

## **CSMW Management Subcommittee Meeting Minutes November 30, 2006**

G. Domurat, L. Ewing, K. Berressford, K. Sterrett, P. Mull, H. Schlosser, S. Ming, K. Bane, C. Davenport, C. Potter in attendance

### **Action Items:**

- 1- Clif will develop a "Request for Letter of Interest" to accompany the revised guide for CRSMP to selected local/regional entities to gauge the level of interest at those regions in partnering with CSMW/DBW, and their willingness to contribute staff, etc
- 2- A copy of Appendix C will be revised by Clif for use by CSMW:
  - a- Elements related to the CRSMPs will be gathered together.
  - b- 2007 efforts will be together,; elements scheduled for later will be pushed out in the spreadshhet
  - c- Elements that can be performed by CSMW staff will be separated from those that need to be contracted out
- 3- Everyone agreed to spend some time looking at the layout of the website and provide comments to Clif no later than December 8.
- 4- Heather agreed to send everyone a link to the IMS website so folks could try it out in their offices.
- 5- Clif will include all of LA County's requested additions to the CBReS list within the CBReS report, and limit the discussion on CRSMPs to a very brief reference to upcoming document(s).
- 6- The potential development of a Coastal Sediment Management Office (CSMO) should come up as a separate discussion and soon. Agenda Item for December 19<sup>th</sup>?

**Agenda:** 1) Provide CD/KS with input & guidance on Coastal RSM Plan development; 2) discuss SMP task elements scheduled for implementation in 2007; 3) review comments received to date on SMPSR; 4) provide CD with input on needed changes to CSMW website; 5) take early look at IMS; and 5) recognize LA County's requested additions to CBReS project locations.

### 1- Coastal RSM Plan Development:

- General agreement that any discussion in CBReS report regarding these plans should be brief, to sever the two efforts and provide for more timely issuance of the CBReS report for general purposes.
- Development of these Plans is of high priority for CSMW's 2007 activities
- Purpose of the CRSMPs is to provide guidance to regions promoting local development of the regional sediment management plans.
- DBW has monies targeted to fund two of the CRSMPs. \$120K has been set aside for what's currently envisioned as northern and southern projects.
- Potential Federal funds not as clear: RSM program fund the region/A/E Contractor's scope of work and provide oversight over the project product?

- Additional funding for future projects may be available through MMS (CIAP) and Ocean Protection Council.
- CBRReS should focus on critically eroding beaches for now until Coastal Conservancy money comes on line to help target wetlands and estuaries.
- While it's not desirable to tie the CRSMPs to updating local coastal plan, it would be worthwhile look at LCPs in the region to see if they are compatible, and make recommendations on how LCPs could be updated to facilitate RSM.
- The PMP is a living document, and could/should be rescoped to reflect the CRSMP development.
- The CRSMPs would require local groups to coordinate the regional effort through some organization (e.g., SANDAG, BEACON) that CSMW could work with. Minimum criteria for partner include authority to work on the coast and cooperation towards common goals, staff available and assigned, public outreach. CSMW provides partners tools, technical overview, assistance with public outreach, helps groups implement projects.
- Incentive for regional groups to participate is that CSMW has tools to help them develop the regional process which should make life easier for them somewhere down the line when they need to resolve erosional issues. And, resolving these concerns may be difficult for them 5-10 years later if they don't have a regional plan, since the State and Federal governments want regional solutions.
- SANDAG seems to be a desirable potential choice for a pilot CRSMP, as they have many of the minimum criteria in place, including an overall governance structure to guide overarching use of sediment. Interested and available staff are eagerly waiting to see this, SCOUP is focused and evolving within San Diego County, and CSMW's Coastal Sediment Benefits Analysis Tool is being calibrated there as well. Some problematic elements there however, due to the number and separation within littoral cells could result in a non-littoral cell based approach to sediment management. Wanting add little step – requirement to have to participate.
- BEACON may be more straight-forward as their jurisdiction covers a single littoral cell.
- Other possible locations discussed include Southern Monterey Bay, San Francisco (Ocean Beach) and Humboldt.
- Development of a JPA or similar governance structure as part of CRSMPs could be a valuable way of encouraging regional use of sediment.
- The local/regional entity should define what makes sense to them with respect to the governance structure. CSMW can contribute what we think makes sense; work with them to develop the governance tools within the region.
- RSM Governance
  - Needs to be part of the plan either by CSMW or locals
  - Localized regulation that has to be added.
  - JPA formation quasi governmental agency. Don't dictate that they have a JPA, but do have a central organization. Groups in other regions see the value and consider working towards it.
- Outreach
  - Help them establish that.

