

**CSMW Meeting Minutes**  
**11 May 2005**  
**9:30 A.M. to 1:30 P.M.**  
**South Pacific Division**  
**333 Market Street, San Francisco CA**  
**Room 1134**

**1. Welcome/Introductions - Brian Baird and George Domurat**

**2. Review of Minutes from Last Meeting - Susie Ming and Clif Davenport**

- ❖ Syd Brown and Brian Baird to provide comments to Susie Ming to finalize notes. Tom Kendall noted that we need to spell out more of the acronyms in the future. After these changes – send minutes to Brian Baird and George Domurat for final approval before Clif Davenport can post to the website.
- ❖ Currently we are using both the Corps and Resource Agency logos – and will continue this for future correspondence.

**3. CSMW - Program Overview - Susie Ming**

- ❖ Presentation on the Master Plan and current status.
- ❖ Kim Sterrett noted that to date the State has contributed more funds than federal.

**4. Cal Boating and Waterways Activities - Ron Flick and Kim Sterrett**

- ❖ Kim Sterrett provided a breakdown of the remaining beach restoration funds. Some of the funding is slated as three year and some as eight year funding. The hopes are that the Corps would get matching funding; however, the corps portion has been under funded by 50%. There is approximately \$8.8 M that has not been spent. Waiting for federal match – hard for the state to keep it and not lose it to the state process.
- ❖ George Domurat – there are projects that need funds and reprogramming is very tough.
- ❖ State needs help to keep funding rolling. Steve Aceti and Howard Marlowe. COL Feir to talk to George Domurat.
- ❖ Ron Flick discussed the Coastal Data Information Program (CDIP) and Southern California Beach processes study. The average is \$600K over the last 10 years from Corps through Engineering Research and Design Center (ERDC). CDIP has been ongoing for over 30 years. Mr. Orville Magoon was instrumental in starting this program in the 1970's. This is a three-part cooperative effort between the state, federal and Scripps University. From the beginning this has been a crucial component as there are many examples that show that it useful to have long term data which is essential to researchers and for them to maintain the quality and kinds of data useful in the long term active research. It is not just gathering data for government agencies, but for actual scientist with scientific interests. We need to sustain the data gathering effort and usefulness out of CDIP – as there are larger pictures with Southern California Ocean Observing System (SCOOS) and the Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS).

- ❖ Southern California Beach Processes Study is being funded for \$700K out of the Corps R&D Budget. It is a 5-year program that has two more years to go. Analogy to national weather service – CDIP – real-time swell measurement and modeling and the website is disseminating this information. Scripps has a computer modeling effort using buoy data to forecast swell and long shore transport. There is nothing comparable in other states. CDIP has other sites around the country, Hawaii, North Carolina at Duck. All NOAA buoys are all cross-linked.

#### **5. EPA Role in Coastal Sediment Management - Brian Ross**

- ❖ Beneficial Use to the littoral system within 3-mile area is regulated under the Clean Water Act. EPA is looking to set up an interim situation for portion of their offshore disposal site SF-8 that is open for material.
- ❖ Peter Mull discussed the demonstration project at Ocean Beach, which would take new material from the offshore bar putting it closer to the shore to show more fully beneficial use. EPA supports this demonstration.
- ❖ There is a regional general permit underway for southern California.
- ❖ Brian Ross asked whether this group is strictly coastal and coastal watershed as he's being hearing about starting Delta Long-Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for sediment management? CSMW is interested in getting updated on those efforts.

