



**CSMW Meeting Minutes
Conference Call
18 NOVEMBER 2009
10:00 AM – 3:00 PM
SCCWRP**

MEETING FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:

- ✓ **CSMW:** Next meeting in San Francisco (USACE Conference Room). Date and Time TBD.

Still Pending:

- ✓ Heather and Chris? Letter to the CERB outlining the progress that has been made on LIDAR project. PENDING.
- ✓ **George and Brian-** look at existing PPR draft and give comments (Chris will make sure Brian looks at it) – PENDING.
- ✓ CBRs/CBECS/CBEAS – Natural Resources Agency (**Chris**) is seeking Governor's office approval to release the report to the public. PENDING.
- ✓ **Chris** should give a perspective of the funding needed for each of the "Top-10" recommendations, so that we can focus on the least costly items in these economic times and separate out federal and state items. DONE.

❖ **Workshop**

- Share lessons learned from participants that have gone through the Regional Sediment Management (RSM) Plan Development process.
- Educate upcoming regional entities in this process.
- Give background on the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW) and RSM.
- Discuss Top 10 Ways to help implement RSM from a local/regional perspective.

❖ **Welcome & Introductions – Brian Baird**

- Brian stated that the goal of the CSMW Group is to manage the three currently ongoing regional sediment management plans for the State as well as begin the five RSM plans currently on the way.
- Input from those in attendance on language to take back to State legislature to implement the RSM Plans is desired.
- Request input on maintaining and implementing MLPA's.

❖ **Review Workshop Agenda, Housekeeping, and Groundrules – Jim Fawcett**

❖ **Background on the CSMW and RSM - Clif Davenport**

- CSMW members and goals identified, one of which is RSM.
- Slagel Study done in 2006 - 125,000,000 CM of sediment has been impounded by coastal dams across CA.



- BEACON's Coastal RSM Plan showed reductions in sand transport to coast. Sand sources and sinks impact sediment budgets and balances (Patsch 2007).
- CSMW "Deliverables" to include informational reports, computer-based tools, and Coastal RSM Plans.
- Objectives of Coastal RSM Plans: Region-specific approach desired as regions are unique but at end of the day we want to have an integrated statewide plan developed by stakeholders.
- Governance: Desire to maintain a regional perspective by employing an outreach approach to involve all stakeholders.
- Technical aspects of Coastal RSM Plans: compile info, identify critical erosion areas, permitting, determine sediment sources, locate critical species/habitats, and identify funding streams.
- There are 3 current Coastal RSM Plans: Southern Monterey Bay (AMBAG), Santa Barbara Littoral Cell (BEACON), and San Diego County (SANDAG); and five upcoming plans: Eureka Littoral Cell, San Francisco Central Bay and Open Coast, Northern Monterey Bay, LA County, and Orange County.

Lessons Learned

- Lessons Learned in Outreach Arena need a well-written plan to get buy-in from public and stakeholders; establish an appropriate advisory group at onset including all involved entities; coordination with watershed and similar groups.
- Lessons Learned in Governance Arena: utilize existing Joint Powers Authority to address regional sediment management issues; JPA's EO needs a funded staff member to manage issues; Integrate Plan into various permitting streams including CEQA, Local Coastal Programs, CCC permits, county general plans, & local zoning ordinances.
- Lessons Learned in Technical Arena: characterize and pursue offshore sediment; assess feasibility of sand-retaining devices; dedicated revenue streams necessary to fund projects seems to be best avenue to fund projects.
- Lessons Learned in Regulatory Arena: Statewide and Federal regulatory coordination to integrate RSM needs; pursue regional permits from all permitting agencies; pursue sediment stockpile areas for upland sediment.

Comments

- A goal of the Southern Monterey Bay Plan is to protect shorelines without armoring, in partnership with City of Monterey.
- Long-term changes are much more noticeable so it is hoped that emerging from today, we think about how we could be more engaged in MLPA processes, and to what degree we could stay involved in permit



processes/agencies. Are there public/private partnerships or things we could do to make an impact sooner?

- There are a lot of sediment TMDL and Clean Water Act issues and RSM is largely dependent on the CWA so how can we act on that to make progress?

