

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

Attending: Brian Baird, Ray McDowell & Chris Potter (Resources Agency); Heather Schlosser & Susie Ming (USACE); Kelly Larvie (CGS); Clif Davenport (CSMW); Mark Johnsson and Lesley Ewing (CCC); Kim Sterrett (DBW); Dan Swenson (USACE); Jeff Lillycrop & Rose Dopsovic (USACE-Mobile); Dan Specht (USACE); David Cannon (Everest Consultants); Nate Strout, Jordan Henk, Paul Burgess and Petya Maneva (University of Redlands); Neal Fishman (SCC).

By phone: George Domurat & Karen Berresford (USACE); Syd Brown (DPR)

### Action Items

- ✓ An appropriate standard disclaimer for reports prepared for CSMW needs to be developed for inclusion within the reports.
- ✓ Regional Sediment Budget subcommittee needs to review Study findings and Peer Reviewer comments and recommend how CSMW should proceed with publication of the Report.
- ✓ SMP sub-committee (Clif, Chris, David, Heather, Susie, Karen) needs to work together in combining and focusing the “SMP Strategy for Implementation” (State) and the “California Coastal Sediment Master plan: An Overview” (Federal) documents.
- ✓ Heather will send out the current White Paper to CSMW and ask for comments. The Strategy for Implementation was previously distributed to CSMW, contact Clif if you need a copy.
- ✓ The SMP sub-committee will meet as necessary to coordinate the merging of the two documents, beginning in early February.
- ✓ The new document will be distributed to CSMW by the 3rd of March, two weeks prior to CSMW meeting on the 21st of March in San Francisco.
- ✓ Each agency to provide a two-paragraph blurb describing their agency’s sediment management programs for inclusion in the Website’s “partner Programs” page.
- ✓ The GIS Technical Committee needs to evaluate whether the USACE’s e-Tools Geodatabase is an appropriate structure for data storage for CSMW, due to SDSFIE data storage requirements.
- ✓ Mark and others will work to obtain and store other historical information on erosion rates not yet included into CSMW reports.
- ✓ Clif will send out a draft list of criteria for priority site selection for review along with the CBReS report previously distributed. CSMW is requested to review approach and provide input in the not to distant future so that the next steps can be formulated.
- ✓ Minutes of last meeting to be posted on the web ASAP.

# CSMW Meeting Minutes

## January 18, 2006

### Item 1: Welcome / Introductions

Brian and Neal attended the Ocean Protection Council Meeting

- 11.9 million dollars approved by Ocean Protection Council
- Authorization for 1 million dollar seafloor mapping
- Approved projects for invasive species and ecosystem management
- OPC developing new strategic plan – this group should pay close attention to process:
  - ⇒ 2 public workshops in the rapid process. Should be done in June. Good opportunity to get coastal sediment management on the agenda of the OPC.
- Hiring full-time executive officer for the OPC at around \$100,000
- Hiring science advisor – on a contract basis \$100,000 – \$120,000. This person sets up advisory council.
- Focus on once-through cooling process in power plants up and down coast and how to minimize negative environmental impacts.
- Efforts to amend the energy bill that would allow off-shore drilling. Gov. does not want it. All amendments dropped from energy bill.
- Next meeting April 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento
- Meeting in June as well (Monterey on the 9<sup>th</sup>).

### Item 2: Sediment Master Plan Products for 2006

- Most products should be finished by June, 2006. List follows Project Managers Report at the end of these minutes.
- All Study Reports should be placed on website
- Use these products to frame the discussion around each of the identified restoration sites (from CBRoS). This would be a *useful* way to use the products. Put this on the public website.
- CSMW studies have gone way past that originally proposed, and the USACE just got their funding. Rushing to produce a product that incorporates all findings so fast is putting a squeeze on the workers creating the products, and to some degree “putting the cart before the horse”.
- BB: We need to show where the CSMW is heading with this and some demonstration of tools that can help in our mission. And its OK to have “boxes” that are not completely filled in. In this respect, the CSMW needs an interim product – and a systematic way to have access to the products.
- GD: We need to explain how specific tools in the toolbox can help, even if it’s just a one-liner.
- NF: The SMP should not only provide tools for local planners to better address site-specific issues, but also serve as a guide for DBW and the USACE to identify *regional* areas that need to be serviced/receive funding!

