



**CSMW Meeting Minutes
30 NOVEMBER 2010
9:30 AM – 12:30 PM
Conference Call**

STILL PENDING:

- ✓ **Susie and Brian Ross** – Convene and discuss depth of closure issue. Tentative date of December 8th – Ocean Beach surveys (USGS) could help the discussion. Information will be sent out soon.
- ✓ **Kim** – Discuss local government involvement (City of Encinitas / Local Coastal Zone Management Plans) with Steve Aceti. STILL PENDING
- ✓ **Chris** – Will reconvene the PPR sub-committee to discuss the RSM Top Ten Recommendations. ONGOING – collaborated on letter to BEACON on sand ordinance.
- ✓ **Susie/Heather** – Will reconvene the Corps' PPR sub-committee to discuss Federal actions. ONGOING
- ✓ **Heather** – Check on progress of posting of JALBTCX LIDAR data to NOAA website so others can access. STILL PENDING – NOAA Digital Coast – USGS flew additional LIDAR that should be available soon
- ✓ **Heather** – Finalize and obtain hard copies of SMP Brochure for Outreach efforts. STILL PENDING
- ✓ **Chris** – Determine interest in ABAG committing to development of SF Open Coast Coastal RSM Plan. Spoke with ABAG staff and they are interested and awaiting us to have funding.
- ✓ **John** – Conversion of USACE reference database for incorporation into CSMW's searchable Access Database. ONGOING (will see about additional support)
- ✓ **John** – Provide update on Noyo Harbor issue of what to do with harbor dredging. PENDING – Peter is now assigned project. Field data collection effort to collect data north of harbor currently underway (water quality data, surveys, water level, ADCP, etc.) This will be a discussion at next meeting.

COMPLETED ITEMS:

- ✓ **CBRs/CBECS/CBEAS** – Natural Resources Agency is seeking Governor's office approval to release the report to the public. DONE
- ✓ **Chris** – Draft comments for National Shoreline Management Study. DONE
- ✓ **Clif** – Provide comments on National Shoreline Management Study – Recommendations for Sediment Management to Lynn Martin, USACE/IWR. DONE
- ✓ **Clif** – Contact BEACON, request extension of Public Review for BEACON Programmatic EIR, provide supporting information to CSMW. DONE
- ✓ **Chris** – Convene PPR subcommittee to review BEACON PEIR Ordinance. DONE



- ✓ **ALL** – Have your agency review draft sand ordinance and provide comments to BEACON by mid-October if possible. **DONE**
- ✓ **ALL** – Provide comments to Clif on Nicole Kinsman’s development of layman’s document on retention structures by mid-October. **DONE**

NEW ACTION ITEMS:

- ✓ **Corps (Los Angeles District)** – Generate memorandum agreeing upon a beneficial use (depth of closure) definition
- ✓ **Susie** – Send out information about “depth of closure” discussion with EPA
- ✓ **Heather/Clif** – Fix the printability of the SMP brochure
- ✓ **Chris** – Add new agenda item for January meeting to have a discussion on disposal methodology (running into problems with disposal, particularly in the North Coast area)

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

- CA Beach Erosion Assessment Survey is FINAL
- West Coast Governors are discussing Marine Spatial Planning
- Brian is on the panel to help choose the next National Ocean Service’s Administrator

❖ **Review of Meeting Minutes from 9/22/10 Conference Call – Heather Schlosser**

❖ **National Shoreline Management Study (NSMS) – Rachel Grandpre (USACE – IWR)**

- WRDA 99 (Section 215c.) authorized the National Shoreline Management Study (NSMS) to describe the state of the nation’s shorelines and to provide regional conclusions and recommendations for shoreline management in a systematic manner.
- NSMS Goals
 - Describe geologic, biological, and sediment process aspects of shorelines
 - Summarize shoreline changes based on data
 - Climate change and SLR concerns
 - Socio-economic and environmental impacts of erosion/accretion
 - Identify and describe Federal, State, and local shoreline management programs
 - Provide future conclusions and recommendations for shoreline management
- Plans are being developed for different regions of the Nation’s coastline



