- Susie Ming: LA District will be receiving \$600K for the Master Plan
- Brian Baird:
  - Ocean Protection Council – working with State Coastal Conservancy, is funding projects related to oceanic issues.
  - Wants to give a presentation to the council on precisely what the Sediment Master Plan is
    - Plan of what we are going to achieve and timeline
    - Brian needs to be able to explain to his bosses what it is
    - Is there a difference between state and federal effort
    - Tiered deliverables?
    - Planning windows – 3years? 5 Years?
- Bill Orme – MND for Regional General Permit for Beach Nourishment
  - SWRCB is evaluating monitoring for beach turbidity, would like to identify a group that would benefit from the data – perhaps have standard monitoring log form (Karen Green) – anyone have monitoring log – ask Water Board for money, permittee would be required to collect the data, Coastal Commission has requirement to monitoring turbidity data – have part of Master Plan
    - Blue Water Task Force
    - SWRCP
    - Heal the Bay

**Coastal Sediment Master Plan**

- Susie have overview
- IMS, GIS, tools, workplan
- Brian – developing a plan or a tool
  - Susie – developing both a plan as well as inventory
- Phased implementation plans
  - As we gather more info, may need to adapt the plan
  - Use the tool to start making decisions
  - Hot Spots – show how data can be used
  - Show how the plan would be used, taking tools, then demonstrating
  - Could use CSA to do a demo in Ventura
- Brian Baird: hopes that as a plan we will have 2 or 3 demo projects – would like to see that laid out
- Inventory of GIS
- Analytical Tools
  - IMS
  - eCoastal tech transfer

- CSA pilot tool
    - White paper to take into implementation, outline other potential goals
- GIS work plan- Being developed to guide the construction of the GIS and the IMS to ensure State and Federal needs are being addressed.
- Public meetings – 2 – incorporate the new structure of the CSMW, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting in March.... (want to be able to show folks that we have something)
- Chris Potter –The GIS work plan effort needs to take into account Kelly’s work (she needs funding after February)
- Map out when the CSA tool could be used at other areas
- Brian Ross – CSA is an economic model
  - Model for placement of sub-optimal materials needed.
- Kelly is exploring development of a tool that would allow a user to identify environmental issues, sensitive species, land management, economic aspects related to a potential project – using Melanie’s Coyne’s and more recent data, that will put up red flags of issues and assist in priority development.
- Use analytical system to shorten the time required to get project-specific info
- Clif – requests that the State has the opportunity to look at the GIS Workplan scope prior to sending it out for bid – MaLisa will circulate scope to GIS tech committee (include Chris Potter) – would like to add users to look at scope:
  - Mark Johnsson or Lesley Ewing
  - Josh Burnam
  - Brian Ross
- Sam Johnson – CSA should not be rolled out without identification of potential environmental consequences (studies that would be required)
- Neil – Need to have a “punchy” opening for problem statement for the SMPs Implementation Strategy, with description of what we’re going to do to resolve the problem.
- Brian Ross- Many beach nourishment projects are “allowed” because of beneficial ecosystem effects. Nearshore disposal within 3 mile limit of shoreline, when primary purpose is for beach fill, can be done under Section 404 of the CWA.

**PPR Study (Dave Cannon, Everest International Consultants, Inc.)**

- Project developed due to apparently inconsistent applications of various Policies, Procedures and Regulations (PPRs)
- His research indicates that no-one has done a beach nourishment project specifically and/or solely for beach ecosystem restoration – to restore sandy habitat
- Critical definitions list – terms are defined differently depending on agency and regulation. Consistency needed.

- California Coastal Act – seen as both an impediment as well as helpful
- LA County Sand Renourishment Plan
- Local entities (debris basins) trap sand at first, then become potential suppliers
- 404(b)(1) guidelines – done by Regulatory Branch of Corps on State-Local projects, however, Corps projects are evaluated by USACE Planning. Potential Inconsistency in project requirements
- MPRSA – Section 102 or 103, MLW as shown on appropriate NOAA map that shows the 3-mile limit, etc
- if material is placed in the water with the primary purpose of beneficial use, then can regulate under Clean Water Act
- NEPA/CEQA – umbrella policy reviews, have to be in compliance with other regs, but doesn't mean that you are in compliance with NEPA/CEQA
- CZMA – focuses on Section 3 of Coastal Act
  - CCD (Coastal Consistency Determination) and CDP (Coastal Development Permit)
- Recommendations
  - Consider a 2-prong strategy- working within existing PPRs, and working to change or develop new PPRs.
  - PPRs categorized by government level (Federal, State and Local)
  - Federal PPRs
    - Develop general permits under CWA Section 404 involving relatively small sediment loading rates analogous to the Nationwide permit issued by the USACE for wetlands
  - Utilize the TMDL Program to establish criteria aimed at maintaining an adequate deliver of beach-compatible sediment to the beaches.
  - Dedicated State fund for the matching funds needed to design and construct the beach nourishment projects that are currently authorized or under study by the USACE.
  - Develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing local PPRs
  - Consider developing modifications to NEPA to require the analysis of impacts to beach sand supply for all projects.
  - Develop a “no net loss of beaches” or “no net loss of coastal sediment”
  - Propose legislation to authorized the Fed gov't to mitigate .....
- Is the State authorized to mitigate for State projects
- New sub-committee formed to discuss and address the consultant's recommendations to CSMW
- Target is Nov. 23<sup>rd</sup> to have final draft for CSMW subcommittee review.