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

### State-lead Products:

1. *SCOUP –Pilot Project Mitigated Negative Declaration*

Completed and is currently posted on CSMW website Library. Product prepared for City of Oceanside with SANDAG and CSMW listed as “Interested Parties”.

Discussion: If CSMW reports are presented as a product of a state agency (ie it has a State Seal), then it must be approved by that Agency before being made public.

2. *Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP) – Guidance for Upland Opportunistic Regional Programs (Report):*

Technical and regulatory review edits have been incorporated and report should be available for final approvals and posting before the end of January. Document will be presented as a Moffatt & Nichol report to SANDAG and CSMW.

Discussion: Needs to be approved by state before publishing. It’s recommended that each report prepared for CSMW should have a standard disclaimer to say something like: Document produced for CSMW with input from member agencies, but does not necessarily represent the official position of the member agencies. Chris Potter has some examples that could be applied to reports prepared for CSMW.

3. *Beaches, Littoral Drift, and Littoral Cells: Understanding California’s Shoreline*

Educational document developed as a Guide for resource managers, written by Gary Griggs and Kiki Patsch. CSMW review comments are being addressed. Should be finished by January/February.

4. *The Economics of Regional Sediment Management in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties*

Research and report by Phil King, associate professor of Economics at San Francisco State University. Currently under revision – should be finished by February, 2006.

5. Development of Sand Budgets for California’s major Littoral Cells

Technical and detailed report on California’s major littoral cells by Gary Griggs and Kiki Patsch. Potentially finished in March.

Discussion: Impressive document WRT information presented. Peer reviewers have expressed some major reservations regarding the budget methodology, and CSMW should evaluate how to proceed with this document. Subcommittee needed to review document before it is made available to public. Members expressing interest in reviewing include Lesley, Mark, Syd, Chris. Due to lack of time, the review period and meeting of the subcommittee was not established.

6. *Policies, Procedures, and Regulations Analysis – Recommendations to the CSMW (Prepared by David Cannon, Everest Consultants)*

Draft due on January 31, but unlikely that deadline will be met. Final now scheduled for March, similar reservations.

7. *Beach Nourishment Reference Guide: Guidance for Local coastal Stakeholders (Prepared by David Cannon, Everest Consultants)*

Draft should be submitted by the end of January, and dependant on level of interest and review by CSMW, available for publication considerations by February/March

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

8. *Analysis of Impacts and Recommended Mitigation for Critical Species and Habitats: A Guide for Environmental Documentation (prepared by Karen Green, SAIC)*

Draft now scheduled for submittal at the end of this month. Peer review to occur after, as well as CSMW review. Document hopefully available for publication considerations in April.

9. *California Beach Restoration Strategy, 2006: State Priority List for Coastal Mitigation;*  
Finished and available June, 2006

10. Various fact sheets describing SMP status and products.

Feb – June, assuming CSMW decides to begin sending them out.

11. *Mud Budget Final Report : Fine Grained Sediment Sources, Transport, and Sinks (prepared by Katie Farnsworth and David Warrick, USGS)*

Should be done in October, 2006

12. *California Sediment Master Plan – Strategy for Implementation*

Looking to have a Master Plan product in June (see above discussions). Any further development will take longer.

### Discussion:

- By June we need to identify specifics of what are we doing. What “tools” are we creating to help us do that?
- As we talked about last meeting, the general elements of the SMP need to include: 1) Identification of Hot Spots in California; 2) Priorities; 3) Tools to resolve the prioritized problems with regional solutions, and: 4) Steps to proceed further. The current version of the “SMP- Strategy for Implementation” was designed with these steps in mind, and CBReS focuses specifically on the first two items.
- The SMP Strategy for Implementation needs to have the mission statement clarified and moved to the front of the document.
- As listed on page 2 and 3 of this months CSMW PM report, tools that CSMW is currently developing for regional solutions include: 1) SCoup; 2) Statewide GIS database and web-based mapping (IMS); 3) CSA decision support tool; and 4) Website. Other possibilities include the CBReS spatial library to be developed March-May and e-tools developed by USACE Mobile District.
- Comparison of “HotSpot” vs. Regional Problem Definition
  - ⇒ USACE: Focusing on Erosion “HotSpots” discounts the idea of identifying regional problems that can then be addressed with regional solutions.
  - ⇒ KS: If you do not focus on specific locations, you will not get funding to address the problem. We have to focus on the location, and then develop regional solutions.
  - ⇒ BB: We have critically eroding areas that need to be addressed. The need for identifying and prioritizing these areas was what started the collaboration between USACE and Resources Agency. CBReS presents our findings and those areas need to be addressed first, keeping a regional approach to problem resolution always in mind.
- Discussions continued under Federal-lead Project #5 below.