❖ **RSM Plan Presentations**

- **AMBAG – Bob Battalio**
 - Bob lead consultant on S. Monterey Bay Plan.
 - An overview of the S. Monterey Bay Littoral Cell, a summary of the RSM plan, and current issues within the Plan were presented.
 - Main problem is Dune Bluff Erosion: roughly 200 K CY/yr. Shoreline erosion is mainly south of Salinas River, ranging from 1 to 6 ft/yr.
 - Sand Mining has been ongoing in Marina dredge pond; has yet to be successfully shut down.
 - ~200 k cy/yr loss from system as dredge pond filled every winter by waves.
 - Future erosion rate of study shoreline ~1.5-3 ft/yr.
 - Summary of RSM approaches: do nothing north of River, allow central area to continue to erode, cease sand mining from the beach, and beach nourishment in most southern area.
 - Governance Structure: AMBAG the head with Partners (NOAA, CSMW, DBAW, and USACE); contracted consultants/contractors; Advisory Committee: SMBCEW.

Lessons Learned

- More money needed, need to conduct more public outreach, gather data through the government more as it is often easier than through consultants.
- Outreach: there are different levels of detail in outreach and sometimes it's better to keep it simple.
- SMBCEW was very helpful in working out details of the Plan
- Important to have a specific POC from the locality (Sponsor) and keep them involved from start to finish.
- A large amount of meetings had to be attended throughout the process and a lesson learned was that having CSMW involved was really beneficial to assist in working through governance structure issues.

Comments

- Was there guidance on what not to do south of Moss Landing since it's a stable area? Bob: No, because it was clear what the causes of erosion were in the area.
 - There was a lot more work involved in working with locals than expected.
 - The Army Corps was considering incorporation of sand capture to canyons in the study...why was it not considered? Bob: We looked at sources from two locations: Near emergent zone and at the head of the Monterey Canyon and focused on placing sediment in the most southern region so the back-passing option wasn't analyzed.
 - What are the options for shutting the sand mining option down? Bob: A number of people are pursuing regulatory and permit options to do this.
 - How long did the Plan take and how much did it cost? Bob: 1 year and \$150,000.
- **BEACON – Gerald Comati (w/ Larry Paul and Jon Moore)**
- The biggest challenge in BEACON's RSM Plan (Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties) is protection of beaches and erosion control.
 - Noble Consultants was contracted as the lead consultant when a grant was received in 2007.
 - Due to permitting issues in the program BEACON wants to focus more on Policy and Management.
 - A Programmatic EIR is being prepared to prioritize aspects of the Plan that will provide more detail.
 - Jon Moore provided a brief overview of the Plan in which the approach was to: 1) Understand the coastline 2) Identify challenges 3) Formulate plans
 - There are 7 watersheds, 4 rivers, 4 harbors, and 3 littoral cells within the study region.
 - Population concentrated between Goleta and Port Hueneme.
 - Central and South regions are divided into reaches (sediment limited and sediment abundant).
 - A sediment "Bottom Line" shows where sediment has been lost
 - Sediment "bang for the buck" is the priority in locating sand (i.e. offshore sand, inland sources, trapped in harbors, natural sediment delivery processes)
 - Key Objectives: beach preservation, beneficial reuse of material, retrieve offshore sand, preserve natural resources, address funding needs, implement innovative/alternative technology to maximize sand longevity.

Lessons Learned

- The North Region has been the easiest to assess because the recommendation is to do nothing.
- CRSMP needs to be technically sound, environmentally sensitive, politically realistic, and financially feasible/sustainable
- Implementation of RSM on Beacon's coast requires a diverse effort to address successfully.
- BEACON Board approved the Strategic Implementation Plan in January 2009; Plan is currently under review and next step is implementation.

Comments

- Is BEACON engaging in land use planning to address issues that might be approved 'on the ground'? Are you going to the board of Supervisors to address issues? Gerald: Resources currently available don't allow us to do this. Jon: The plan recommends a lot of stakeholder collaboration to increase involvement and produce solutions. Larry: An advantage BEACON has is that government entities/members are already involved in the RSM Plan, which saves time down the line.
- Larry: To address lack of funding, the purpose of the Strategic Implementation Plan is to get local governing bodies to recognize that they have valuable sediment sources. It is also intended to get the Resource Agencies' buyoff by explaining where we're going with the Plan.

○ **SANDAG – Shelby Tucker**

- The new due date for Regional Beach Fill Project II: 2012.
- The Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP) was created to maximize the benefits of sand placement on beaches in the Plan region. The Program was started with a pilot project in the Oceanside littoral cell and is still in process of receiving permits.
- Plan Recommendations: Implement opportunistic beach fill programs, continue maintenance dredge operations, implement large scale projects (SANDAG, USACE, by-passing), and strongly consider sediment management devices such as artificial reefs.
- To ensure Plan implementation we need to build on the regional momentum of opportunistic beach fill programs, proactively addressing obstacles such as stakeholder issues and regulatory, and assessing funding opportunities.