- Previous assessments (including data analysis) completed for the state of California will be reviewed and drawn upon to complete the NSMS CA Study. Previous and current studies include:
 - 1971 USACE National Shoreline Study CA Regional Inventory
 - USGS National Assessment of Shoreline Change, Parts 3 & 4
 - CSMW CA Beach Erosion Assessment Survey 2010
 - Griggs et al. 2005 Living With the Changing Cost
- A copy of the Draft National Assessment (“National Shoreline Management Study” June 11, 2010) has been posted to the CSMW ftp site and the completed North Atlantic Region Draft Assessment will be posted on ftp as an example
- What still needs to be done
 - Identify data gaps
 - Organization of CA report – by county, littoral cell, geomorphology, etc? Recommendations can be given
 - Environmental effects of erosion/accretion for each region
 - Coastal hazards due to erosion/accretion
 - Potential climate change/SLR impacts
 - Shoreline management programs/practices that exist in CA
- Q’s and Feedback?
 - Recommendations for ways to approach CA Assessment requested
 - Collaborators are requested
 - CA Agency POC’s requested to help develop report

Comment: When will the Pacific Coast report be completed?

Response: Draft complete likely by Spring.

Comment: Is funding available for CA Study?

Response: All funding received to complete CA Study.

Comment: What is purpose of CA Study?

Response: To develop recommendations for future management of shoreline resources as well as provide a status update on State and Federal programs across the country.

Comment: Will there be a discussion of the effectiveness of State/National programs?

Response: Yes.

Comment: How is the report defining Shoreline Management as it is often defined in different ways?

Response: It will be defined in a comprehensive, systematic manner for study regions.



Comment: Has the completed North Atlantic report resulted in additional funding opportunities from OMB?

Response: No, as it is only in draft form.

Comment: What is the timeframe for the final CA Assessment report?

Response: The final report should be completed by the end of 2011.

Comment: In general, what did the North Atlantic report provide?

Response: It primarily provided conclusions that were included in the national report.

Comment: Does the national report have regional recommendations for funding?

Response: That would be helpful and possibly included in the final report.

Comment: Intent was not to make recommendations at the project level but rather on a regional level. The North Atlantic report resulted in more conclusions than recommendations for shoreline management.

Comment: Are grain size regulations included?

Response: If this is a significant issue in CA it could be discussed in the report.

Comment: Jim Dyer recently provided assessment of future Federal budget requests. Beach erosion and nourishment unfortunately was lined out in this discussion so future funding could be difficult to obtain. DoD will likely look at a ~\$12 M cut in funding in the next few years and this report could be instrumental in generating funding requests for beach activities.

Comment: Climate change should be emphasized.

Comment: A committee could be formed to provide information in development of the report.

Response: Marine spatial planning and coastal data implementation personnel and input would be most helpful.

Comment: CA's Coastal RSM Plans are similar to this effort as well as the Sediment Master Plan and both could be drawn upon to develop this draft report.

Comment: Chris Potter will be the State contact and Susie Ming the Corps rep for providing info and developing report with Rachel. Also, a subgroup should be formed to determine State and Federal interest.

❖ **Systems Approach to Studying the Bay-Delta – Stu Townsley (USACE)**

- Stu is the Flood Risk Manager for SPD and coordinates within all facets within the Corps that impact flood risk management



- Civil Works Budget Process
 - Continuity is lacking in the OMB process as it is not project specific
 - Each new FY budget examines annual benefits and costs of a project without considering past or future project performance
 - USACE has no long term goals to improve major infrastructure systems
- Optimal funding for projects is examined every year
- Inland Marine Transportation System
 - Scheduled and Unscheduled maintenance hours, as well as Unscheduled Mechanical Breakdown hours, of transportation systems have steadily increased from 1992 to 2007, peaking in 2006 and 2007
 - Infrastructure is breaking down increasingly as we haven't spent enough money to prevent breakdown
- IMTS investment Strategy Program
 - Collaborative team composed of USACE and Waterways Industry
 - Created a 20-yr program to reform program management, design, construction, and O&M
 - 25 prioritized for program target of ~\$380M/year (new construction and rehab)
 - Bottom line is to reform program management and think long-term
- IMTS Capital Investment Strategy Major Rehab Program
 - Proposed program includes both continuing construction and new start Dams across the country
- IMTS Lessons learned
 - Corps is a project oriented organization so systems approach is not a strong point
 - We need to change our approach to project planning from project-oriented to systems-oriented

Comment: Is HQ buying in?

Response: Yes, as this approach was developed by the POC that is responsible for all budgeting for USACE.

Comment: From a national perspective, all sponsors were congressionally united; SPD doesn't have same unity in congressional interest so funding was harder to come by as opposed to from a national perspective.

