

**California Sediment Master Plan  
Workgroup Meeting**

**7 April 2008  
9:30 AM to 3:00 PM  
San Francisco**

Attendees:

Name	Organization
Susie Ming	USACE-Los Angeles District
Heather Schlosser	USACE-Los Angeles District
Marriah Abellera	USACE-Los Angeles District
Tom Kendall	USACE-San Francisco District
Caleb Conn	USACE-San Francisco District
Anne Sturm	USACE-San Francisco District
Janice Lera-Chan	USACE-San Francisco District
Karen Rippey	USACE-San Francisco District
Kim Sterrett	Dept. of Boating and Waterways
Clif Davenport	California Geological Survey
Mark Johnsson	CA Coastal Commission
Chris Potter*	California Resources Agency

\*Attended By Phone

**Agenda**

1. Goals/Vision of CSMP
2. End Products of CSMP
3. PMP Tasks
4. Next Steps/ Products
5. "Baseline Report"
6. Updating Status Report

**Goals**

- The goal is to reintroduce monthly working group meetings to discuss project management tasks, determine if the set tasks are still applicable to the project, is there a need to set new tasks, set a plan for federal dollars.
- This project is different from a typical USACE feasibility study because this project is covering the entire coast of CA. USACE would like to workgroup to work together to determine how to approach the PMP. It should be a document that can be used by all agencies/department.

**What is the end product of CSMP?**

- To be able to combine RSM plans, tools, and products for one overall plan/product
- One thought is to try and get a New Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Authority which focuses on the California. The CAP authority would allow the

Corps in California to essentially do “feasibility type” studies, however, at the end of the study, we would not have to go to Congress for Authorization. That authorization would be delegated down to the Division Commander (Currently that is General McMahon).

- LCPs – How do we get the Master Plan ideas integrated into these plans? (suggest Leslie and Mark weigh in here – recall discussions in Monterey about other vehicles that might be easier to work with than LCPs for starters)
- Need to be able to show economic value of regional projects.
- State’s viewpoint/goal for Master Plan is to better manage sediment and have more federal projects/funding.
- End products of the Master Plan: At the end of the study what do we have?
  - Chris: It is a living document and a bunch of tools. It would be key to have periodic Status Reports.
  - Heather: When the Corps went to D.C. asking why we weren’t getting more money for our beach nourishment projects compared to the rest of the nation, D.C. said come to us with more regional projects.
  - Karen: Agrees with Tom that if we can show a value to the sand and essentially finding ways to get more “bang for your bucks” would be important to demonstrate to people why certain projects are getting funding and selected.
  - Clif: Monterey is currently looking within their Coastal RMS plan to stop the loss of sediment via sand mining operations in their area.
- Do a regional EIS/EIR for the entire region or programmatic EIS/EIR with individual EAs or EIR/EISs? Get someone from San Francisco District Regulatory dept. with knowledge of Monterey Bay region to review – LA District will talk with Robert Smith. With the environmental documentation we want something that these regional areas could use (i.e. areas called out already that need sediment so it will be easier for regions to get sand placed on the beach).

**Action:** San Francisco will bring in regulatory personnel

### **Objectives of the Master Plan- Do we need to adjust?**

- ***Objective 1: Promote the use of RSM strategies to address areas of sediment imbalance along the coast of CA.- An example is Tijuana Estuary.*** Considered combining this objective with objective #3.
- ***Objective 2: Support the CA Ocean Protection Council in the implementation of their strategic plan.***

Susie: Should the CSMW should be more connected to the OPC? Currently some CSMW personnel don’t feel very connected. Are we getting funded by their group? Response: YES (Coastal RSM Plans, GIS Support, Tijuana Demo project) There is a partnership in that they are doing some of the work that meets the CSMP and we are doing beneficial tasks to their projects. The next round of RSM Plans are being funded by the OPC (\$900K)  
Is there duplication of work? Response: No.

- **Objective 3: Develop an adaptive plan to meet current and future needs of coastal sediment managers.** This objective 3 should possibly be combined with #1 and #5.
- **Objective 4: Identify critical ocean accretion and erosion areas prioritizing?** We aren't doing this yet, how should this be done? Clif: Get CSMW members to commit to getting CBRoS process unstuck – list of critical coastal areas is in report.  
Agreed: Maybe do regional prioritization, but removing the word prioritize from the objective. Keep the term critical coastal erosion. **Need to get CBRoS “unstuck”.**
- **Objective 5: Provide resource managers critical tools to support their decision making.**  
Group: Agreed this is important and should remain as an objective. Consider Combining with objective 3.
- **Objective 6: Facilitate and coordinate beach and coastal watershed efforts with federal, state, local, and public stakeholders.-** This objective should remain as is.
- **Objective 7: Collaborate with regulatory agencies to provide a consistent permit framework for coastal sediment projects.** - This objective should remain as is.
- **Objective 8: Demonstrate the value of sediment as a coastal resource for habitat, recreation, shoreline protection, and economics.** - Haven't exactly shown that sediment is a resource to this point. Phil King has put an economic value on the sand. This will help, however Phil King's model is heavily criticized.
- **Objective 9: Support the requests for funding from local/regional authorities and eliminate inefficient use of public funds.** - The idea is that regional groups with RSM plans will be able to receive funding easier in the future.
- **Objective 10: Foster beneficial use of sediment dredged from ports, harbors, wetlands, and other sources.**
- Maybe can combine several of these objectives to reduce this from 10 objectives since several seem redundant with minor differences.
- Removal of dams (C-4 and T-10 and T-11 Status Report App. C) and reconnecting the natural flow of sediment should be added as one of our objectives.

