



CSMW Meeting Minutes
28 March 2012
9:30 AM – 1:00 PM
USACE Lobby Conference Room
1455 Market St., San Francisco, CA

STILL PENDING:

- ✓ **Chris** – Will reconvene the PPR sub-committee to discuss the RSM Top Ten Recommendations. ONGOING
- ✓ **Susie/Heather** – Will reconvene the Corps' PPR sub-committee to discuss Federal actions. ONGOING – will follow the general sub-committee meeting
- ✓ **Nate** – Check on progress of posting of JALBTCX LIDAR data to NOAA website so others can access. ONGOING – 2009 JALBTCX CA LIDAR data not all posted yet, only orthomosaics. CA Coastal Conservancy LIDAR posted for all of CA
- ✓ **Nate** – Conversion of USACE reference database for incorporation into CSMW's searchable Access Database. ONGOING – completion expected in a few weeks.
- ✓ **Chris** – Add new agenda item for future meeting to have a discussion on disposal methodology (running into problems with disposal, particularly in the North Coast area) – ONGOING – Chris will add to a future agenda
- ✓ **Brad or Phil King** Give a presentation on the economic analysis of the Southern Monterey Bay study – PENDING – Will be placed on future agenda
- ✓ **Chris** – Follow-up with SWRCB regarding classification of clean sediments as pollutants in CA – ONGOING - Email exchange with George and Eric – will revisit in the future with a presentation when new State Board representative is identified by Jon Bishop
- ✓ **Susie/Heather** – talk with SPL and SPN Regulatory – STILL PENDING – Joint Meeting possibly in April or May. Susie made contact with DMMT
- ✓ **Susie** to Coordinate with the DMMO for future meeting
- ✓ **Chris** will look into the Noyo issue of inert vs. designated waste – STILL PENDING. **Brian Ross** will follow up with the State Board. **Chris** to speak with John Bishop
- ✓ **Steve** Will send contact info for Solana Beach to ERG to include litigation examples. STILL PENDING
- ✓ **Chris** – Will set up a sub-committee to address Crescent City Marsh issues. – - ON GOING - Caltrans has not followed through – Chris will follow up with CALTRANS
- ✓ **Brenda** - review Redwood City case study – Pending
- ✓ **Chris** – follow up with OPC staff re: the applicability of the NSMS to the National Ocean Policy NOP Implementation Plan. Susie will follow up with OPC
- ✓ **Chris** – follow up with Susan Brodeur re: CSMW public meeting at H2O. Chris followed up with Steve Aceti and will follow up

COMPLETED ITEMS:

- ✓ None



NEW ACTION ITEMS:

- **Mark Johnsson** – will send Melanie Coyne's OC Nourishment Access Database & GIS files to Dave Cannon
- **Clif** – will send contact info for local coastal permits (SD Co.) to Jon Warrick and Kristin Goodrich
- **Susie** – will set up joint meeting with DMMT for a Tijuana Study discussion (if preferred separately of joint CSMW/DMMT endeavor)
- **Leslie** – send CALTRANS contact info to Jon Warrick
- **All** – Send agenda recommendations for April meeting to Chris

❖ **Welcome & Introductions – George Domurat and Chris Potter**

❖ **Review of Meeting Minutes from 2/22/12 Meeting – Nate West**

- Meeting minutes from 2/22/12 adopted

❖ **Discussion: Malibu Rindge Dam (Susie Ming/Jim Hutchison/Marriah Abellera)**

- Ecosystem restoration of watershed, including potential removal of the obsolete Dam, which impedes fish passage
- \$210K received in FY12 and in FY13 President's Budget for \$420K
- Looking for suitable placement sites for material behind dam, don't want to just dispose. Looking for stockpile areas and beneficial reuse.
- A project summary sheet was distributed to the CSMW group. An updated project sheet is available, but study team prefers not to place on the CSMW website
- Kevin, another study manager, attended a meeting with the Sponsor and County yesterday to examine potential landfill placement sites

Comment: What's the cost difference for mining the good quality sand vs. silt?

Response: The sediment is layered behind the dam making it much easier to remove and sort the material, coarse on top, clean sand underneath.

Comment: Malibu in President's Budget next year and matching non-Fed funds are expected.

Comment: How big of a stockpile area needed?

Response: Have not identified any suitable stockpile areas. No easy answer. We have about 780,000 cubic yards of sediment with 320,000 of that as beach compatible sand. We may have to split the material up into multiple areas for stockpiles.

Comment: Behind Zuma could hold sand (near gas station). CDP underway for that area, which would probably preclude its use as a stockpile area.

Comment: What stage is the environmental document at?

Response: Working toward a draft Alternative Formulation Briefing Report, scheduled for September 2012, which would present the viable alternatives and

identify a tentatively recommended plan. A draft EIS would be produced at that time, but would not be available to the public until further internal review (probably sometime in late 2013). Construction wouldn't start for at least 5-6 years from now likely.

Comment: How does Malibu Lagoon Restoration fit in?

Response: That project gets sufficient sediment from watershed. Won't make difference/impact on this study pre or post project.

Comment: Any limitations on notching the dam?

Response: The team is looking at notching the dam at the same level as the sediment is removed.

Comment: How much could we notch before losing sand material?

Response: A 10 ft notch would allow the taking of coarse material.

Comment: Could we create a stream diversion and/or send suitable material downstream?

Response: Downstream communities have flood risk concerns and are opposed to potential need for levees/floodwalls, so we don't want to increase any chances for flooding from diversions. At this point modeling results are showing that even a small notch can create additional risk of flooding downstream.

❖ **Presentation: Orange County Coastal RSM Plan (David Cannon)**

- Today's presentation is draft of presentation to Stakeholders to come in late April/May
- OC is an ongoing plan, not yet completed
- Plan recommendations are preliminary as feedback still being received from Master Plan team and will go out to the Stakeholders soon for review.
- Draft RSMP expected April 2012; Administrative Draft currently complete
- SLR incorporated in terms of how it will affect future nourishment volumes
- 4 primary littoral cells in study area: Seal Beach Cell, Huntington Beach Cell, Laguna Cell, and Oceanside Cell
- Phil King and Karen Green (SAIC) also sub-contracted
 - Phil examined Economics for 46 beaches and funding options
 - Funding Options included sediment impoundment fee, transient occupancy tax, real estate transfer tax, sporting goods tax, among others
 - Karen examined Biological and Environmental Impacts and Issues
 - Biological Obs.: maintain habitats, protect sensitive resources, avoid/minimize impacts
 - Sensitive Resources include grunion, tidepools, least tern, snowy plover, surfgrass, kelp reef, fishing, nesting sites, fish nursery/foraging
- Receiver Sites, Upland Sources, Coastal/Offshore Sediment Sources, and Sediment Management Methods analyzed in plan



- Mapped out receiver sites by level of need

Comment: How did you define high, medium, low need?

Response: BECA's were high (only 4 for open water), medium identified by Cities such as Seal Beach or if they were nourished in past they were given a medium or higher ranking. Others were low ranking.

Comment: How did you choose to include certain beaches?

Response: If not a stakeholder concern, then subject beaches left out. Several iterations done with County (Susan Brodeur) to identify all relevant beaches.

Comment: Surfrider concerned with loss of beach in some areas not depicted on maps in RSMP.

- Regulatory & Governance issues identified
 - Regulatory: sand gradations requirements, national and regional permits, local opportunistic use permits, SCOUP, etc.
 - Governance: Regional Coastal Planning Entity with Implementation Focus is preferred way to implement plan
 - SCAG or OCCOG are potential current candidates
- Plan Activities prioritized based on several factors including timing, type, prioritization, etc.
 - Completion Timeframe
 - Near Term (<5 years) and Long term (>5 years)
 - Prioritization
 - Stakeholder interest, needs, rec./shore protection benefits, funding availability, costs, habitat impacts, reg./permitting requirements

Comment: Was high fines pilot study the current Tijuana Study or did the RSMP have another project in mind?

Response: Not the Tijuana Study but the RSMP could propose a new one.

Comment: Add monitoring and feedback to Activity Types.

Comment: Where did coastal mapping leave off?

Response: MLPA went to Pt. Conception and is in the report.

Comment: Should look at Laguna Niguel and Strand. Due to many beach types in Laguna Subcell and OC, should be careful to extrapolate into private beaches and beaches without data.

Comment: 12 years ago, Melanie Coyne put together a nourishment analysis for OC. Access Database with GIS that included economics. She did a nourishment model based on need and not proximity.

Comment: Long-Term acquisition of governance structure should be completed sooner because many near term activities depend upon it.

Response: Could move the governance to the near term list.

Comment: Could make another category for high priority activities even if it's long-term as well.

Comment: We should add status (potential, ongoing, etc.) to items.