### Federal-lead Products:

1. *California Coastal Sediment Management GIS and IMS Work Plan*

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

Requested by the State. Will be prepared by Everest and sub-consultants. Draft due by end of February. SOQL and ArcSDE experience needed for database person to build the database according to USACE protocols (see issue under "Geotabase", Item #6)

### 2. *Coastal Sediment Analyst – whitepaper w/ workshops*

Not a working tool so far.

MM: Tool may be functional for Ventura by June, State-wide will take longer.

3. IMS – CSMW's GIS technical committee has agreed on several layers for inclusion in a demonstration IMS, and USACE's contractor will have the demonstration site up and running by March. USACE needs MOU with DFG in order to use DFG's codes to access DFG's BIOS IMS site. This could take some time to set up. Chris Potter may be able to facilitate the MOU process.
4. Spatial database (aka GIS) – need to develop staff to be able to do this. Trying to get things ready to sub it out. State needs to be consulted before any decisions are made about the architecture of the database. State must be advised and consulted prior to any decision making.
5. *Sediment Master Plan Marketing "Colorful White Paper"*.
  - Being prepared by David Cannon, Everest International Consultants. "California Coastal Sediment Master Plan: An Overview". Draft presented today, final due in February.
  - HS/SM: Intent of document is to summarize the Sediment Master Plan and to communicate it in a way it can be easily understood by people unfamiliar with coastal sediment supply issues. Meant to be high level, strategic plan approach.
  - David looked for all info he could cobble together about what the *Master Plan* is, pulled it all together, and tried to make sense of it.
  - David presented what he saw as different State and Federal perspectives relating to how the SMP should pursue regional sediment management:
    - ⇒ **State** – Define problems areas (Hot Spots) and the associated problems within those areas and then develop solutions (technical and institutional) to address those problems. [i.e., Site analysis focus with solutions grouped in a regional context]
    - ⇒ **Federal** – Define problems with the existing sediment management approach within (and across) each region. After regions are delineated and regional problems defined then formulate solutions (technical and institutional) to address the problems. [i.e., Regional analysis focus with solutions by region yielding solutions to site-specific problems]
  - Proposed two half-page each schematic of coastal watersheds to littoral cells to illustrate how sediment is managed now and how it would be managed differently after the master plan is implemented. Consensus was that this was desirable.
  - Overall, presentation was met with "mixed reviews":
    - ⇒ Some CSMW members expressed concern that the group's focus of the group appears to be drifting- is CSMW still following their original mission statement and do the USACE and the State still have the same mission?
    - ⇒ Some people questioned the differences between this White Paper and the State's Strategy for Implementation paper, hence questioning the need for the USACE White Paper,
    - ⇒ Some people seemed to like the content of the USACE White Paper and saw a need for it, and
    - ⇒ Most members felt that the two efforts should be collapsed or, at least, heavily coordinated.

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

NF: The more you can drive this toward actual goals the easier it will be to get it funded. Don't lose the pitch that we need resources (\$) to make this plan happen. So we need to spell out exactly what are the problems.

BB: The current SMP Strategy for Implementation still needs work, but is getting there. The 30-page document (SMP Implementation Strategy) needed for distribution to the OPC and others in June should begin being fleshed out from this document after changes as noted by other discussions today. The USACE White Paper sounds useful, but he's concerned that it won't mesh with the Strategy for Implementation if not properly coordinated. It should be based on and function as an Executive Summary for the SMP Implementation Strategy.

BB: CSMW needs to form an SMP sub-committee (Clif, Chris, Kim, Lesley, Heather, Susie, Karen) to work together in developing this combined product. Get this document out for the group to comment on.

Heather will send out the current White Paper to CSMW and ask for comments. The Strategy for Implementation was previously distributed to CSMW, contact Clif if you need a copy.

The Executive Committee will meet as necessary to coordinate the merging of the two documents, beginning in early February.

Distribute the new document to CSMW by the **3rd of March**, two weeks prior to CSMW meeting on the 21st of March in San Francisco.