- Ecosystems of National Significance
 - The ASA and SPD Commander Rock Donahue challenged SPD FRM to develop systems approach for CA Bay Delta management
 - When viewed as a system, this ecosystem produces greater potential ranking for funding than other projects

- OMB and HQUSACE liked this approach which will introduce a radical change to our budgeting requests
- Integrated Regional Water Management
 - Watershed, engineered, economic, environmental, and governmental aspects
 - Through 12 item budget process, this systems approach will become more important and effective in requests

Comment: Could this be used in the Coastal arena as well?

Response: Potentially. There were only a few requests that used this approach. Among them:

- Hudson Estuary – large ecosystem endorsed by Steve Stockton
- Everglades

Comment: It may become necessary to include different aspects of projects to combine into a systems based analysis to garner benefits and request enough money to cover a system. The money could then be used for different aspects of projects over time to benefit the system.

Comment: There is often inadequate funding for projects that can be taken back by Congress and reprogrammed to other projects.

Comment: How does this align with CALFed?

Response: This is aligned with a portion of the CALFed Program and a lot of coordination was done. Stu is working with FEMA and other agencies to link efforts. Recommendations for State Agency involvement and efforts could be very beneficial.

Comment: Senate likes this approach but House does not.

Comment: Ports have been pushing for an integrated system and some aspects have been excluded such as agricultural, fishing etc. in some ports/projects. Maintenance tax an issue as well.

Comment: Current political climate against earmarks could favor this system.

Comment: There is a new House and earmarks will likely go away.

❖ **Overview of the Bay-Delta Transport Model – Frank Wu**

- Outline
 - Program Goal: Provide science based info to managers and decision makers in SF Bay region
- Project Site: SF Bay preferred dredge scenario is minimum 40% beneficial use, 40% ocean disposal, and maximum in-Bay disposal of 20%



- Physics
 - Consider watershed inflows, tide interaction, tributary influx, sediment resuspension, delta flows, and flux through Golden Gate
- Salinity Calibration
 - First time dynamics of salinity in the Bay captured.
- Model was selected by several agencies (USGS, USBR, DWR, BDCP, BCDC) roughly a year ago based on the benefits it could produce for the Bay
 - Coupling of Hydrodynamic (UnTRIM) and Sediment Transport Model (SediMorph); SWAN Wave Model used
- SOW and Schedule
 - Model Integration 12/31/10
 - Model Calibration and Validation 6/30/11
 - Model Application 11/30/11
- Next Steps
 - USBR and USGS requesting formal collaboration with SPD
 - USBR/USGS responsible for data gathering; USACE model simulation
 - 1st phase focuses on sediment transport only
- Conclusions
 - Preliminary model has been reviewed and accepted
 - “First flush” simulation by next summer

Comment: Does first flush include rain activities?

Response: Yes, as it affects salinity profile.

Comment: General pattern of erosion and accretion within the Bay will be examined.

Comment: Are model simulations being done in-house?

Response: USGS is under contract and all model simulations are being run under contract.

Comment: Model will include erosion, sediment transport, hydrodynamics, etc. in the Bay.

❖ **Recent Beach and Seafloor Changes in San Francisco Bay – Patrick Barnard**

- USGS Pacific Coastal and Marine Science Center in Santa Cruz has been conducting an ongoing study to identify physical changes in the San Francisco Bay and sediment processes.
 - Over last 50 years severe restriction of extent of ebb tidal delta at the mouth of the Bay has occurred (loss of 92 M CY of sediment)

- Overall system is dominated by erosion
- Navigation channel dredging has historically placed sediment offshore (1931-1971) but since '71 has placed in the nearshore
- Sediment Removal
 - 1900's to present: 200 M m³ removed from system; 113 M m³ from Central Bay and 75 M m³ identified as sand
 - Many borrow pit and aggregate mining records missing

Comment: In the case of sediment loss, how do you measure loss when the material isn't really there?

Response: Comparison of bathymetric surveys over time.

- 2008 Multibeam Survey used tighter survey controls to garner better results
- '97-'08 Bathymetric Change
 - Found there was not great bias in data and analysis is true
 - There has been a 3-fold increase in the rate of erosion over previous studies in the Bay
 - 1st study that demonstrates a severe local impact from sand mining operations
- SF Bay Coastal System Model
 - Predicted sediment transport volumes and directions based on 36-day hydrodynamic winter tidal cycle

Comment: Where is the sediment near Pier 39 attributed to?

Response: Most material comes out of the South Bay.