Comment: Everest received regulatory comments and have a stakeholder meeting on April 30th (tentative) in Seal Beach. Will likely have a day and/or night meeting.

Comment: PPR was referenced a lot in document.

Comment: What type of feedback have you received on a potential Governance Agency?

Response: County is a good option but no agencies have come forward yet.

Comment: Has any local entity tried to drop any RSM into their local coastal plan?

Response: For S. Monterey Bay, there was some interest but not sure elsewhere.

Comment: Future presentation to Orange County Coastal Coalition will be done.

Comment: There are two aspects to LCP's: Ordinances and Land Use Policy. May be harder to get RSMP's incorporated in Ordinance aspects.

❖ **Update: San Francisco Coastal RSM Plan (Doug George, Athena Honore)**

- Doug George (PWA) and Athena Honore (ABAG) presented
- 1st deliverable (data compilation) submitted Feb. 2012
- 1st Plan Formulation with SAG input mtg today
- Study Area
 - Jurisdictions: San Francisco, Daly City, Pacifica, National Park Service (GGNRA)
 - Littoral Cells: Pacifica Sub-Cell and Golden Gate Sub-Cell

Comment: State Parks should be included in the process as they're a land owner.

Comment: Why didn't the RSMP study go North of the Golden Gate?

Response: Griggs Sediment Budget Study for CSMW identified separate littoral cells north and south of the Golden Gate. Also, Limited coastal structures North of Golden Gate, development of a separate CRSM Plan for the Bay to accommodate BCDC's governance extent, and the initial plan development discussions identified the Golden Gate as the appropriate Northern limit.



- Project Tasks
 - On board review: August 2011
 - Data Compilation: February 2012
 - Plan Formulation: current/ongoing
 - Admin Draft expected in Summer, Draft in Fall, Final Report in Winter

- Athena gave an overview of ABAG (Assoc. of Bay Area Governments)
 - CA's first Council of Governments (1961)
 - ABAG encompasses 9 counties, 101 Bay Area Cities
 - Comprehensive Regional Planning Agency
 - Primary Efforts: Land Use, Housing, Env. Protection, Water, Hazard Mitigation
 - Examples: Sustainable Communities Strategy, Regional Housing Assessments & Needs, Earthquake Mapping
 - ABAG helps municipalities with services they may not be able to acquire on their own, is new to coastal sediment issues, sets up committees to address issues, and does not have their own funding sources

Comment: Do we include San Mateo Harbor District in the Plan?

Response: No, but there is dredging on the bay side potentially that could provide a sand source. Should get in touch with Rob Anderson with RJR as they have data for some sediment.

- PWA updated the CCC Coastal Armoring layer from groundtruthing.
- Critical erosion zones are based just on erosion rates, not storm analysis, SLR, etc.
- Wave Analysis
 - Wave transformation coefficients from CDIP not available
 - Time Series available but Ocean Beach data may not be usable
 - Wave Analysis already developed by Corps and could be used
 - Daly City and Pacifica have wave data readily available
- Other Data Analysis
 - Beach thickness an issue in Pacifica and Daly City
 - Ecology data in Pacifica and Daly City lacking
 - A good dataset for vertical land motions hasn't been found
 - Pacifica and Daly City data lacking in general

Comment: Should look at NOAA's Vdatums.

Response: Vdatums is essentially a synthesis of other data sources so you could also go directly to CGPS or other sites.

Comment: Include coastal trail in coastal infrastructure discussion.

❖ **Presentation and Discussion: Tijuana Pilot Project Communication Plan (Jon Warrick, Kristen Goodrich)**

- “Got Dirt?” Fact Sheet for study passed out and will be circulated this summer as well
 - Please send Jon comments
- Presentation will be made on Fine Sediments at H2O
- Today want to discuss how to proceed with communication plan and fine tune message
- Kristin works for coastal training program at the Tijuana Research Reserve and is assisting in the study as well as Outreach as the Outreach POC
- Outreach
 - Phase I Roadshow: Increase audience understanding and identify early adopters
 - Phase II Supporting Practitioners: Outreach to gain stakeholder input and track user experience, facilitate regional meetings
- Need feedback on whether folks like presentation or workshop style better

Comment: Want to use this analysis to assist small-scale projects in CA.

Comment: We have a lot of RSM Plan POC’s and contacts from Master Plan efforts as well.

Comment: Should consult with BEACON on their RSM efforts. They have a lot of fine grained sediment available. Gerald Comati a good POC.

Comment: For OCRSMP, they’re examining how to use fine-grained sediment.