### **Item 5: National Coastal Databank (Jeff Lillycrop from USACE, Mobile)**

- Portal to search and access existing coastal information, both spatial (such as shape files) and non-spatial (such as Excel spreadsheets, historic photos, etc)
- Developed out of Mobile office.
- Consists of: 1.) Database; 2) Desktop ability to access database; 3.) Web-based portal (IMS )
- Network accessed through one portal. Data resides on many different servers.
- Architecture not limited to the USACE data structure
- Configured to connect to a collection of servers through the country that maintain coastal data and information
- This distributed network is not limited to spatial data, but also includes temporal datasets, such as waves, currents, tides, and more
- Available to local agencies (i.e., non-federal)
- Can search for spatial data by keyword (place name)
- Can search by data type
- Can search by time period. Metadata very important to this.
- Works by searching metadata and using metadata to point to data. SO – metadata critically important to success.

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

- Does not download directly from this site, but it clips and posts the data to another FTP site.

### **Item 6: eCoastal Toolbox (Rose Dopsovic, USACE, Mobile)**

- An enterprise GIS developed for coastal engineering business practices. It was developed to concentrate on the specific needs of the coastal engineer.
- eCoastal is a database architecture developed by the USACE that addresses spatial data standards, Geodatabase (ESRI-specific) development, and desktop and web applications. It was designed as a data management solution to provide baseline info for effective planning and prediction of regional and local coastal processes.
- This architecture allows adjacent coastal projects to effectively share and access data contained in the system.
- The Geodatabase serves as the data repository for all spatial data accessed by the enterprise GIS applications.
- Components: 1) data management (geospatial, reports, model results, historic, time series, photos) 2) dredging management (history, lab reports, placement design, incorporation of Silent Inspector data) 3) Environmental (inventory, change analysis, permitting, water quality) 4) Impact Evaluation (DMMP etc) 5) Sediment Budget Analysis (Create, visualize, and analyse).
- The Geodatabase:
  - ⇒ Enterprise solution for data storage
  - ⇒ Using the SDS ESRI geodatabase builder, a shell database was created that includes common types of coastal information.
  - ⇒ Standardized attribution makes application development and data sharing easier
  - ⇒ USACE is required to use SDSFIE (Spatial Data Standards for Facilities, Infrastructure and Environment) which has detailed and somewhat complicated structure that not all entities (ie other California State Agencies) may be able to access/use. The GIS Technical Committee needs to evaluate whether the Geodatabase is an appropriate structure for data storage for CSMW.
- The Desktop Interface:
  - ⇒ ArcGIS (ArcView) dependant
  - ⇒ Customizable tools – they can add things in that you might want.
  - ⇒ Data viewer tool
  - ⇒ Quick Mapper utility
  - ⇒ Pre-formatting xy datasets for importing into ArcView (spatially)
  - ⇒ Survey tools (works on top of spatial analyst or 3-D analyst)
  - ⇒ Creates Grids
  - ⇒ Cross-section viewer from user-defined profile points
  - ⇒ Calculate volume difference between different surveys
- Non-spatial data viewer tools:
  - ⇒ Dredge Tools (silent inspector)
  - ⇒ Profile Application

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

- IMS (eCoastal for everyone):
- Survey Application
- For more info: <http://gis.sam.usace.army.mil>
- **Q:** What about the Geodatabase format? How accessible is this?  
**A:** Data is accessible through the National Databank

### **Item 7: GIS Tools in action – Paul Burgess, et al, from Redlands Institute**

- Encourages us to reconfigure our conceptions of GIS to the idea of integrating science, management, and policy
- Portal technology – management and synthesis of knowledge
- Uses the ontology of coastal science for searching (that is, uses coastal science and all that is related to coastal science as the basis for defining search parameters)
- Slide 7: Beyond traditional GIS: Decision Support Systems
  - ⇒ A lot of R&D with decision support.
  - ⇒ Multi-criteria decision analysis
  - ⇒ Spatial decision support
- Nate shows the Salton Sea Digital Atlas

BB: The initial page with the visual links to different parts of the Atlas is along the line of what he's searching for the SMP- i.e., painting the picture of what the various documents are about and where we're going
- GRIP – the **Geographically Referenced Information Portal**:
  - ⇒ Uses IMS, or other web-based servers
  - ⇒ Uses dynamic clustering
  - ⇒ Build a tree built on semantic clusters, customizable algorithms
  - ⇒ The implication is that we could use this for the PPR information