- Golden Gate Sediment Flux
 - Model output compares well with measured data; collected sediment samples, ADCP data, and CTD-LISST profiles along two transects
- Regional Shoreline Changes
 - North Ocean Beach: rate of erosion/accretion has increased 4-fold over last 100 years to present
 - South Ocean Beach has experienced much more erosion at rates of up to 2 m/yr
- Summary
 - Recent sediment loss highly correlated with aggregate mining
 - Net seaward flux of sediment through gate
 - Outer coast region is highly erosional

Comment: Where does material moving south go near Pedro Point?

Response: It goes offshore likely onto the outer shelf.



Comment: Aggregate mining from Bay is a large source and much sediment comes from Half Moon Bay. Do we know what the quality of this sediment is?
Response: Aggregate yards supply communities landward but a lot more material comes from British Columbia imported by dredge.

Comment: BCDC is near the end of the CEQA process for in-water sand mining (draft report is out through SLC). Determined in draft that sand mining is not depleting resources. They didn't look at the outer coast so hopefully they will expand the study area to include this region. There weren't many comments on the draft report and the final report will be out in January. Comments can still be submitted. The preferred environmental alternative is no sand mining in the Bay and the currently proposed alternative is to just limit sand mining quantities.

Comment: How thick is the sediment near ridge of Golden Gate area?
Response: Sediment is all bedrock and clean sand in some areas – it could be fairly thick.

Comment: How much sediment is transported through the Bay as a result of Ocean Beach dredging?
Response: Most material is moving onshore and south.

Comment: The channel is more effective in an ebb flow pattern, and in a flood pattern sediment goes over the bar.

Comment: Do we know where majority of material is coming from to supply the bar?
Response: Most material comes from the Bay.

❖ **Updates: Army Corps Projects – Heather Schlosser and John Dingler**

Los Angeles District

- Oil Piers
 - Draft design from ASR in mid to late January for conceptual submerged reef
 - Only have funding for engineering and design
- East San Pedro Bay Ecosystem Restoration FCSA Signing Ceremony held today 11/30.
- San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study will go to ATR Monday and have CWRB likely in Feb or March

San Francisco District

- Humboldt



- Demonstration placement site north of jetty entrance near Samoa
 - Effectiveness may be based on Essayons' depth limitations
- Revising EA
- Humboldt RSM Public Meeting Dec. 8th in Eureka
- Half Moon Bay
 - FCSA signed
 - Talks ongoing with DBAW to acquire funding
 - Feasibility Study will develop solutions to structures built in '62-'63
 - Surf rider called meeting to discuss potentially moving sand out of harbor to accommodate boats for America's Cup Races
- Ocean Beach
 - Potentially expand and enlarge placement site to include onshore regions
 - Corps and EPA discussed EA for converting demonstration project to a permanent site
 - Two EA's discussed with Brian Ross (EPA) but only one EA is necessary
 - Corps has authority to place sediment per Section 2037
 - Would like to pre-designate placement locations; want to pump sand directly from Essayons into nearshore next spring
- Southern Monterey Bay RSM Meeting the week of January 13th in Monterey Bay

State Agency Updates

BCDC RSM Activities – Brenda Goeden

- Aramburu Island and Richardson Bay doing island habitat restoration and beach nourishment
- San Mateo Co. Coyote Point Beach doing beach nourishment of ~70K CY
- Crown Beach BECA ~85,000 CY mined from Bay
- Hamilton Project nearing completion

Department of Boating and Waterways (DBAW) – Kim Sterrett

- State budget signed
- SANDAG III project funded but ~\$700K of funds reallocated to 4 Corps studies
- Clif and Kim may fund Phil King and Jenny Dugan to do an Ecological/Economic Benefits study

Comment: Does the State have interest in funding offshore surfing reefs?

Response: Possibly.



Comment: Will money reallocated from SANDAGIII be accounted for in the future?

Response: Yes.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) – Eric Berntsen

- SWRCB incorporating geomorphic landscape units and watershed processes in work efforts
- White Paper to be released on analysis of land development and corresponding impact on sediment supply
- Water Board looking at how we examine sediment and preserving watershed processes

❖ SMP Project Manager’s Report – Clif Davenport

- PM Report Attached
- Orange County and LA County RSM Plans in data collection/preliminary phases
- CSMW Online Coastal Webmapper
 - LA District sending historical dredging shapefiles to CA Natural Resources Agency to update online database
- CSBAT – no updates
- Biological Impacts Analysis Report – Final Report by January
- BEACON PEIR – final draft maybe by January
- