



CSMW Meeting Minutes

28 JULY 2010

9:30 AM – 12:30 PM

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) Office

50 California Street

San Francisco, CA 94111

MEETING FOLLOW-UP ITEMS:

- ✓ **Susie and Brian Ross:** will work on convening a scientific group/meeting to discuss the depth of closure issue in terms of defining limits of beneficial reuse placement rather than defining location of depth of closure along coast.
- ✓ **Kim** will discuss local government involvement (City of Encinitas / Local Coastal Zone Management Plans) with Steve.
- ✓ **ALL USACE** trying to resurrect GIS technical committee. Corps soliciting names of recommended people to sit on committee within *2 weeks of today's meeting*. Please send recommendations to Heather and Susie.

Still Pending:

- ✓ **Chris** will reconvene the PPR sub-committee to discuss the RSM Top Ten Recommendations. STILL PENDING
- ✓ **Susie/Heather** will reconvene the Corps' PPR sub-committee to discuss Federal actions. STILL PENDING
- ✓ **Heather and Chris** Letter to the CERB outlining progress on LIDAR data collection. PENDING (A draft letter to OPC about LIDAR efforts has been prepared).
- ✓ **Corps** Check on progress of posting of JALBTCX LIDAR data to NOAA website so others can access.
- ✓ **George and Brian** – look at existing PPR draft and give comments. PENDING.
- ✓ **Brian and Chris** Check on availability of report from Nicole Kinsman (student of Gary Griggs at UCSC).
- ✓ **CBReS/CBECS/CBEAS** – Natural Resources Agency is seeking Governor's office approval to release the report to the public. PENDING – Brian will check on status

❖ **Welcome & Introductions – Brian Baird and George Domurat**

❖ **Review of Meeting Minutes from 5/26/10 Conference Call – Heather Schlosser**

❖ **SMP Project Manager's Report – Clif Davenport**

- CSMW Brochure



- Brochure will be sent to Everest Int'l Consultants to make final changes to graphics, etc. Chris has made revisions based on comments received from Lesley, Clif, and Syd.
- SF Bay RSM Plan
 - Money received from USGS for BCDC portion. Other funds still have to be sent to BCDC for their portion.
- CEMEX Sand Mining Site
 - Problem arises based on local shoreline erosion rate vs. sand extraction rate at sand mine.
 - Erosion rate ~200,000 CY/yr in Monterey Bay area found in RSM Plan. Roughly the same as the rate of extraction at the sand mine. Erosion rate downcoast of the sand mine is highest in California
 - When the other sand mines in the area were shut down in the 80's, this mine upped its extraction rate to match past levels.
 - Consensus recommendation of Monterey Bay Coastal Erosion Workgroup, adopted in the Southern Monterey Bay Coastal RSM Plan, was to move sand mine off the beach to lessen impacts on net sand loss in littoral cell.
 - Corps Regulatory personnel visited site in June 2009 to assess enforcement of any jurisdictions for extraction from or placement of sand in the Mine. Clean Water Act Section 404 does apply and therefore placement of sand in the Mine can be regulated. jurisdiction (In July 2009, Corps noticed the MHW line was below level of cut, so they knew 404 jurisdiction was valid but not section 10 of the Rivers & Harbors Act, which regulates extraction).
 - In October 2009 a site visit with State Lands Commission found that any sand placed in lagoon required permit. Because the MHW line was below the cut but the wave run-up reached the pond, this is not jurisdictional under Rivers & Harbors Act, Section 10). The Section 10 line is far enough below the MHW water line that it does not apply. Therefore, the Corps does not have strong case to enforce relocation of the sand mine.
 - Comment: Is the cut above MHW due to the sand berm or just natural topography?
Response: The cut hasn't been verified since the site visits. There is a steep incline to the top of the dune.
 - Comment: Are there time of year restrictions?
Response: Yes because the topography and above water beach profile can change, MHW and tide lines are set. Cut looks different now than from last year. Since then, the Mine has been moved further inshore, so there is more sand between ocean affecting profile changes.