#### **6. Santa Cruz Harbor / Arana Gulch - Regional Sediment Management - Brian Foss**

- ❖ Brian Foss presentation for Santa Cruz Harbor. The watershed is about 6 to 7,000 acres. From the culvert out, the material winnows out quickly. The watershed is varied from sea level to 600 feet – saltwater to redwoods/chaparral, sandy watershed. There has been urban development and erosive forces.
- ❖ There have been accelerated and episodic sediment yields. In 2001, Santa Cruz Harbor applied to the EPA and Corps to bring some science to the 80/20 (coarse to fines) rule of thumb used to determine appropriate material for beach renourishment. They used a 50/50 mix of about 3,000 cubic yards of material from the estuary to determine if there were any negative impacts. The paper was peer reviewed and the conclusion is that the sand stayed in beach zone and clays gravitate to the midshelf mudbelt. The project purpose was to use sediment as a beneficial use instead of waste disposal. The permit allowed up to 3,000 cubic yards a year and they setting up a study to see if they can re-use more – up to 10,000 cubic yards.
- ❖ George Domurat asked - what about other alternatives for the fines? With the saltwater in the material, sending to a landfill for daily cover is not an option.
- ❖ There are marine sanctuary regulations about fill and no new disposal sites.
- ❖ Brian Ross has another option for the harbor but they are constrained by the current equipment they have. Moss Landing could use SF14 for dredge material disposal, however it requires two barges to dry out the material and haul it out. It's doable, but would be costly.

- ❖ CSWM has seen the results of the 3,000 cubic yard demonstration and agrees that there were no negative affects and it is appropriate to evaluate a larger demonstration project.
- ❖ Clif Davenport received comments from Holly Price at the Monterey public workshop for the Sediment Master Plan, which stated that the Sanctuary, under the right conditions, was willing to consider a pilot study to conduct beach nourishment within the Sanctuary.
- ❖ There has not been an argument for what are the beneficial impacts of this nourishment as opposed to that there are no negative impacts.
- ❖ Dr. Thorton is at the Naval Postgraduate College and estimates that erosion rates are approximately ½ to 2 meters per year in southern Monterey Bay.

## **7. Legislation – Steve Aceti**

- ❖ Two bills are being proposed for funding of ecosystem restoration - SB 658 and AB 1269. SB 658 – would allow coastal counties to impose a vehicle registration fee of up to \$6 dollars per vehicle. The funds would be deposited in a mitigation fund for coastal projects. If the bill were approved, LA County alone could generate up to \$43 Million. CalCoast and the San Francisco Open Space Council is the sponsor. 30% of the funds would go the County to grant out for coastal projects. The remaining 70% would go to the coastal conservancy to be granted out in the county it came from. Each county Board of Supervisors would have to vote to impose the fee. There is strong support, but recent opposition from taxpayer groups and the building industry. It may be difficult to obtain the governor's signature due to his opposition to new taxes and fees.
- ❖ AB1269 is a new bond measure for parks and clean water. This is the first time since Prop 12 any beach restoration has had a specific line item. It is not in there yet and would send funds to the California Boating and Waterways. Environmental groups are putting it together for \$30M for DBAW. \$3B is the whole bond measure.
- ❖ Website information required for funding regulations and legislative update.  
**ACTION: Steve Aceti to provide for posting on website. Pending legislation.**

## **8. Ocean Beach Nearshore Sediment Management Demonstration - Peter Mull**

- ❖ Corps and City of San Francisco have a long-term severe erosion problem on southern portion of Ocean Beach adjacent to the Zoo. A General Investigation (GI) study was initiated again with City of SF to look at changing sediment disposal practices. Additional disposal area alternatives for areas able to use dredged sediment are being considered. Demonstration area is adjacent to Sloat Boulevard. A portion of maintenance dredging will be used. The Essayons dredge can operate in this wave climate and analysis will be done to determine the economic impact, dredging mission, cost implications and fate disposal with USGS. A permanent disposal site within 3-mile limit is being worked on with Mark Delapaine. A negative declaration went out last Monday and there is a FONSI on the EA It has been a team effort amongst all agencies and state support

and interagency work for the demo. Designation process for a permanent DMMO will take several years of demonstration in order to get more information.

