

CSMW Meeting

San Francisco, Sacramento, Los Angeles

Video Teleconference

3 March 2004

9:30 A.M.

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Introductions - George Domurat and Brian Baird**
- 2. Master Plan Workshop Report - Steve Sachs**
- 3. Master Plan - Other Projects - Website - Clif Davenport**
- 4. Membership in CSMW - All**
- 5. American Shore and Beach Association DC Coastal Summit - Aceti, Domurat, Ewing**
- 6. National Shoreline Management Study - Brumbaugh, Martin, Pope, Chestnutt**
- 7. Section 227 Program - Susie Ming, Tony Risko**
- 8. State Study Activities - Kim "Edwin" Sterrett**
- 9. Los Angeles District Study Activities - Susie Ming, Tony Risko**
- 10. San Francisco District Study Activities - Karen Berresford**
- 11. Other items as time permits - All**
- 12. Next Meeting - All**

DRAFT MINUTES

1. Introductions: Attendance

Andy Morang	ERDC
Brian Baird	Res. Agency CSO
Chris Higgins	CGS
Clif Davenport	DBW/CGS
George Domurat	USACE SPD
Heather Sumerell	USACE SPL
Jennifer Gear	CCC
Joan Pope	ERDC
John Stauble	ERDC
Karen Berresford	USACE SPN
Mark Johnson	CCC
Lesley Ewing	CCC
Lynne Martin	IWR
Peter Ruggiero	USGS
Syd Brown	DPR State Parks
Susie Ming	USACE SPL
Steve Sachs	USACE SPL
Tom Kendall	USACE SPN

2. Master Plan Workshop Report- Steve Sachs and Clif Davenport

- a. San Diego Workshop on February 5, 2004 went well: approx. 50 people attended, 25 Public comments received and 10 questionnaires given back.
- b. Additional Workshops are scheduled for March (LA County and Orange County) and April (BEACON).
- c. Hosts, such as SANDAG and Beaches and Harbors for LA County, provide venue and setting but Steve Sachs runs the meeting.
- d. The comments collected will be used as a vehicle to gain better input from future workshops and will undergo analysis and categorization on both workshop and statewide level.
- e. Lessons learned:
 - i. Problems with all participants being able to hear discussions
 - ii. Restructure format slightly for better public comment. Lot less presentation, more time for public comment
 - iii. Start Q&A session with specific questions from the questionnaire; ask attendees to complete the questionnaire on site and leave with the workshop coordinator.

- iv. Focus hosts and attendees on how Sediment Master Plan can help them and how they can help the SMP.
 - f. /Issues for future sessions:
 - i. Input provided at last Beacon Meeting suggested that BEACON's coverage area was too large for one workshop to get all interested parties to participate. To get higher attendance, two meetings in different locations and at different times throughout the day are being investigated by Steve Sachs.
 - ii. AMBAG and Sanctuary scheduled to host a a Central Coast Workshop. Sanctuary wants to talk to about their shoreline protection in the sanctuary., It is desirable for their talk to focus on sediment management issues. It was suggested that a talk about shoreline protection may include some discussion related to possible change in direction of Sediment Management by the Sanctuaries over the next 20 years. It was further suggested that the since the Sanctuary perceives needed changes in regulations to fully facilitate beach nourishment in the Sanctuary that such possible changes be identified in the CSMW's Policy, Procedures and Regulations (PPR) effort.
 - i. Host/Venue for SF still needs to be worked out
 - iii. Clif is giving a presentation overview of the SMP to the Humboldt Bay Stewards convention in Eureka on March 15, 2004. The Stewards will subsequently host a more formalized Workshop for the public outreach effort.
3. Sediment Master Plan - Other Projects Clif Davenport
- a. See following PM Report with group discussion in italics.

CSMW PROJECT MANAGER's REPORT
March 3, 2004

- II. **Website Development:** <http://www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw.htm> The website is up and running, but is far from complete. Points to note include:
- a. The website incorporates information previously posted on "csmwonline" which the DBW website was meant to replace.
 - b. Website has overviews for both CSMW and Sediment Master Plan (SMP)
 - c. Public Workshop pages are Up-to-date, except for inclusion of Questions & Issues raised during the San Diego Workshop (Steve Sachs is making final edits)
 - d. Separate contact lists are provided for CSMW and for the SMP.
 - e. CSMW member Agencies and other agency or project-related links are provided in an extensive "Helpful Links" page.
 - f. CSMW Components page needs input from appropriate members:
 - i. RSM
 - ii. NSMS

- iii. Section 227
- iv. LA Studies (Susie's list of Projects?)
- v. SF Studies (Karen's list of Projects?)
- vi. CA Studies
- g. Available CSMW meeting minutes are posted (e.g., December 2003 only has PM Report)

The website has it's basic infrastructure an now just needs filling out.