- Comment: Since no Section 10 jurisdiction, there is no regulation of sand extraction. 404 jurisdiction only applies when they want to place sand in the mine; a permit is needed for this.
 - Comment: We don't know the bathymetry of the pond but if we did we could maybe predict sediment slumping in. Would this trigger a 404 jurisdiction?
Response: Likely an issue to be addressed in the Environmental Legal arena.
 - Comment: Clean Water Act Section 402 doesn't apply. EPA has found that it can regulate material that's placed on the beach above the MHT line for which it is reasonably known will erode away eventually on a seasonal basis.
 - Comment: Is the pipe that runs landward permanent?
Response: No.
 - Comment: Is CSMW interested in funding a surveyor to survey the thalweg? CSUMB offered to do it at no cost. Will fall under Cadastral Law.
 - Comment: Need to define where exactly the sediment is being taken from and how much is taken from the littoral zone. Because this is the material that impacts Corps regulation.
 - Comment: how high of a priority is this in the RSM plan?
Response: Elimination of mining sand from the beach itself was the #1 priority from a regional RSM perspective in the Coastal RSM Plan for Southern Monterey Bay.
 - Comment: CEMEX started using a new dredge and this may impact their process.
 - Comment: The amount of revenue from the CEMEX operation should be documented.
 - Comment: A webcam could be very useful for monitoring littoral processes and CEMEX operations.
 - Comment: Coastal Commission jurisdiction letter will be out in about a month. Analysis of change in intensity of sand extraction over time and jurisdiction issues over Sand Mine will be discussed.
 - Comment: There is no firm evidence that this sand mining is causing downcoast sediment losses.
- Eureka RSM Plan
 - Kickoff public meeting held yesterday. There has been concern with dredging of Bay and subsequent placement locations. They dredge entrance channels to keep boating in operation.
 - Comment: EPA has banned placement of their past placement of over 80% fines (up to 89% in some cases) sediment in littoral zone.



- Comment: Since they can't place on beach, they're evaluating an upland detention basin where they'll place sediment and let it settle out.
- EPA North Coast is strongly against placement of sand in upland areas.
- Comment: Noyo Harbor and Crescent City have experienced problems with locating placement areas for sand.
- Comment: Does RSM Plan include mouth of Klamath River?
Response: No.
- LA County RSM Plan
 - First public kickoff meeting likely to be held this fall with LA Public Works.
- MMS funding (CIAP)
 - Moving State's (DBW) request towards the top of the list
 - May get funding in 2-3 months
 - \$700K
 - Chris is working with MMS on the grant process – it is extremely long
- Computer Based Tools Webmapper
 - John Carotta (former GIS analyst) posted data but we're now out of funding to host the Webmapper at CERES (access available on the CSMW website). Chris working to get revised budget to hopefully include this as a line item.
 - Need funding for GIS Specialist to work with CERES staff to get new GIS data onto the website. Want to see if Corps GIS specialists could update it.
 - BEACON is sending a large amount of GIS data for their region related to their Coastal RSM Plan that will need to be posted.
 - Corps recently awarded a GIS User Survey contract to Halcrowe to assess usefulness of the Webmapper and GIS data.
 - Comment: Was Webmapper useful for MLPA?
Response: MLPA folks used certain data sets (e.g., historic beach nourishment areas, potential offshore and coastal sediment source areas), but didn't want to use CSMW's Beach Erosion Concern Areas (BECA's) as those had not been permitted.
 - Comment: USACE trying to resurrect GIS technical committee. Corps soliciting names of recommended people to sit on committee within 2 weeks of today's meeting.
 - Comment: May want to focus survey into two parts: one for technical people and one for public.
Response: Good idea. The Webmapper, while geared toward



technical users and managerial users alike, was also designed to be very user friendly.

- CSMW BIA Workshops
 - Comment: How useful is the BIA workshop info? We have had 6 so far in a series of 7, with the final one August 4th.
 - Comment: How is the info used?
 - Response: All input received put in the Natural Resource Protection Guidelines and the final Biological Impacts Analysis Report, eventually the Final Work Plan to implement recommendations.
 - Comment: Timeframe for completion?
Response: It will be finalized by the end of the year.
 - Comment: Will there be a screening of environmental limits and thresholds?
Response: Report will be habitat based and limits and windows will be unique for habitats and beach construction activities.
 - Comment: It's most useful to be able to pull out mitigation measures for different projects/habitats.
 - Comment: Use of the phrase "Guidelines" could be perceived as underground regulations. Better to phrase along the lines of "Technical Considerations for Natural Resources Protection..."
- The Administrative Draft of the Programmatic EIR from BEACON is available. Gerald Comati has sent to Clif. Request made for posting to Website.
- Comment: Any updates on Tijuana River Estuary Project?
 - Response: Analysis should be in draft form for public review by CWO Conference (early September).
- CBRES/CBEAS status:
 - Comment- Is this report dead in the water? It's been awaiting approval from the governor's office for about a year. Nicole Kinsman (student of Gary Griggs) has been studying the locations recommended for sediment management in the report to assess whether they are appropriate for beach nourishment.
Response- Brian will check into the status.

❖ **Depth of Closure Issue – Brian Ross**

- Brian Ross has been coordinating with Corps personnel regarding the definition of the Depth of Closure and its demarcation throughout coastal CA. The issue is that material that is placed in the littoral zone is defined

as “beneficial reuse” and material placed offshore that does not contribute to littoral processes/dynamics is labeled as a “waste” disposal.

- Placement of material as beneficial reuse requires a Clean Water Act permit and is classified as “fill.”
- Even if you place 100% sand beyond closure depth and it never makes it back to the littoral system, it’s still classified as waste.
- EPA is considering lowering 80/20 (80% sand; 20% fines) rule of thumb to 50/50. Sediment with less than 50% sand is defined as waste.
- Comment: There is a good definition of closure depth in the SCOUP document.
- Comment: Depth of Closure is different for different regions and beaches. Technical definition is not the same as how being used in this Clean Water Act versus Ocean Dumping Act.
- Comment: EPA suggests we find way to classify closure depth based on orientation of shoreline in a direction-facing sense.
- Comment: There is a fundamental difference between definitions of closure depth between regulatory and engineering arenas.
 - In coastal engineering it is where the depth doesn’t change greatly over time. Sediment can move anywhere along the seafloor in CA.
 - We shouldn’t base it on where the closure depth is defined, we should define based on where there aren’t great changes in depth over time for an offshore area.
 - Comment: EPA doesn’t want good sand dumped where it doesn’t do us any good. We want to be able to classify correctly between beneficial reuse and offshore disposal of sand. We want to define how close to shore we can place material and what the beneficial use area really is.
- Comment: We know there is far more sediment movement very far offshore but not sure it’s a valid assumption that this sediment contributes to littoral system. CA seafloor mapping program could contribute greatly to determining this.
- Comment: Are there times we want to place sand just to protect resources from extremely large storms?
- Comment: It may be better to have each project state where the limits of nearshore movement are.
Response: Difficult to have every project prove where the limit of sediment movement is. Always safe placing sediment within 40 feet of shoreline? We can’t generalize this for every project.
- Comment: We need to explain any generalized limit is subject to special features such as canyons, etc.
- Comment: Wave energy very important for defining any general rule.

- Comment: What is the incremental cost for changing the capability of a dredge such as the Essayons to include pump out (to shore) capability? Capital Cost is \$12 M.
- Comment: EPA doesn't want equipment limitations to cause safety issues. We'd rather have towed barges operating further offshore rather than sacrifice safety.
- Comment: SANDAG has a quality of life ballot measure and must use it to restore habitat. One aspect is beach restoration. 4 categories are open space, clean water, mass transit, and beach nourishment. It may be difficult to include all 4 within funding.
- Comment: It could cost millions to modify dredge operations in connection with this.
- Comment: Corps annually dredges Morro Bay with Yaquina and we have opportunity to monitor this offshore area and where sand goes to determine impacts.
- Comment: Gary Griggs report could be useful to quantify depth of closure.
- Comment: Should we convene a separate effort to define depth of closure or get help from agencies?
 - Corps will form subgroup with EPA (Brian Ross) to make further discoveries.
- ***The issue of defining depth of closure for placement seems to be less of an issue than is classifying material for beneficial reuse.***

❖ **Presentation: Ocean Beach – San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR) – Lesley Ewing and Ben Grant**

- Purpose of presentation is to explain SPUR plan and whether it makes sense for SPUR to stay involved in the San Francisco Outer Coast RSM Plan.
- SPUR mostly works on City planning projects in SF Bay region
- SPUR Program areas
 - Sustainable development – Involves SLR and climate change
 - Housing
 - Good govt
 - Community planning
 - Transportation
 - Disaster planning
 - Economic Development
- Ocean Beach Master Plan
 - Ocean Beach Project uses grants from OPC and Parks Service.