- ❖ Brian Baird - Did the Marine Sanctuary weigh in? They didn't, but they are aware. This would be a good time to update them. Corps funding DELFT3D modeling of this area with USGS. This sediment transport model is not public domain – proprietary. Components are open source. CSUMB working with USGS on sea floor mapping with high definition surveys of the area.
- ❖ How will it impact surf break? It is out pretty far and will ultimately benefit by reducing energy reaching the beach. Offers ideal advantage – portion that goes to this location may help Pacifica beaches that are sediment starved.
- ❖ WRDA Section 933 Program – state requested sand from navigation project to be placed on beach. Streamlined cost/benefits analysis/EIS; 65%/35% federal/state cost shared for increment cost increase. This should be much faster than GI studies and has been done successfully in other parts of country – Florida and New York. Study can be funded \$100/200 fully federal from O&M, especially if directed by Congress in appropriations (new guidance on securing 933 funds through CAP appears to be in flux). Study costs would be shared retroactively. Funding could be limited through O&M since it would be in competition with other projects. Estimated costs range from \$2.50/yard to \$3.80/yard with the Essayons retrofitted.
- ❖ By June 10<sup>th</sup> where will the project be as there is the California Ocean Protection Council? The project should happen 18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> in May and should have the post survey done.
- ❖ Brian Baird – This is a great example and we need to report on this effort. This is a Herculean effort by the agencies. This group has been instrumental in making these connections.

## **10. Master Plan Update/Website - Clif Davenport**

### **11. SCOUP – Clif Davenport**

- ❖ SCOUP – The compatibility template is done and incorporated into the SCOUP Plan document, along with the less-than-optimum sand use template and checklists on how to characterize physical and biological properties of receiver sites and potential sources of opportunistic sediment. Take a look at SCOUP Plan (available in June) and provide input. **ACTION. - All**
- ❖ Next step in the preparation of the Opportunistic Plan is a beta test with local site. We have gone through a priority ranging assessment of receiver sites in the Oceanside littoral cell and South Oceanside beach was selected. A project description and CEQA document is being prepared. Several other cities – requested to be included in the CEQA document, but timing and questions of funding availability necessitated going forward with only the selected receiver site at this time.
- ❖ Website – Some folks were concerned that there is the same picture on every page, so we have procured a number of pictures. Please take a look. Still need project description from the Los Angeles District for GIS/IMS/DST – (system

architecture and decision support tool products are posted). **ACTION – LA District.**

- ❖ Partners Pages on Website needs input from Agencies describing their sediment management programs. Am waiting for write-ups from Coastal Conservancy. Write-ups would provide for linkage to the specific Agency WebPages. **ACTION – Provide paragraph or two on Sediment Management Programs to Clif - ALL**
- ❖ ASBPA – There will be two sessions for the fall conference focusing specifically on the Sediment Master Plan study results.
- ❖ Website – SPD homepage now has “Exploring the California Coast” brochures, please take a look at them. Like to have our CSMW home page link directly to those brochures for more visibility. **ACTION: George and Karen to look at it. Relevant documents. Clif will have the brochures linked to the CSMW homepage.**
- ❖ Chris Potter is the contact for the list serve maintenance. **ACTION: Please add COL Feir to the list – George Domurat.**

#### **11. Los Angeles District Study Activities - Susie Ming**

- ❖ Updated project on website.

#### **12. San Francisco District Study Activities - Tom Kendall**

ASCE calendar needs photos of projects please get them to Karen Berresford.

Peter Mull will request site visit of demonstration project in action. **ACTION – Peter will let folks know the dates.** Preconstruction meeting with captain – agenda this week.

#### **13. CSMW Expansion - Brian Baird and George Domurat**

- ❖ Will send out revised organization and figure out how to implement this. Think about best to implement the kickoff over the next couple of months. Next CSMW meeting decide and then implement.
- ❖ Public outreach recommendations have been awaiting action – approval or disapproval since November 2004. Can we make any decisions to move on them? Clif will send the recommendations out one last time for any additional comments, and provide a date to get comments back. The agenda for the next meeting will include voting on whether to include the recommendations within CSMWs scope.

#### **14. Other Items as Time Permits - All**

#### **15. Next Meeting - All**

- ❖ Mid July – Wednesday the 13<sup>th</sup> of July – 9AM. Santa Cruz – USGS.