Issues:

Website should look less State and highlight more the collaboration of State, Federal and Non-Federal local agencies. There should also be some list of the CSMW members and what there interests are in sediment management. It is suggested that this can be found in either the Master plan or the State's Erosion Control Plan. It was also suggested that the site navigation be altered so that the CSMW site be the home page for the site rather than the DBW site this would make it easier to navigate using navigation buttons Changes to the webpage layout will need to be approved in advance by DBW.

Do-outs:

- i. *Website (Provide to Clif Davenport):*
 1. *Possible additional contact groups, i.e. GIS, Exec Committee, and other and break outs. Current contacts will remain the same (George, Brian and Clif).*
 2. *links to concerns and members homepages. i.e. (<http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/nsms>)*
 3. *CSMW components page overview write-ups for RSM, NSMS (ERDC), Sect. 227, and CA studies (Syd will ask Kim for input). SPL and SPN will provide postable project lists (similar to list available for CSMW without sensitive funding information) with revision dates on the table of contents.*
- ii. *Minutes need to been removed from the website pending approval. Minutes will be taken each meeting and sent out for review and comment, then ratified at the next CSMW meeting. Minutes may be posted to the website after ratification.*

III. Policies, Procedures and Regulations Analysis:

- a. Draft proposal to conduct the work has been submitted by the Everest team
 - i. Minor clarifications/additions to the work effort need discussion
 - ii. Proposal cost currently exceeds our budgeted amount. *This is because a statement of qualifications process was undertaken to meet State Coastal Conservancy requirements. Four teams were identified that could do the work and the best was selected and then prepared a cost. Currently looking to reconcile the proposed cost with current budget.*

- b. Contract between SANDAG and SCC is still under review by SCC Legal.
No update
- c. Anticipate Everest team on board and working by April 1 and the project to be completed by December 2004

IV. **Literature Search:**

- a. *Chris Higgins and others at CGS (CA Geological Survey) has started compiling documents and information relating to the physical/compatibility portion (Biological portion to be included as part of the Biological Impacts Study). Biological Impacts relate to the concerns raised in the technical workshop (approximately 20 specific examples) that fine-grained material may have on biota. Research is intended to indicate if these concerns are real, and compile such knowledge into one spot for reference.*
- b. Main categories of research include:
 - i. Identify known beach nourishment needs and erosion hot spots.
The erosion hot spots identification effort currently slated for study relate primarily to beach erosion; bluff erosion had not been considered for inclusion. It was suggested that the study should be directed to look at bluff erosion as well but this should be separate and distinct from beach erosion. Jennifer Dare and Chris Higgins were asked to talk concerning Jen's research cataloguing bluff erosion in state of CA. Discussion on the fact that beaches were the location where sediment could be used most beneficially and therefore it is beach erosion and not bluff erosion that is the focus of sediment management. However, some bluffs are economic hot spots and it would be advantageous to include them in the study.
 - ii. Fate & transport of fine-grained materials within turbidity plumes.
 - iii. Sand distributions used for nourishment projects
 - iv. Additional information on debris basins for inclusion in the SMP GIS database. Information for LA and Ventura counties has been identified and included, but currently known information on other counties is sparse
- c. Project completion target date of June 1, 2004.

V. **Regional Sediment Budgets:**

- a. Compatibility Study effort: understand the potential impact of local projects in view of regional sediment budgets
- b. Information often requested by regulators
- c. Gary Griggs and Kiki Runyan involved in related work. Good tie-in, still exploring mutual benefits.
- d. Caltrans is exploring funding options to conduct a regional budget along the Big Sur coast that would dovetail with the CSMW effort.
This is independent of the coast of CA study. Caltrans are concerned with landslide disposal in NMS (National Marine Sanctuary) and this study may

satisfy sanctuary. Coincides with CALTRANS funded research into shoreline habitat in the sanctuary

The NSMS needs to report on sediment budgets and the systematic movement of sand along beaches. This ties into regional sediment budgets. Also survey results are a big concern to regulators and others. Start with what we know about littoral cells

VI. Miscellaneous:

- a. Kim Sterrett has requested that CSMW form a “GIS user’s group” to discuss on a monthly basis the status of the GIS development and issues that need resolution. Suggested frequency is monthly to start. *Suggest Claudia and Dan set up a plan for future meetings. Suzy will set a date. IWR/ERDC would also like to know the result of the GIS summary meetings, so that they are aware of what information is available. A GIS group meeting is suggested to occur during the next CSMW meeting where one day will focus on GIS.*
- b. Should CSMW be involved in supporting legislative bills or other activities that affect sediment management activities? For example, individual CSMW members have been requested to write letters of support for the “Coastal Restoration Act” to elected officials. *No, we can post bills and support with information. Questions arise from the ASBPA legislative agenda and if there was anything in the document that we could get support from the Governor. Members of the group will talk off-line to determine if they could endorse anything in the document.*