- Traditionally SPUR not a planning agency but an advocacy group.
 - SPUR should be involved because of:
 - Inter-jurisdictional issues.
 - Long-term master plan stewardship
 - GGNRA
 - Climate change adaptation.
 - SPUR charged to look at the region between water line to building faces.
 - This is a very interdependent system.
 - Significant erosion taking place in many areas of Ocean Beach, jeopardizing utility lines, roads.
 - Role of presenter is to focus SPUR more on policy issues and general jurisdictional issues.
 - Multiple jurisdictions are involved:
 - Many opportunities
 - Model of sustainable space
 - Improve City's landscape near coast
 - Project timeframe is 18 months to arrive at master plan.
 - Want to ensure public involvement – there will be public workshops where stakeholders can weigh in.
- Pros of SPUR/RSMP:
 - Relevant SPUR programs/philosophy
 - SPUR History
 - Spur Capacity
 - Nexus with Ocean Beach Master Plan
 - Potential Fiscal Benefit
 - Long-term implementation presence
 - Ocean Beach Master Plan
 - Climate Adaptation Policy
 - Limited other entities
 - Cons
 - Outside SPUR core programming areas
 - Lack continuity on sediment issues
 - SPUR not a technical entity
 - Timing limits OBMP benefit
 - Q's
 - Budget/funding schedule
 - Guidelines for applying entity
 - Administrative fiscal structure
 - Application and consultant bid process
 - Other coordination needed: mapping, data, regulatory

- Comment: What is SPUR applying for?
Response: The San Francisco Open Coast RSM Plan. In original RSM discussions, BCDC's jurisdiction didn't extend to Pacifica, so we wanted to see how we could include this area.
- Comment: BCDC revised proposal to include both Phase I and Phase II so we want to clarify whether we're under contract to do both regions.
Response: Corps response is that BCDC will do Phase I. Phase I ends at Fort Funston. Phase II goes from Fort to Pacifica and will be awarded to another agency.
 - CSMW agreed that State would fund Phase I under CIAP funds and would also look at different funding mechanisms for the Outer Coast.
- SPUR: Phase II would geographically be out of our interest,
- Comment: Corps is about to release report for this area.
Response: SPUR will treat those results as prior to their master plan and not in conjunction. They are willing to coordinate it but Ocean Beach Master Plan is in its very early stages.
- Comment: BCDC could coordinate through public meetings for the SF Bay RSM plan.
- Comment: There should be a meeting and decision as to whether and how much BCDC collaborates on their efforts with SPUR. Notes will be sent to CSMW following this meeting.

❖ **BCDC RSM Activities – Brenda Goeden**

- In terms of long term dredging in SF Bay, BCDC is looking at expanding efforts beyond just dredging to monitor sediment loads.
- There has been a big sediment load drop-off in the SF Bay in the late 90's
- Need to consider new areas of sediment sources and sinks
 - Flood protection
 - Aggregate mining
 - Any wetland below marsh elevation at great risk
- Had workshop in April of those working on sediment issues within the Bay and asked the questions:
 - What are the most important sediment management issues to those in attendance? Can we manage sediment more economically and better to better manage sediment? Found at workshop that we don't have a common set of bathymetry in the Bay. Different user's use different data sets. Tributaries will become more important in Bay analyses.
- BCDC put gauges upstream and at tributary mouths to measure sediment volumes and suspended sediment.
 - First strategy toward quantifying sediment loads.

- EFH consultation, benthic recovery ongoing between NOAA and Corps. NOAA fisheries considered many habitats disturbed that should be considered lost.
- LIDAR data just received will be useful.
- Sand mining handout shows depth changes in areas of lease areas.
 - Lease Areas have lost ~9.2 MCY from '97 to 2008
 - Non-lease areas have lost ~4.9 MCY
- There are long fin smelt and green sturgeon issues within Bay.
- Have been placing material outside bay instead of in in-bay disposal sites.
- Habitat Goals document explains sediment and habitat loss that could be used in analysis.
- DMMP from Corps looks at a 20-yr window of dredge material use which is beneficial for analysis.
- NOAA 309 Section
 - requesting \$1.4 M for work on this plan
- Brenda recently moderated a coastal erosion meeting for the City of Pacifica
 - This provided a greater understanding of erosion for the City's citizens.
- Comment: How will this effort compare with current RSM plans?
Response: We're looking at a systems' based approach and coordination with a broader audience as we've received a lot of interest.
- Comment: How will this compare with Provenance Work?
Response: Patrick Barnhard took more samples than they had funding. They're looking at analysis of mineralogy and sources of sand to determine where sand is coming from and if there is a time-based trend.
- Comment: "Pulse of the Estuary 2009" report available from SFEI
Money transfer(s) ie: \$100k to Patrick for analysis of his additional samples?