- They would do the plan, but could use the tools we have developed
- RSM tools and plan development
  - Local priorities should address critical erosion areas and other areas of sediment deficient e.g. wetlands. Wetlands are sediment sources in some places and sediment receivers in others
  - CGS maps/report identify offshore location and type of material. Quality will not be there. No grain size distribution. usSEABED might also have that information.
  - Establish source/receiver site sediment compatibility – SCOUP outlines protocols for compatibility. Regional sampling program..?
  - Desirous to provide the regional partner with a GIS platform that we craft for them to input data: metadata, data gathered remain the same. Across regions- provides consistency.
  - SCOUP negative declaration is on website. Regional general permit 67 is as well. No concrete plan to pursue programmatic EIS as of yet, however this is part of the PMP and CSMWs proposed future tasks described in SMPSR Appendix C
- Implementation would be responsibility of local group – obtain permits, funding,(including incremental cost), public workshops.
- A “Request for Letter of Interest” should be developed and accompany the revised guide for CRSMP to local/regional entities to gauge the level of interest at those regions in partnering with CSMW/DBW, and their willingness to contribute staff, etc. Funds need to be encumbered before June 2007.
- The entities agreed by the group as appropriate for inquiring their level of interest include: SANDAG, BEACON, Monterey, San Francisco and Humboldt.

## 2- SMP Tasks (Appendix C) scheduled for implementation in 2007

- Funds Available- USACE \$380K, includes in-house staff efforts. Main focus on continued GIS development. DBW- \$240K for two CRSMPs; additional funding for 1.5 CGS PYs, Turbidity Study (USGS), additional Economics study.
- CRSMPs are to be main technical focus- several tasks in Appendix C can be included in Plan development
- A copy of Appendix C needs to be revised for use by the working group to:
  - a- Pull together elements related to the CRSMPs
  - b- gather all 2007 efforts together, and push other elements out to later
  - c- identify elements that can be performed by CSMW staff versus those that need to be contracted out

## 3- Public comments received to date on SMPSR

Two sets of comments had been received before the meeting. Both were laudatory in nature, and one (Orville Magoon) offered to write a letter of commendation to the governor. The group agreed that if Mr. Magoon did in fact do that, it might help highlight our efforts at high levels of government. Clif agreed to get back to Mr. Magoon and accept his offer.

[Since the meeting, comments have been received from the National Marine Sanctuary and from Surfriders]

#### 4- Website design

- Several recommended changes to the layout of the home page and Sediment Master Plan page were proposed.
- In order to save time, everyone agreed to spend some time looking at the layout of the website and provide comments to Clif no later than December 8.

#### 5- IMS

Heather quickly showed what the IMS consisted of, with the caveat that it was still being worked on. Heather agreed to send everyone a link to the IMS website so folks could try it out in their offices.

#### 6- LA County adds to potential CBRs Sites

- This was primarily an informational item. LA County recently submitted a document to DBW, requesting that about 8 additional beaches be added to the CBRs list of potential sediment management sites, and providing project description updates on several projects already part of the CBRs list. Kim and Clif visited these sites during their recent visit to examine current conditions at various CBRs locations.
- After general discussions on the merits of inclusion, it was decided that all of LA County's requested additions would be included in the CBRs list.

#### 7- Miscellaneous

The potential development of a Coastal Sediment Management Office (CSMO) should come up as a separate discussion and soon. There are elements of the PMP that point toward that, but nothing specifically. This is a task identified in SMPSR, Appendix C. Perhaps a study should be conducted with a recommendation whether or not to set up? LTMS and DMMO provide examples. Value is permit process simplified, with the CSMO on top of who/where/when for obtaining permits; setup and maintain clearinghouse for sediment exchange. Identify funding streams is important