- Potential Governance Actions: addition to CEQA study checklist, reliance on Coastal Commission Act, addition to coastal plans, amendment of permits, etc.
- Partners involved: DBW, CSMW, Shoreline Preservation Working Group, and various Consultants
- Plan Preparation Process: Public Outreach (4 public workshops, meetings); Plan Approval (SANDAG and committees going through Board of Directors to achieve project success).

○ PANEL DISCUSSION

- What were the biggest obstacles in these plans? Bob: Establishing a technical basis and getting everyone on same page to understand coastal processes as those involved sometimes had differences in understanding.
- Brian: Outreach and engagement: We need to structure how money is dispersed/received to improve outreach. A small grant from OPC of ~\$20 K should be pursued.
- Shelby: We had regular meetings, updated our council policy members. We have a unique area in SD and our board is supportive but we need to educate more to connect the dots more for policy members to improve necessary changes in plans. We reached out to Water Agencies to identify sediment sources and use a broad perspective approach.
- What has BEACON's public Outreach experience been? Gerald: Historically the public has been uninterested so we need to get through to the harbors and entities to gain public support and look at how we engage the public to accomplish our huge list of items.
- Brian: If there's a development that'll have a big impact, it seems the public is more interested.
- Kathy: We need to change public perception by giving presentations on what actually is out there and happening.
- Do any of the RSM plans address changes desired by the public that could be addressed through permitting? Bob: We have looked at opportunistic use of sand to support this and one of the goals of the plan is to conduct opportunistic projects.
- Why is sediment testing through the EPA more stringent for sand going to the ocean than beaches?
- Kim: Strong local support and buy in to make the process work is really important.
- Shelby: We need to frame the issues to get through to the public better and use the correct terminology for better understanding.
- Gerald: We have been looking at how CEQA plays into RSM.

- Chris: We need to make inland projects, notably SANDAG, consistent.
- Clif: Has the RSM checklist been finalized? Shelby: Not yet.
- Brian: Maybe we should say CSMW should take this action and say what should be done.
- Bob: We are essentially trying to institutionalize plans, and what it means to adopt plans.
- Clif: If we're going to pursue plan checklists, we need to observe the downcoast impacts of the proposed actions.

Sediment Testing

- Clif: In the development of SCOUP, we worked to identify the appropriate sediment testing criteria to ensure the process would 'fly'.
- Heather: We need to show that there's extensive testing for both offshore and beach placement of sediment.
- Kathy: There's an inland testing manual that's used for all testing.
- Chris and Jon: The reason for going offshore with sediments is that usually small particles and silts are placed offshore and more chemicals attract to these. We need to inform the public that it is a programmatic result as to why testing different.
- David: From a cost standpoint, sometimes testing is bypassed or omitted if not needed for beach placement.

❖ Roundtable to Discuss Tools and Data Collection that would Help in RSM Plan Development and Implementation

- **Philip Williams and Associates – Bob Battalio**
 - Regional plans and development are very important but we need to do more shoreline management and coastal zone management. A team process would be best.
 - Public and local awareness of coastal hazards important and sediment is a resource and not a waste.
 - We are in a static phase in terms of SLR analysis and we need to get clarification on how much it should be incorporated.
 - The Risk and Vulnerability analysis in Monterey Bay is important to people in that area.
 - We need to make the distinction between retention measures versus structures.
 - There are tons of recommendations in the Monterey Bay Report and the 3 plans that exist provide a good framework to move ahead.
 - We are moving toward a regional shoreline management plan



- **Moffatt & Nichol – Chris Webb**
 - The SANDAG Plan contains many tools.
 - A database of all sand sources was useful but getting arms around the data is tough.
 - Additional investigation of offshore sand sources would be helpful and would better identify sources – this is expensive work though – USGS work would be good.
 - Scripps has developed database program MOPPS that produces longshore transport data, which would be useful. “Mini-littoral cells” theory by Bill O’Reilly (Scripps) could be used to optimize placement sites.
 - We should estimate future habitat areas in dollars for future funding requirements.
 - A centralized repository of data would go far in building tools to help implement RSM and over time monitoring requirements could benefit. CSMW has made strides with data tools.
 - Results from the Tijuana Estuary Fate & Transport Study would benefit us in finding where sand should be placed so we should expedite the results of this.
 - Regional Permit #67 is in place for Corps and Water Board. Another permit for the Coastal Commission and Lands Commission would streamline the sand identification process. A joint permit would be difficult but two separate ones may be better.
 - Need to determine adverse effect of retaining sand along SD County coast including optimal placement of sand along this area.