❖ Update on Corps' Projects – Susie Ming & Heather Schlosser

- San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study
 - Draft EIR will start public review next Friday August 6th.
- Oil Piers Project
 - Section 227 experimental coastal structures project
 - Contract to be finalized for multipurpose sand retention/reef structure.
 - Received \$2.5 M for FY11 from Congress but likely need \$5.5 to construct.
- Fletcher Cover is under national RSM plan but hoping to move it to 227 program.
 - Looking to see if we could move any funds from Oil Piers to Fletcher Cove. 30% engineering design of submerged offshore reef achieved for Fletcher Cove.



- Design issues found with removal of Matilija Dam.
- Rindge Dam: lacking funds from State Parks.
- Comment: Solana-Encinitas EIR will be available next year, not this year.

❖ Other New Business and Announcements

- West Coast Govs Agreement
 - Currently ~\$500,000 in grants available for all plans to improve RSM activities throughout CA, WA, and OR.
 - Want to know if there is any interest in a one-year grant for \$20K or maybe two \$20K grants for any work in CA. If anyone has thoughts on how to use the funds, let Jim Haussener know.
 - Example would be maybe a lessons learned joint study of different State Parks studies between 2 of the 3 states. Or lessons learned for hard structures for Coastal Commission.
 - Brian/Chris: Makes most sense to use the money for development of RSM for all 3 states.
- CWO Conference: Hyatt Regency SF is under boycott resulting in disruption and 150 employee arrests. Contract with hotel has been closed and Conference will likely be held at Marriott. Schedule will likely be modified with 7 concurrent sessions, not 9.
- Previous meeting follow-up item: Susie was looking at options for beneficially using sediment behind Carbon Canyon dam.
 - Corps O&M issue – Corps only had stimulus funds to move sediment, not separate grain sizes. George: it would take at least \$3-5 M to move all this sediment.
- EPA: 4 dams on the Plymouth River will not be flushed until roughly 2020
 - ~4MCY to be flushed from dams.
 - CSMW could likely provide sediment management information in development of EIS.
- Richard Young of Crescent City has expressed interest in a potential RSM Plan.
- Next Meeting: Conference Call on Wednesday, August 25th at 9:30.
- Next In-Person Meeting: Wednesday, September 22nd.

ADJOURN

NEXT MEETING - Wednesday, August 25th
****CONFERENCE CALL****
Call-In Info Will Be Provided
9:30 AM – 12:30 PM



Project Manager's Report July 28, 2010

A: Outreach

1. Chris Potter is incorporating CSMW member edits to the SMP Brochure. Everest will produce final hard copies and electronic version for posting.
2. USACE SPN Regulatory issued a letter of jurisdiction regarding CEMEX sand mine indicating CWA 404 applies, but R&H Section 10 does not. Some members of the SMBCEW have taken exception to the latter, indicating the survey to determine the thalweg in front of the dredging pond (and therefore the MHW line) was not adequately surveyed. USACE regulatory has reportedly indicated a willingness to consider a better survey, and Tom Kendall has suggested this might be appropriate for a RSM initiative.

B: Coastal RSM Plans:

1. Orange County- Working on collecting all the data for the OC reach.
2. Santa Cruz littoral cell- No Activities this period
3. SF Bay Littoral Cell- USACE LAD funded USGS for the Sand Provenance for the San Francisco Bay Coastal System. Additional efforts with BCDC will be continued next FY with state CIAP funds.
4. San Francisco Open Coast: We're examining possibilities for the Governance structure and SPUR is making presentation on their capabilities today. Funds not yet available for Plan development
5. Eureka Littoral Cell- Task order for the RSM was executed with Moffatt and Nichol Engineers (Walnut Creek) and work has begun. First public/project kickoff meeting is scheduled for 27 July 2010.
6. Los Angeles County - Work has been initiated. Susie Ming presented to the LA County Department of Public Works and will work with the A/E to schedule the first public meeting in the fall. Noble Consultants is coordinating that effort.

CIAP Funding: MMS is reportedly reviewing DBW's CIAP funding request and we hope to hear back from them in the near future.

C: Computer-based Tools

WebMapper/GIS

1. CERES has inquired about funding for hosting-related activities on their part. Funds for this activity have not been identified.
2. Funds for GIS Specialist to administer and post GIS-related data obtained by CSMW have not been identified
3. BEACON reports that the GIS data collection has been completed and shapefiles are on their way. Until #s 1 and 2 are resolved, we won't be able to post BEACONS spatial data to WebMapper
4. A GIS User's Survey has been contracted by USACE LAD and resurrection of CSMW's GIS subcommittee is a necessary first step in this effort.

