



## CSMW Meeting Minutes Conference Call 11 February 2009

### **MEETING FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:**

- ✓ Chris will set up sub-committee meetings to discuss the RSM plans and the Biological Impacts Analysis (2 different groups) – Let Chris know if you are interested in participating in either meeting.
- ✓ Chris will follow-up with ABAG in regards to a San Francisco RSM plan
- ✓ Mark and Syd to send SANDAG RSM comments to Clif by February 23<sup>rd</sup>

### **MEETING FOLLOW-UP ITEMS from Past Meetings:**

- ✓ Clif and Heather will investigate whether the report could be adapted into a website product, with GIS figures that could be used to bring up individual project pages (long-term effort).
- ✓ Discuss LIDAR needs at a future CSMW meeting – should we create a sub-committee?
- ✓ George to update CSMW on upcoming Corps dredging projects
- ✓ Brian will bring someone from MLPA process to talk at the December meeting

---

#### ❖ **Introduction**

- Corps – Still waiting to hear about Stimulus Bill
- Dept of Boating and Waterways – looking at moving the function of the department to State Parks
- Will change meetings to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday

#### ❖ **Tijuana Estuary**

- Funding issues have delayed project – looking at ways to fund the project next winter
- USGS going to map again this May – perhaps we can piggyback on to the placement of material by the Corps just south of the Imperial Beach pier (~300 kcy)

#### ❖ **Biological Impacts Analysis**

- Have received numerous comments on the report – Karen Green has put together scope to address comments (additional \$110K needed – above the \$12K)
- Comments focused on:
  - Making document a useful reference guide
  - Editorial changes
  - Summary of key findings
  - Further discussion of some key issues not identified initially

- More coordination with marine sanctuaries
- Abbreviated users guide
- Public workshops
- Could the Sanctuaries/MLPA contribute funds?
- Chris will set up sub-committee to discuss the additional work in more detail

#### ❖ **Next Round of RSM plans**

- Sub-Committee met last week to go over Letters of Intent received
- Had some questions regarding some of the proposals – Chris is working on some questions regarding the San Francisco area (potentially with ABAG)
- Mark/Lesley met with BCDC regarding a potential partner to work outside of SF Bay
- Currently have a Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) for the Bay area
- USGS is currently researching the SF mouth as well as the surrounding areas
- Chris will follow-up with ABAG
- Chris will schedule next sub-committee meeting
- Letters of Intent received from:
  - Orange County
  - San Francisco Bay (BCDC)
  - Northern CA
  - Northern Monterey Bay
  - Humboldt (Eureka Littoral Cell)

#### ❖ **MLPA**

- Brian/Kim/Clif talked with MLPA - it was suggested that the CSMW target the Stakeholder Group
- Working with Phyllis Grifman (USC SeaGrant) on the Stakeholder Group
- Clif presented CSMW's perspective at MLPA Stakeholder meeting in January
- Supplying MLPA with CBRs sites and potential offshore sediment sources
- Letter sent to MLPA requesting that someone from CSMW give a presentation on coastal processes – the response was that they don't want to have presentations, but would rather see "boxes" from us of areas that are important to CSMW in terms of beach nourishment
- Loni is working on comments on the proposed MPAs

#### ❖ **SANDAG RSM**

- Clif has received a number of comments (waiting on comments from Mark and Syd) – need to send comments to Shelby
- Mark and Syd to send Clif comments by February 23<sup>rd</sup>

❖ **CBReS**

- Received comments from 11 parties – still waiting on comments from 2 others (Dave Revell and Corps – San Francisco (working on additional BECAs))
- Some of comments received:
  - Report presents brief description rather than more comprehensive evaluation of issues affecting beaches and how they would affect nourishment program; questions if use of “restoration” is appropriate; beach widths vary dependant on cool/warm PDO phases; draws conclusion from report that all listed BECAs are eroding/needs restoring, but doesn’t believe that a valid conclusion; beaches undergoing passive erosion shouldn’t be recommended for nourishment without sand retention program; objects specifically to Zuma Beach as a BECA; including all 57 BECAs as potential projects for beach restoration without evaluation or discussion of feasibility, cost, sand source, littoral transport seems futile, especially under sea level rise scenarios.
  - No mention of “Federal Consistency”; impacts of sand mining should be mentioned earlier in the report.
  - Appreciates and supports effort to inform decision makers of the extent and types of beach erosion problems facing the state; developing inventory of critical erosion sites important step in addressing these issues; role and special designation of MBNMS and GFNMS should be mentioned with respect to BECAs; MBNMS’s recently-revised Harbors and Dredge Disposal Plan lays out a framework for addressing need for placement of dredged materials coupled with protection of MBNMS resources- mutually beneficial for CSMW and sanctuaries to evaluate Plan strategies; the Biological Impacts analysis report, when finalized, will help sanctuaries better understand impacts/mitigation measures of nourishment projects; CSMW has been important partner in Southern Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup’s efforts to develop regional approach within southern Monterey Bay; MBNMS plans to begin assessment of policy/regulatory options for permitting of beach nourishment and other erosion options that conflict with current interpretations of sanctuary regulations; encourages development of Coastal RSM Plans covering Santa Cruz and San Mateo counties.
  - Erosion rate listed at San Clemente should be higher; would like to note beach is focus of USACE Feasibility study expected to be completed in 2009.
  - City of Long Beach should be included as a BECA (beaches not administered by LA County Beaches and Harbors, who provided the BECA information); artificial littoral cell- beaches erode and sands pile up elsewhere, >\$0.5M/year to redistribute; suggests looking at use of sand-bag structures, and finer-grained clean sediment could be used locally to help nourish beaches.
  - Concerned that dam removal on Klamath River without capturing sediment could aggravate beach accretion, which affects disconnected salmonid streams; while many beaches from Oregon to Bodega Bay are

narrow (as described in report), there are many beaches in this stretch that have widened substantially.

- Report does not consider climate change impacts in prioritizing beaches for nourishment; plenty of beaches are apparently in need of sand, but some are going to be more critical in terms of sea level rise than others
- El Granada Beach could be nourished by relocating sands from inside breakwater (for Pillar Point Harbor); recommends breaching the breakwater and/or relocating Deer Creek outlet to outside of the breakwater.
- Public Resources code requires each state and local agency to cooperate with the Commission in carrying out its duties; indicates that CBRoS survey and Workshop (??) may impact areas of Native American cultural resources and requests that Native American tribes in those counties be contacted for early consultation; provides list of recommended activities to do so.
- Master's degree with research on beach width changes at Coal Oil Point; CBRoS should consider more options for reducing beach erosion that those outlined in appendix E; plant cover and topography are necessary for many species to survive; support restoration of sand supply from watershed rather than focusing on sand retention; exotic species should be removed, and beach grooming should be stopped.
- Climate change was not mentioned; look into capturing wave energy instead of placing retention structures; beach renourishment is a waste of money.

❖ **State Issues**

- Having problem giving Corps money for Seal Beach

**NEXT MEETING  
San Francisco  
March 18, 2009  
9:30 – 1:30**

**\*\* Please note that CSMW meetings will now be held the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of every month (still alternating between a face-to-face meeting and a conference call – the meeting in March will be a face-to-face)**



## CSMW ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail
Loni Adams	CA DFG	858-627-3985	<a href="mailto:ladams@dfg.ca.gov">ladams@dfg.ca.gov</a>
Jim Haussener	CMANC	925-828-6215	<a href="mailto:jim@cmanc.com">jim@cmanc.com</a>
John Dingler	USACE		<a href="mailto:moceans@gmail.com">moceans@gmail.com</a>
Susie Ming	USACE - LA	213-452-3789	<a href="mailto:Susan.M.Ming@usace.army.mil">Susan.M.Ming@usace.army.mil</a>
Karen Rippey	USACE- SF	415-503-6747	<a href="mailto:Karen.E.Rippey@usace.army.mil">Karen.E.Rippey@usace.army.mil</a>
Jon Warrick	USGS	831-427-4793	<a href="mailto:jwarrick@usgs.gov">jwarrick@usgs.gov</a>
Sam Johnson	USGS	831-427-4746	<a href="mailto:sjohnson@usgs.gov">sjohnson@usgs.gov</a>
Syd Brown	Dept. of Parks and Recreation	916-653-9930	<a href="mailto:SBROW@parks.ca.gov">SBROW@parks.ca.gov</a>
George Nichol	SWRCB		<a href="mailto:gnichol@waterboards.ca.gov">gnichol@waterboards.ca.gov</a>
Mark Johnsson	Coastal Commission	415-904-5245	<a href="mailto:mjohnsson@coastal.ca.gov">mjohnsson@coastal.ca.gov</a>
Clif Davenport	CGS	707-576-2986	<a href="mailto:Clif.Davenport@conservation.ca.gov">Clif.Davenport@conservation.ca.gov</a>
Heather Schlosser	USACE - LA	213-452-3810	<a href="mailto:Heather.R.Schlosser@usace.army.mil">Heather.R.Schlosser@usace.army.mil</a>
George Domurat	USACE - Division	415-503-6575	<a href="mailto:George.W.Domurat@usace.army.mil">George.W.Domurat@usace.army.mil</a>
Brian Baird	CA Resources	916-657-0198	<a href="mailto:Brian@resources.ca.gov">Brian@resources.ca.gov</a>
Chris Potter	CA Resources	916-654-0536	<a href="mailto:Chris.potter@resources.ca.gov">Chris.potter@resources.ca.gov</a>
Kim Sterrett	DBW	916-263-8157	<a href="mailto:Sterrett@dbw.ca.gov">Sterrett@dbw.ca.gov</a>
Tom Kendall	USACE - SF	415-503-6822	<a href="mailto:Thomas.R.Kendall@usace.army.mil">Thomas.R.Kendall@usace.army.mil</a>