- **Noble Consultants – Jon Moore**
 - We need to understand wave climate, water levels, where the sediment is going, and what we predict will happen to sediment.
 - State of CA’s analysis already in progress, but let’s pool all of the in-house state resources and talents to answer these questions and use the info to understand the coast and make decisions.
 - How do we interpret shoreline evolution and modeling (Genesis, etc.)? We need to choose one model we all agree on to get an unassailable database springing from one model.

Comments

- David Cannon: Where should database reside? Should it be housed within academia or public agencies? Chris: It would probably reside at the local/regional level like SANDAG and at state level so user could go to either spot. Heather: CA Sed Master Plan and CSMW are working to house this data. Bob: Maybe we could learn from SF Bay strategy from in-bay disposal of dredged material, because they might



keep track of all the sediment volumes and associated data. Clif: USGS maintains USseabed which could be used.

- Brian Baird: The President has new Ocean Policy, and a new approach to Marine Spatial Planning. We need to work under this approach to bring precious federal dollars to the State to meet needs. Funding is a huge issue and without State matching funds we could lose out on projects. We want people to be able to research, search, and find data to assist in projects.
- Susie: We'll likely get Section 227 funds for Oil Piers to restart the study. Want to learn about sand retention from this.

❖ **Top 10 Ways to Implement RSM from a Local/Regional Perspective**

- See Attached Summary of Changes/Additions to the Top 10 List

ADJOURN

**NEXT MEETING
San Francisco
Date & Time TBA**



CSMW ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail
Brad Damitz	Mont. Bay NMS	415-259-5766	Brad.Damitz@noaa.gov
Athena Horne			
Lauren DeFrank	USACE - IWR	703-428-6076	Lauren.DeFrank@usace.army.mil
Chris Potter	CA Resources	916-654-0536	Chris.Potter@resources.ca.gov
Clif Davenport	CGS	707-576-2986	Clif.Davenport@conservation.ca.gov
Larry Paul	Larry Paul & Associates	949-439-1455	Larry@LarryPaulandassoc.com
George Nichol	SWRCB		Gnichol@waterboards.ca.gov
Rick Raives	BEACON	805-654-7870	RRaives@cityofventura.net
Gerald Comati	BEACON	805-962-0488	Gerald@com3consulting.com
Shelby Tucker	SANDAG	619-699-1916	STu@sandag.org
Kim Sterrett	DBW	916-263-8157	Sterrett@dbw.ca.gov
Brian Baird	State of CA	916-657-0198	Brian@resources.ca.gov
Jim Fawcett	USC	213-740-4477	Fawcett@usc.edu
Heather Schlosser	USACE - LA	213-452-3810	Heather.R.Sumerell@usace.army.mil
Tom Kendall	USACE - SF	415-503-6822	Thomas.R.Kendall@usace.army.mil
Jon Moore	Noble Consultants	949-752-1530	Jmoore@nobleconsultants.com
Chris Webb	Moffatt Nichol	562-426-9551	Cwebb@moffattnichol.com
Susie Ming	USACE – LA	213-452-3789	Susan.M.Ming@usace.army.mil
Jorine Campopiano	EPA	213-244-1808	Campopiano.Jorine@epa.gov
Susan Brodeur	Orange County Parks	949-586-6448	Susan.Brodeur@ocparks.com
Karen Green	SAIC	858-826-4939	GreeKa@saic.com
Kathy Weldon	City of Encinitas	760-633-2632	Kweldon@ci.encinitas.ca.us
Lynn Martin	USACE - IWR	703-428-8065	Lynn.R.Martin@usace.army.mil
David Cannon	Everest International	562-435-9309	David.Cannon@everestconsultans.com
Cesar Espinosa	LA County	310-305-9530	cespinosa@bh.lacounty.gov
Vicki Frey	CA Fish & Game	707-445-7830	VFrey@dfg.ca.gov
David Hull	Humboldt RCD	707-443-0801	dhull@portofhumboldtby.org



Nate West	USACE – LA	213-452-3801	Nathaniel.R.West@usace.army.mil
John Doughty	AMBAG	831-883-3750	JDoughty@ambag.org