4. Membership in CSMW – All

- a. Discussion related to inclusion of
 - i. CMANC (CA Maritime and Navigation Congress). A lobbying group for the California port community, representing navigation interests. Many of its member ports and harbors participate in the CSMW process. However the group feels that they while they are an extension of local government, inclusion as a member may affect public perception since CMANC’s members are perceived as development oriented. They have supported Coast of CA studies, the CA master plan and the 227 program.
 - ii. Do we want to include advocacy groups such as Surfrider, Sierra Club etc. A possible delineation is that of the difference between an organization that deals with the management of sediment (either through carrying out projects or regulating them) rather than those which have an interest regarding sand.
 - iii. Cal Coast is in CSMW given their beach resource interests. They have been included in CSMW because it was considered advantageous to get one entity that represented many local

governments. But by giving the nod to one local government representation group does this send the message that we are endorsing Cal Coast? The alternative is to invite all the Associations of Local Governments. to become members.

- iv. Cal Trans; currently not really on CSMW put participates fully.
 - b. Webpage currently states CSMW members in the following categories a) Resource Agencies, b) Corps and c) Other. Cal Coast, Minerals Management Service and USGS are listed under Other.
 - c. Resolution/Suggestions:
 - i. It was determined that CSMW would continue under it's current membership until the membership issue could be reviewed. A list will be devised to divide current members possibly into members and (non voting) participants/advisors, or even incorporating a management committee. Karen will initiate email discussion on the division by sending out a current list of CSMW members.
 - ii. More public meetings targeting local interest groups/governments or get CMANC members etc. to give regular presentations to CSMW. In the interim, Steve Sachs will ensure ports are invited to workshops and inform CMANC (Jim Haussner) of workshops so that they can inform their members.
 - iii. Need to add ERDC and IWR groups as members.
 - iv. There is also a concern about who is on the mailing list and will therefore be able to view minutes/discussion and whether they want to stay on the mailing list.
5. American Shore and Beach Association DC Coastal Summit - Aceti, Domurat, Ewing
- a. ASBA (technical information source) merged with American Coastal Coalition (a lobbying group). Bills were discussed and there were presentations by Mj. Gen. Strack and OMB.
 - b. Lots of lobbying for legislature. Mj. Gen. Stated the Corps is heavily committed to RSM: this is a strong endorsement. However there is still the division between decline in commitment to dredge small harbors and the need to nourish beaches in RSM.
6. National Shoreline Management Study - Brumbaugh, Martin, Pope, Chestnutt:
- a. Purpose to report and recommend, to congress, on the status of shores.
 - i. Summarize existing info
 - ii. Determine Fed and Non-Fed participation levels
 - iii. General status nationally.
 - b. Workgroups on erosion and accretion and the environmental and economic impact of the changes including:
 - i. Shore process
 - ii. Econ.
 - iii. Envi.
 - iv. Systematic management of sand
 - v. Agency roles; currently describing existing agency participation.

- c. Intent is a National study but practically scaled down original data collection and because there is more literature available at a regional level use these to build an interpretation for the national scale. Recommend to use CA as a pilot as it is “Rich” in agency roles and info and because there is a chance to streamline the interplay between the Master Plan and NSMS.
 - d. Propose a meeting for early May to find out what’s going on in region, where CA is in the progress it is making, and find out what info is available or when it will become available. Concentrated focus on GIS.
- 7. Section 227 Program - Susie Ming, Tony Risko
 - a. SPL: Tech Review completed 13th Feb. Current coordination with ASA, Envi agencies, APR? and Beacon. Susie will send an overview to Clif.
 - i. Issues Construction schedule probably delayed until FY05
 - ii. MOA with Beacon
 - b. SPN: No update
- 8. State Study Activities - Kim Sterrett not present, item postponed to next meeting.
- 9. Los Angeles District Study Activities - Susie Ming, Tony Risko no update (materials provided but not discussed)
- 10. San Francisco District Study Activities - Karen Berresford no update (materials provided but not discussed)
- 11. Other items -
 - a. Issue of data collection by Dick Seymour in San Diego. Wave data has been collected in San Diego in order to investigate daily shoreline changes. This is not scheduled to receive Corps funding in FY05. The lack of funding could be detrimental to CSMW work and it is suggested that this problem be publicized and alternate sources of funding be examined (possibly Corps Research funding through ERDC in conjunction with the modification of SBEACH numerical model to fit West Coast). The project currently receives funding through Coastal Data info Program (CDIP), including some state funds (\$500,000). Level of Federal funding will be determined and forwarded (George).
 - b. Lesley discussed LA county and the possibility of a policy for beach nourishment that may state that all material is to be screened regardless of source. This policy is stimulated by the use of construction debris however concerns arise due to the fact that this policy might affect dredge material usage. Susie will check with Joe Ryan on this information.
- 12. Next Meeting –
 - a. 11-12 May 9:30-3:00 to be held in San Francisco. The purpose of this extended meeting is to a) Day 1: discuss CSMW and the NSMS with HQ, ERDC and IWR reps and b) Day 2: Focus on GIS and information availability.