

**California Coastal Sediment Master Plan
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation**

Stakeholder Meeting 4 (Eureka Littoral Cell)

November 6, 2014 (9:00am to 12:00pm)

**Humboldt Bay Harbor District (Conference Room)
601 Startare Drive (Woodley Island)
Eureka, California 95501**

Notes

1. CSMW Welcome (Jack Crider)

Jack Crider called the meeting to order at 9:05am, and he welcomed everyone to the meeting on behalf of BEACON, State of California, Coastal Sediment Management Working Group (CSMW), and USACE. Jack briefly reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A) and had everyone introduce themselves.

2. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Overview (Chris Potter)

Chris delivered an introductory presentation to set the stage for the rest of the meeting. The presentation included information regarding the principles of regional sediment management, the CSMW Sediment Master Plan (SMP), coastal processes (physical and biological), resource protection, and regulatory issues. A summary list of activities implemented by or with assistance from the CSMW was presented, along with some context regarding how the resulting products are being used by stakeholders for sediment management activities. The final point made during this presentation was that the next step in CSMW's effort is to utilize the information prepared to date (since 2004) to prepare a statewide SMP based heavily on the information in the coastal regional sediment management plans (CRSMPs) prepared over the past six to seven years. The SMP is slated for completion by the end of 2015, so timely input from stakeholders will be important.

3. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary (David Cannon)

David delivered a presentation that summarized the overall scope of work for the current project. He also presented a list of the primary objectives for Stakeholder Meeting 4. He directed the stakeholders to keep these objectives in mind, in particular during Agenda Item 6 (Stakeholder Input). David explained to the stakeholders that the focus of this meeting would be different than the first three meetings that were conducted in southern California between June 2014 and October 2014. This is because the Eureka CRSMP has not been completed yet, so the focus of this meeting will be modified such to encourage stakeholders to provide input relative to the completion of the Eureka Littoral Cell CRSMP. David made it clear that the stakeholders are also encouraged to provide input relative to development and implementation of the SMP.

4. Eureka Littoral Cell Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David Cannon)

David presented a summary of the Eureka Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (ELC CRSMP) prepared for the CSMW by Moffatt & Nichol (M&N). David informed the stakeholders that the presentation was delivered by Dilip Trivedi (M&N) at the 2012 Headwaters to Oceans (H2O) conference so it is acknowledged that material is somewhat dated. John informed the stakeholders that, although dated the presentation represents the most current information for that effort since no additional work has been completed on the ELC CRSMP. John told the stakeholders that, as the regional project manager for the CRSMP funding agency (USACE) he will be working to complete the ELC CRSMP by the end of this fiscal year (September 30, 2015).

5. GIS/Web Mapper (John Dingler)

John discussed the types of data that CSMW is collecting and how the public can access those data online. Integral to CSMW's data collection and sharing are the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and the specific GIS web mapper tool developed to assist coastal sediment management activities. He walked through various screen shots to illustrate various capabilities of the GIS web mapper tool. John concluded with directions for stakeholders to access the GIS web mapper tool as well as CSMW's Coastal Sediment References searchable database, and he provided contact information for stakeholders that want more information.

6. Stakeholder Input (All)

David opened up the meeting to discussion and input. Attendees were asked to provide input regarding any and all topics discussed during the presentations in the context of preparing the Final ELC CRSMP. Notes taken during this portion of the meeting are presented in Attachment B (Stakeholder Input).

7. Next Steps (David Cannon)

David summarized the next steps to be conducted to complete the scope of work for the current project. The next steps included compiling information regarding both the stakeholder outreach and plan formulation components of the scope of work. In addition, a timeframe of Summer 2015 was provided for each outreach and plan formulation task in the scope of work.

8. Adjournment (All)

David adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.

ATTACHMENT A

**California Coastal Sediment Master Plan
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation**

Stakeholder Meeting 4 (Eureka Littoral Cell)

November 6, 2014 (9:00am to 12:00pm)

**Humboldt Bay Harbor District (Conference Room)
601 Startare Drive (Woodley Island)
Eureka, California 95501**

Conference Call Info:

Telephone No.: 888-273-3658

Access Code: 7951308

Security Code: 1111

Web Meeting Information:

Website: <https://www.webmeeting.att.com>

Meeting Number: 888-273-3658

Access Code: 7951308

Agenda

1. Introduction (Jack) [5 min]
2. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Overview (Chris) [20 min]
3. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary (David) [15 min]
4. Eureka Littoral Cell Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David) [15 min]
5. GIS/Webmapper (John) [15 min]
6. Stakeholder Input (All) [90 min]
7. Next Steps (David) [5 min]
8. Adjournment (All)

ATTACHMENT B – Stakeholder Input

California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Public Outreach and Plan Formulation

Stakeholder Meeting 4 (Eureka Littoral Cell)