### **Item 8: Mark Johnsson presenting NOAA Fellow Jennifer Dare's Armor and Erosion Database**

- *Bluff Erosion Rate Data*:
  - ⇒ Erosion rates taken from reports submitted to the Coastal Commission in support of development permits. Location plus lots of information.
  - ⇒ Limitations = accuracy, coverage Area, time intervals. Erosion rates must be carefully interpreted, understanding the context
- Does not include all known data sources, especially older reports and photographs. CSMW should investigate how to obtain and store relevant historical information on erosion rates not now available in digital format.

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

- *Armoring Data Set:*
  - ⇒ Captures complexity of coastal armoring
  - ⇒ Created by looking at California Coastal Records (Ken and Gabrielle Adelman) oblique photos to verify armor existence and to distinguish armoring type and material (i.e., a concrete seawall, a rock-fill groin) as well as high-resolution aerial photography for spatial location.
  - ⇒ Limitations: time (photos several years old), photo interpretation, difficulty of representing vertical component in 2-D space (that is, one stretch of shoreline may have a seawall at the toe of the bluff, as well as a revetment at mid-bluff and at the top of the bluff. How does one represent this in 2-D planimetric space?)
- Mark will work to obtain additional historic data.
- This is BLUFF erosion – NOT BEACH EROSION. Beach erosion rates are being worked on by the USGS (Cheryl Hapke) to be published shortly.
- Data is available from Mark Johnsson and includes databases as well as a pre-set ArcView set-up for viewing and querying the data. Also includes detailed instructions.
- Aerial imagery not included, but data should lay over appropriately georeferenced imagery.

### **Item 11: State Activities (Kim Sterrett)**

- *California Beach Restoration Strategy (CBReS)*
  - Based on an initial needs survey done in 1997. All coastal communities were surveyed about their concerns.
  - Noble and Consultants (Jon Moore) took the survey results and boiled the initial sites down to around 35 sites. They also proposed some concept projects. Priority on beach nourishment. If beach nourishment didn't work, then proposed alternative.
  - Phil King did initial benefit-cost analysis.
  - Sites are currently prioritized by presence of local support and time to construction. The plan is to introduce more data for prioritizing sites according to environmental, biological, etc. using the CBReS spatial library to be developed by Kelly and USACE in the near future.
  - Clif will send out a draft list of criteria for priority selection for review along with the CBReS report previously distributed. CSMW is requested to review approach and provide input in the not to distant future so that the next steps can be formulated.
- **State of California Report:**
  - ⇒ New budget out. Need review

### **Item 13: San Francisco Study Activities: (Karen Berresford)**

- Waiting for funds

CSMW Meeting Minutes  
January 18, 2006

**Item 14: Other Items**

Each agency to provide a two-paragraph blurb describing their agency's sediment management programs for inclusion in the Website's "partner Programs" page.

Minutes of last meeting: APPROVED. They will be posted on the web ASAP.

*Next Meeting: March 21, 2006 in San Francisco*

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

### CSMW PROJECT MANAGER'S REPORT January 18, 2006

This document provides a January 2006 update on various projects currently being conducted as part of CSMW's coastal Sediment Master Plan.

#### **CSMW WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT**

- <http://www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw/csmwhome.htm>.
- The SCOUP Pilot Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration was added to the "Documents" Page, as was a more direct link to the Reference Review report.
- I await response to my "call for information" from each CSMW member department (exclusive of USACE and DBW) regarding their coastal sediment programs. Needed descriptions are intended to provide highlights/overview of the member agency's sediment related programs, and would refer the visitor to appropriate webpages at the agency's own website. Please see current descriptions (i.e., DBW) on the "Partner Programs" page for examples.

#### **PUBLIC OUTREACH**

- No activities this period.
- Is it time to develop a SMP Update/Fact Sheet and distribute to the Contact List?

#### **REFERENCE REVIEW**

- No activities this period.

#### **ECONOMICS ANALYSES**

- Dr. King is reviewing my comments on the latest draft, and should have a final report for distribution to interested parties early this year.