- Jon talked with Curt Storlazzi and efforts were compared in Fact Sheet and should be combined in future

Comment: Can more discussion of implementation recommendations be made? Also, can audience be more of a holistic coastal management audience (i.e. floodplain managers, wetland restoration folks, harbor managers, etc.)?

Response: Yes. Ongoing efforts such as Imperial Beach could benefit as well.

Comment: Have results been presented to the S. CA DMMT? We’re looking at different levels of beach compatible material.

Response: Not since acquiring permits. A future joint meeting w/ CSMW could work.

Comment: DMMT efforts sometimes don’t involve all aspects such as ecology, so maybe separate efforts with more players would help.



Comment: A lot of these sand placement efforts are ongoing already and we want to be sure we use material appropriately.

Comment: Each RSMP should have appropriate recommendations for use of different size sands in different areas to address this.

Comment: EPA is the biggest player in water quality issues associated with placement (grain size suitability).

Comment: There are at least 5 cities in San Diego with Opp. Use permits and along the coast. SCOUP designed to use upland materials, which would benefit efforts. Many permits will expire soon or have already. Many permits used less than optimum quality sand. Encinitas is an example

Comment: What would a tangible use of the model be?

Response: The next step beyond using the results hasn't been developed. Want to see if results are helpful to different locations/efforts already ongoing.

Comment: Looking for more validation sites or just development?

Response: Have substantial validation, need application sites. Do we talk more about physics or implementation?

Comment: Idea of an ideal project to use results?

Response: Project in which fine sediment involved and needs to use greater than 20% fine sediment. San Elijo could be a good pilot.

Comment: Pillar Pt. Harbor & SD Co. Harbor have a lot of local interest and could be a pilot. Dredging marina this year. Bob Battalio is on the workgroup committee.

Comment: How do we get consultants aware of it?

Response: Need a project leader with some standing to get it going.

Comment: What about application outside CA as 80/20 is a national standard?

Response: All physics-based and can be applied elsewhere.

Comment: How much does study provide regarding ecological recommendations/constraints?

Response: From a turbidity-sedimentation effect on communities. Thresholds of concern are something we look at for different habitats and locations. A potential biology team could help set thresholds but running the model is on the order of \$50-\$60K.

Comment: CALTRANS could be a good implementer.



Comment: Coast highway management plan could be beneficial.

Comment: Is there a significant amount of lower quality sand below the layers at Malibu? We could use analysis for that type of application.

Response: Yes there is but that would be a future question, not addressable now because of coarse grain material on top.

❖ **Break**

❖ **Updates: Federal Agencies**

Army Corps, LA District (Susie Ming/Heather Schlosser)

- San Clemente Chief's Report will be signed next week by acting Chief of Engineers
- Solana Beach and Encinitas Shoreline study
 - AFB Report by August 2012

Army Corps, SF District (Tom Kendall / John Dingler)

- No updates

USGS (Jon Warrick)

- No updates

Other Federal Agencies (x)

- No updates

❖ **Updates: SMP Project Manager (Clif Davenport, CGS)**

- See attached Project Manager's Report

❖ **Updates: State Agencies**

Boating and Waterways (Kim Sterrett)

- No updates

Coastal Commission (Lesley Ewing/Mark Johnsson)

- No CEMEX Update, but Chris noted the Secretary is interested; Lesley acknowledged
- Lands End – agency permits are needed from State Lands and Corps. Seawalls are being built and they ordered all sand to be trucked off site
 - 80K-100K CY of sand moved from bluff that would've made it to beach.

Comment: What is the process for the permit?

Response: This wasn't a regular permit application but it's up to the permittee to know status of their permit.



Coastal Conservancy (Karen Bane)

- Karen won't be in U.S. as she's moving to Germany for at least 3 years and Kristin Goodrich will be filling in
- Thinking of starting a Tijuana RSM Plan to protect resources and manage sediment

BCDC (Brenda Goeden)

- No updates

State Water Board

- Chris talked to Jon Bishop and he'll assign a rep. for CSMW involvement
 - George's position not yet backfilled

Other State Agencies. SWRCB Representation? (Chris Potter)

- Eric is new DFG representative
 - BIA Report comments forthcoming from DFG

❖ Confirm date, location, and agenda for future meetings

- Next Meeting: April 25th, in-person likely, but TBD.
- Possible Agenda Items: LA Co. RSM Presentation, BEACON RSM Authority update
 - Susie and Chris will organize
- CSMW Conference at H2O unlikely, but Kristin could help arrange if needed; possibly a meeting at ASBPA would work
 - Eureka RSM, Orange Co. RSM, LA Co. RSM, BEACON RSM, and SPN Dredging Issues could be potential discussion items