**Humboldt Bay Harbor District (Conference Room)
601 Startare Drive (Woodley Island)
Eureka, California 95501**

1. It was suggested that the proposed scenarios in the Draft ELC CRSMP should be reviewed for feasibility based on suitable sediment availability. As described, this would include an evaluation of the various sediment sources to establish the potential quantities of various materials (e.g., coarse sand, fine sand, silts & clays) available via different construction methods (e.g., hopper dredge, hydraulic cutterhead dredge). This information would be compiled into a matrix that would include the estimated needs for the various scenarios in terms of sediment type, sediment quantity, and dredge equipment type.
2. One of the issues that has an adverse impact on regional sediment management is the requirement that the USACE place dredged sediment at a site designated to be the Federal Standard. The Federal Standard requires the USACE use the most cost-placement site during maintenance dredging of the federal navigation channels. For example, even though it might make more sense to place dredged material within the littoral cell to provide a beneficial use, an offshore site would be required by the Federal Standard if it is the most cost-effective. The stakeholders suggested that ELC CRSMP include a recommendation to pursue activities aimed at changing the Federal Standard.
3. It was noted that the current publicly accessible Draft of the ELC CRSMP does not include consideration of sea level rise (SLR; the most recent, unreleased draft does consider it). For example, SLR would have an adverse impact the Eureka Littoral Cell through increases in beach erosion and inundation of coastal salt marsh habitat resulting in habitat type conversion to mudflat and subtidal habitats. The stakeholders suggested that the Final ELC CRSMP should include consideration of sea level rise (Note: it does) and that such consideration should be based on the latest SLR guidance. Engagement with the SLR working group was suggested to assist this effort with Aldaron Laird taking the lead for the engagement.
4. The stakeholders pointed out that there have been numerous changes within the area since the last public draft of the ELC CRSMP was assembled. These changes include the implementation of projects and programs that affect regional sediment management as well as staff changes for many of the stakeholders. For example, it was pointed out that the California State Coastal Conservancy has funded several studies (e.g., SLR vulnerability/adaptation and wetlands restoration) that will provide information that should be incorporated into the ELC CRSMP (Note: that work is acknowledged). Another example is the recent purchase of a hydraulic cutterhead dredge by the Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District (HBHRCD) to implement an annual dredging program within Humboldt Bay. It was suggested that the Final CRSMP should be updated to reflect as many of these changes as possible or, at least, to acknowledge such changes. It would also be helpful if the stakeholders could be reengaged again once the ELC CRSMP is updated.

5. Stakeholders identified the lack of interagency coordination for dredging activities within the area as a potential impediment to effective regional sediment management. There was some discussion about regional coordination conducted in other areas with questions regarding how such work is coordinated in those areas. For example, the Dredged Material Management Office and Dredged Material Management Team handle agency coordination of dredging activities within San Francisco Bay and southern California, respectively. The stakeholders suggested that the Final ELC CRSMP should include the formation of a similar group for the Eureka Littoral Cell, especially as it relates to Humboldt Bay. Engagement with the Humboldt Bay Initiative sediment working group should be included as a step in this process. Another possible step or interim measure would be to form a working group composed of various stakeholders. The USACE-SPL could prepare a letter to federal agencies (e.g., NOAA) identifying a local sponsor (e.g., HBHRCD) that could be used by federal agencies to provide the necessary mechanism to get involved on the working group. A similar letter could be prepared by the California Natural Resources Agency to involve of state agencies on the working group.
6. There was a lengthy discussion regarding littoral processes in the area with focused discussion of the sediment budget, wave transport, bay circulation, and fluvial sediment inputs. The consensus opinion of the stakeholders was that these processes are not adequately understood, and that additional work needs to be done prior to implementation of the various scenarios in the ELC CRSMP. The stakeholders suggested that these needs be added as information gaps in the ELC CRSMP. Jeff Anderson indicated that he would provide a list of research data gaps to help this effort.
7. The stakeholders indicated that the ELC CRSMP should include a discussion and analysis of the historical context for the region (much of this is in the CRSMP). For example, some literature sources indicate that the northerly and southerly longshore transport rates are in balance. Other sources, however, indicate the opposite. In many cases, however, it is not clear what timeframe the various studies are referring to. Moreover, it may be that each study was correct in the results and conclusions associated with the period of analysis used for that work; a review of the historical context, however, may reveal that historical land uses and human activities created a surplus of sediment in recent times. This surplus could be on the verge of being exhausted, especially in light of future changes expected to be associated with climate change. In other words, activities planned and implemented now should be formulated in the context of historical conditions as well as expected future conditions (e.g., SLR).
8. Some stakeholders suggested that the ELC CRSMP include activities that could be implemented in the upper watersheds to manage sediment (e.g., erosion control, land-use changes, debris basins, wetlands restoration).
9. To increase the ability of communities to tap into state funds for beach nourishment, it was suggested that the state develop a formalized application process for the two state beach nourishment programs, both of which are run by California State Parks, Division of Boating and Waterways.
10. The stakeholders requested that the first draft of the Final ELC CRSMP be circulated for review and comment prior to release of the Final ELC CRSMP.