CSMW Website



1. The Natural Resource Protection Guideline (NRPG) webpage has been extensively updated to incorporate information provided during and developed as a result of the six workshops to date (see BIA below)

CSMW Reference Database:

1. USACE SPN staff are still converting an older bibliography to the current, Access-database searchable format.

Coastal Sediment Benefits Analysis Tool (CSBAT) No activities this period

D: Educational Documents

Biological Impact Analysis Phase 2: In order to address CSMW-requested reviews, SAIC is developing "Resource Protection Guidelines" that will enable agency reviews of environmental issues associated with sediment management for environmental assessments and permitting. Six of the seven workshops have already been held (Long Beach (NMFS), Sacramento (RWQCB), Carlsbad (USFWS), Moss Landing (MBARI), Oakland (SFEI), and Eureka (HBRCD)). The final workshop is set for 4 August 2010 at SCCWRP's office in Costa Mesa. Agenda, handouts and meeting notes for completed workshops has been uploaded to the NRPG webpage.

Environmental Document, BEACON: The Administrative Draft has been completed and will be provided to Clif and Heather (*anyone else interested?*) for review/comment shortly. One issue is that the proposed area for the regional stockpile may not be doable.

Environmental Document, Southern Monterey Bay: Two proposals to address the RFP issued by AMBAG have been received, and John Doughty is coordinating review and selection of consultant

Environmental Document, SANDAG: Comments were incorporated and document will be finalized in the next couple of weeks.

California Beach Erosion Assessment Survey (CBEAS):

1. The September 2009 draft report is still awaiting approval by the Governor's office.
2. Kim is awaiting a critical assessment by UCSC (Kinsman) on cliff geomorphology and beach width at the Beach Erosion Concern Areas that will conclude as to whether beach nourishment would be adequate/appropriate for those areas.

E: Demonstration Project

Tijuana Estuary Sediment Study: Jon Warrick is continuing to evaluate the monitoring data, and will present results in a session at CWO 2010.



CSMW ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	Phone	E-mail
George Domurat	USACE - SPD	415-503-6575	George.W.Domurat@usace.army.mil
Brian Baird	CA Resources	916-657-0198	Brian@resources.ca.gov
Chris Potter	CA Resources	916-654-0536	Chris.Potter@resources.ca.gov
Sam Johnson	USGS	831-427-4746	SJohnson@usgs.gov mailto:
Brenda Goeden	BCDC	415-352-3623	BrendaG@bcdc.ca.gov
Susie Ming	USACE – LA	213-452-3789	Susan.M.Ming@usace.army.mil
Monica Eichler	USACE – LA	213-452-4012	Monica.Eichler@usace.army.mil
Art Shak	USACE – LA	213-452-3675	Arthur.R.Shak@usace.army.mil
Larry Smith	USACE – LA	213-452-3846	Lawrence.J.Smith@usace.army.mil
Corice Farrar	USACE – LA	213-452-3296	Corice.J.Farrar@usace.army.mil
Holly Costa	USACE – SF	415-503-6780	Holly.N.Costa@usace.army.mil
Lesley Ewing	Coastal Commission	415-904-5291	LEwing@coastal.ca.gov
Kim Sterrett	DBW	916-263-8157	Sterrett@dbw.ca.gov
Brian Ross	EPA	415-972-3475	Ross.Brian@epa.gov
Sandra Hamlat	BCDC	415-352-3645	SandraH@bcdc.ca.gov
Carolynn Box	BCDC	415-352-3624	CBox@bcdc.ca.gov
Syd Brown	CA DPR	916-653-9930	sbrow@parks.ca.gov
Steve Aceti	CalCoast	760-612-3564	SteveAceti@calcoast.org
Heather Schlosser	USACE - LA	213-452-3810	Heather.R.Schlosser@usace.army.mil
Ben Grant	SPUR	415-298-1579	BGrant@spur.org
Jim Haussener	CMANC	925-828-6215	Jim@cmanc.com
George Nichol	SWRCB	916-341-5504	GNichol@waterboards.ca.gov
Brad Damitz	MBNMS	415-259-5766	Brad.Damitz@noaa.gov
Nate West	USACE – LA	213-452-3801	Nathaniel.R.West@usace.army.mil