### **SMP Implementation Strategy**

- What is the sediment master plan – is it separate from the implementation document?
- Brian – in June (present to Ocean Protection Council) – will there be a document that lays out “the plan” – need to prioritize the activities – need

- to put into an actual plan of work – wants to be able to describe the plan (with the use of these tools we will be able to do this.....)
- Clif – trying to develop the plan – wordsmith Clif’s strategy outline....
  - Col. Feir – objective is to do something with certain outcomes
    - Tools need to support the plan/project
  - Brian – Process started with his conversation with Corps HQ that indicated CA needed to have a document that identified hot spots in order to obtain funding.
    - What are the problems?
    - The California Shoreline Survey 2000 (draft, never finalized) has already identified the hot spots
  - Lesley – trying to establish a new framework for how all projects will be evaluated – establishing basic tools – trying to redrive all projects in CA
    - Respond better to the projects that are available
  - Brian Baird– needs to see a document that has all problems, map with hot spots, prioritization, tools identified, here’s the statewide plan
    - How do we focus our interests
    - Would like to see this now–we have elements of this already, need to put it together– start with PMP – more simplified document, but with a map of hot spots.
    - Action Item: Clif and Kim will bring a draft of the document to CSMW in January 2006.
  - Current and Ongoing Actions wrapped into purpose and goals
  - **Action Item – Develop a unified Implementation Strategy, looking at components, purpose statement timelines, based on PMP, SMP Study findings, and Brian’s needs for OPC – early to mid January – 2 pages**
  - The “Why” needs to include economic data – identify the benefits
  - Recommended Actions – number of individual steps that relate to implementation
    - Establish prioritized list of RSM needs and potential projects for the next 5-10 years to convey project funding priorities.
    - Establish RSM priorities at the state and regional levels based on economic, environmental and cultural benefits and costs
      - Have a temporary list of critical requirements to drive database that Kelly is working on, need to refine and start implementing
    - Plan regionally by evaluating project impacts and benefits on a littoral cell basis
      - Drive regional planning, look at benefits on a regional basis
    - Continue outreach efforts with NGO, public and government entities utilizing public workshops and website
    - Continue development of CSMWs SMP GIS and Web-based mapping tools as well as coastal sediment management DSTs

- Problem statement of why we need tools (talk about lost opportunities, etc, and these tools will help to take advantage of opportunities)
- Lead a series of technical workshops with regulatory and project proponent staff to develop science-based approaches to minimizing impacts to natural resources
  - Go from agency to agency and city to city – if you do things a certain way, it will help with projects (standardized approaches to think of projects) – tie to state efforts in ocean resources
- Expand network of governmental and NGO contacts to include wetlands and watershed groups, local and regional entities to help establish regional priorities and strategies
  - Focused on beach nourishment now, need to look at wetlands and watersheds
  - Ports and harbors, county organizations
- Address recommended changes in federal, state and local laws and procedures to facilitate increased sand to the coast and minimize inconsistencies
- Expand the scope and define the timing of the SMP Implementation activities in order to reflect regional differences across California in a time-sequenced manner
  - Come up with agreed upon approach
- Establish working relationships with agencies having jurisdictional responsibilities towards pollutants to develop sediment management solutions that work for all parties
- Assess whether the development of a Coastal Sediment Management Office can/should be set up similar to the Dredged Materials Management Office (DMMO)
  - One-stop shop for folks that have coastal sediment issues
- Establish a dedicated source of funds for beach nourishment programs
  - Recommended by Marlowe
  - Ocean Protection Council – will be looking for funding sources (Neil)
- Investigate and help facilitate long-term solutions to regional sediment management, and
  - Want to stay involved in dam removal, creek restoration, etc
- Realign the current programs that fund coastal restoration with an agency more involved with funding of coastal projects.
  - Should Public Beach Restoration Program change agencies? (Coastal Commission, Coastal Conservancy)

Brian Ross- Focus of CSMW to date has been on Planning and Tools to help solve problems, but not on actually solving problems. The CSMO model just

mentioned should not only focus on coordination but also on trying to solve specific problems.

### **EPA Region 9 Activities and Noyo Harbor Dredged Sediment Management Issues (Brian Ross)**

- Our actions are good, but while we are “making plans”, regulators still have to continue making decisions
- Outreach – need to get groups like CMANC sooner rather than later so that they don’t become an impediment (CMANC here in January?)
- Don’t see anything that is going to actually solve a problem for someone. Tools to help solve problems. Would like to see Master Plan actually solving project specific problems.
  - Noyo is one of these problems. Have clean sand – barging ~120 miles away because it’s the closest ODMDS. Hitting local roadblocks – no way to elevate it up the line. (Syd Brown interested/involved)
  - Want to recommend that this group be used to help with project-specific issues – a higher level issue group
- George – perhaps a subset of the CSMW could meet more often to discuss those issues
- ½ day meeting at the next meeting?

### **State Study Activities**

- Reapplied to NOAA for funding with CSMW as partner as well as FL (need a Gulf Coast partner)

### **LA District Activities**

- Project funding – will send

### **SF District Activities**

- Project funding

### **Coastal America Involvement**

- Will engage them to bring in other federal agencies

### **Other items**

- NSMS – starting again
- CalCoast – April 19-20 symposium in Sacramento
  - Symposium at Scripps beginning of December

**Next Meeting January 18<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 in Los Angeles**