Adjourn 1:00 PM

NEXT MEETING
April 25, 2012
Location TBD



CSMW PM Report March 28, 2011

A: Outreach

1. CSMW Public Meeting at H20- **Susie update?**
2. Sediment Master Plan Status Report 2012- Draft prepared, awaiting CWD comments, will be released to CSMW early next month
3. DWR - requesting participation at Workshop for "Sediment Management in the California Water Plan" tomorrow related to "...Sediment Management to support coastal beach replenishment" and "...Sediments behind dams and dam removal..." , amongst other items. Any CSMWers willing to participate?
 - o

B: Coastal RSM Plans:

1. Orange County- Everest team addressing comments on Administrative Draft. Presentation at CSMW is on today's agenda
2. Santa Cruz littoral cell- Working on getting Sanctuary involvement in helping coordinate Plan development
3. SF Bay- **Brenda update?**
4. San Francisco Open Coast: GIS data compiled and under review. Presentation by ABAG/ESA PWA is on today's agenda. First Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting follows CSMW today.
5. Eureka Littoral Cell- **John update?**
6. Los Angeles County - Received USACE Regulatory comments, awaiting LA County Beaches & Harbors comments. Noble may present at April CSMW and/or H20 in May.
7. Southern Monterey Bay- AMBAG is in contract negotiations with ESA PWA to implement the effort to produce Environmental Document related to CRSMP

C: Computer-based Tools

WebMapper/GIS

1. USACE's GIS Specialist has compiled much of the data identified in the GIS User's Survey, and Clif is working with her to organize for placement on WebMapper
2. USACE contractors working on getting access to State (CERES) FTP on corps network. Working with ACE-IT staff to resolve.

CSMW Website

1. Minor update activities this period, including updating CSMW contact information and meeting minutes



CSMW Reference Database:

- 1- References search site being duplicated on National Corps Library Homepage (to be accessible from a future link on CSMW). Library Staff encountering a few technical difficulties but completion expected in next several weeks.

CSBAT

1. No activities this period

D: Educational Documents

Biological Impact Analysis Phase 2:

- 1- Currently waiting on DBW contracting to have peer review done by CalOST

o

PPR White Paper

1. No activities this period

E: Demonstration Project

Tijuana Estuary Sediment Study:

1. John Warrick will provide an update at today's meeting



CSMW ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	E-mail
Marriah Abellera	USACE-SPL	Mariah.s.abellera@usace.army.mil
Karen Bane	Conservancy	kbane@scc.ca.gov
Bob Battalio	ESA PWA	BBattalio@esassoc.com
Syd Brown	CA State Parks	sbrow@parks.ca.gov
Clif Davenport	CGS	Clif.Davenport@conservation.ca.gov
John Dingler	USACE – SF	John.R.Dingler@usace.army.mil
George Domurat	USACE - SPD	George.W.Domurat@usace.army.mil
Lesley Ewing	CCC	lewing@coastal.ca.gov
Ken Foster	SLC	Fosterk@slc.ca.gov
Doug George	ESA PWA	DGeorge@esassoc.com
Kristin Goodrich	TRNERR	KGoodrich@parks.ca.gov
Phyllis Griffman	USC Sea Grant	Grifman@usc.edu
Athena Honore	ABAG	AHonore@waterboards.ca.gov
Jim Hutchison	USACE-SPL	James.D.Hutchison@usace.army.mil
Mark Johnsson	CCC	MJohnsson@coastal.ca.gov
Tom Kendall	USACE-SPN	Thomas.R.Kendall@usace.army.mil
Susie Ming	USACE-SPL	Susan.M.Ming@usace.army.mil
Peter Mull	USACE-SPN	Peter.Mull@usace.army.mil
Chris Potter	CA Resources	Chris.Potter@resources.ca.gov
Jenny Quay	BCDC	JennyQ@bcdcc.ca.gov
Heather Schlosser	USACE – LA	Heather.R.Schlosser@usace.army.mil
Anne Sturm	USACE-SPN	Anne.K.Sturm@usace.army.mil
Jon Warrick	USGS	JWarrick@usgs.gov
Nate West	USACE – LA	Nathaniel.R.West@usace.army.mil
Eric Wilkins	DFG	EWilkins@dfg.ca.gov