### **PMP Tasks**

- PMP questions to think about: how should we spend our dollars this year and next year and to make sure that we are doing what we need to do to accomplish the tasks?
- **Webpage development**- State has gotten the website up and currently updating.
- **Web-based Mapping (IMS/GIS)**- In the process.

- **Public Education**- FY09 will be mainly federal dollars for this task. Should we setup public outreach/workshops or should we have public meetings?  
Clif: Think about reaching out to specific areas: Marin/Sonoma Counties, Morro Bay, and other areas not yet touched upon.
- **Recreation**
  - Phil King has looked at beach attendance and the economic value of the beach. Currently updating Phil King's model. The Ventura model has received some criticism; he is currently working on San Diego region model addressing the comments previously.
  - Should water quality be a part of economics task? We wouldn't test water quality in this project, but should be addressed under RSMs. Water quality will determine whether or not sand may be placed on the beach. We will revisit the water quality wording and determine if this should be removed from tasks. Do we need to spend more \$\$ on economics? Does State need to do more than what has already been done?
  - Where is the \$135,000 coming from? Is that correct? Kim: \$85,000 is for the RSM study. 75,000 beach attendance. \$50,000 unaccounted for.
- **Transportation Analysis** is a case by case basis. This should be a portion of the RSM plans included in the CSBAT tool.
- **RSM plans:**
  - Literature Research and data entry- John will be doing this. This task also includes listing of available and relevant GIS layers.
  - The state has and will solicit regional groups to see who is interested, and appropriate for conducting, Coastal RSM plans for regional areas. Southern CA has three groups committed.
  - Clif is getting money for 3 more RSM plans for next year. The intent is for the regional groups to contract out the work in the fall. Looking at the following regions:
    - Humboldt/Eureka
    - Orange County
    - Santa Cruz Littoral Cell
    - San Francisco Littoral Cell
    - In addition, Morro Bay and Marin/Sonoma could be considered if we can identify and work with appropriate regional groups (see above).
  - If this is a priority USACE can also potentially fund additional regions.
- Clif: Christine Blackburn (Coastal Conservancy) is looking at sea-level rise and how shoreline management plans can be constructed to address inundation- Coastal RSM Plans should play into that construction.
- **PPR**- what tasks are remaining? The recommendations have changed therefore the Analysis report will need to update and reflect the revised

recommendations. There is another \$100,000 that was set for GIS linking. That is not possible with this GIS product so we will take out \$100,000.

- **Sand Rights**- should remain within the PMP?
- **WET SCOUP**- Nearshore Sediment Compatibility. Is this a high priority? Getting nearshore sites permitted or have process laid out so that if someone who wanted to they could more easily get a permit. Should this go in the EIS/EIR?
- **Programmatic EIS/EIR**: This was under budgeted. We need to talk to regulatory to discuss what documentation needs to go into the document. Kim will be providing \$150,000 per region. There are 10 regions/ RSM plans. We will need \$1.5 M to complete Programmatic EIS/EIR to cover the potential 10 regions identified.
- **Habitat mapping** - CHARTS/LIDAR to get aerial imagery. Status of the national charts – check with Jennifer Wozencraft. NOAA/USGS/Corps. Keep for future work.
- **Biological Impacts**- Report has been done by Karen Greene. Currently being peer reviewed, not in the SOW for her to incorporate comments. It is suggest we take more money from habitat impacts to have her complete the document and address all comments.
- **Habitat Impacts**- May possibly take out or it's being covered by Karen's work.
- **Real Estate**: Have a SHAPE file that we were able to use. Done!
- **Prioritization**:
  - Funds- possibly have a brief explanation on webpage on where the funds are going.
  - Change term from "hot spots" to CBRs report in PMP.
- **Interagency Coordination**: (what are we doing for this)?

### **Baseline Reports**

- The baseline report will discuss site specific environmental conditions, coastal processes, and geotechnical data. The baseline report describes what the current conditions/ future without project conditions are for a specific area.
- The group needs to determine how to approach baseline report, should we divide areas and write a baseline for each area separately and then bring it together? We can apply portions of the status report to the F3 Report.

### **Updating the Status Report**

- Status Report Appendix C has a number of tasks with timeframes from 2006. Cliff is planning to update the status report by September 2008. This status report will describe the project tasks and products. The status Report will describe what we are doing, what products we will produce, etc.

### **Regional Demo Project**

- Should the Master Plan demo project be Tijuana Estuary? Should it be something else, or perhaps we have multiple "mini-demo projects"? We

should be able to use demos (maybe more than one) that utilize tool(s) that we have developed within the Master Plan (i.e. SCOUP). Tijuana is directly in line with P-8 in Status Report Appendix C.

- Discuss further in another CSMW meeting. What do we want to demo to show us? Should Tijuana Estuary be a demo? Are there other ones we want to do?

### **Next Tasks for the Master Plan**

1. Update Economics model
2. Public Outreach/Education
3. RSM Plans (State can do 3 RSM Plans, Federal can possibly do 2 RSM Plans)
4. EIS/EIR for RSM Plans – start with SANDAG
5. Biological Impact Assessment/ Peer Review Process (State to check on funds, need \$40,000. Maybe be better to have state fund rather than Corps writing a task order.)
6. Tijuana Estuary?
7. Permit/Sediment Database

### **Action Items**

- Corps needs to talk to regulatory on:
  1. EIS/EIR
  2. Need regulatory contract from San Francisco District.
- Heather will work on updating the PMP – including task descriptions and cost estimates

### **Next Meeting**

Week of June 16<sup>th</sup> –USACE will send an email to request availability.