#### **POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS ANALYSES**

- This project continues to slide and has been impacted by the project's team leader being called on to work on other CSMW and/or USACE projects. Major holes in the work product to date include inadequate writeups on local PPRs, the beach nourishment reference guide is still being formulated, and recommendations need to be recast into a "problem resolution" format (as opposed to "Individual PPR" style of presentation).
- A "PPR Subcommittee" has been formed to review the draft document for CSMW, and all members have expressed interest in getting the review completed. However, due to the current incompleteness of the report, I have placed convening of the subcommittee on hold until further notice.

#### **SCOUP**

- The Pilot Project's (Oceanside) CEQA Document (MND) has undergone public review; received comments have been addressed and the document was finalized. The report has been posted to CSMW's website in the "Library" section.
- Comments from all resource/regulatory agencies participating in the projects regulatory advisory committee have been received and our consultant (Moffett & Nichol) is currently addressing those comments. Finalized report may be posted to the Library by the end of the month.

## CSMW Meeting Minutes January 18, 2006

### **REGIONAL SEDIMENT BUDGETS**

- Dr. Griggs is addressing CSMW comments on the educational document describing sediment transport within littoral cells originally prepared by Kiki Patsch. Final report is expected this month and will be posted to the Library.
- Drs Griggs and Patsch's report "Development of Sand Budgets for California's Major Littoral Cells" has been peer reviewed by Drs. Seymour (Scripps) and Ruggerio (USGS), as well as by myself. The document contains an incredible inventory of information on the studied littoral cells and the draft version has been useful to USACE already. Some of the peer-review comments may take some time to resolve, and a RSB-Subcommittee should probably be set up to determine how CSMW should proceed.

### **BIOLOGICAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

- The schedule for submittal of this document continues to slide. SAIC's latest estimate for submittal of this document to CSMW and the peer reviewer is the end of January.

### **MUD BUDGET**

- Drs. Farnsworth and Warrick have submitted their interim report, documenting the sources and transport mechanisms of fine-grained sediment. Folks interested in reading their report should contact me.
- The final report will describe depositional areas and source-to-sink transport, and should provide information and answers for regulatory personnel and others concerned about turbidity-associated potential impacts of sediment management and beach restoration projects, particularly those using less than optimum materials.

### *CALIFORNIA BEACH RESTORATION STRATEGY (CBReS)*

- New name! Formerly referred to as "GIS Database Enhancement"
- Project combines identifying priority erosional areas and potential sediment sources with procuring and use of a spatial library of relevant GIS files to further refine potential project requirements.
- Kim Sterrett will present our initial assessment today. Final report targeted for delivery to Resources Agency prior to June meeting of Ocean Protection Council.

### **SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN- STRATEGY FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

- USACEs "White Paper" being produced to serve as marketing tool; will be presented today by David Cannon
- The Implementation Strategy presented to CSMW in November has been updated and reorganized to reflect input received from CSMW; will be presented today by Clif Davenport

### **GIS DEVELOPMENT**

- Presented separately by USACE LA District.

### **IMS DEVELOPMENT**

- Presented separately by USACE LA District.

**CSMW Meeting Minutes**  
**January 18, 2006**

**EXPECTED SMP PRODUCTS AND TIMEFRAMES**  
State-Lead SMP Projects

- 1- *SCOUP Pilot Project Mitigated Negative Declaration*: January 2006
- 2- *Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP)- Guidance for upland opportunistic regional programs*: March 2006
- 3- *Beaches, Littoral Drift and Littoral Cells- Understanding California's Shoreline*: March 2006
- 4- *The Economics of Regional Sediment Management in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties*: February 2006
- 5- *Development of Sand Budgets for California's Major Littoral Cells*: April/?? 2006
- 6- *Policies, Procedures and Regulations Analysis- Recommendations to the CSMW*: March/?? 2006
- 7- *Beach Restoration Reference Guide- Guidance for local coastal stakeholders*: March/April 2006
- 8- *Analysis of Impacts and Recommended Mitigation for Critical Species and Habitats- Guidance for environmental documentation*: April/?? 2006
- 9- *California Beach Restoration Strategy, 2006- State Priority list for Coastal Mitigation, and California Sediment Master Plan- Strategy for Implementation*: May 2006
- 10- Various Fact Sheets Describing SMP status and Products: April, June, ??, 2006
- 11- *Mud Budget Final Report- Fine Grained Sediment Sources, Transport and Sinks*: October 2006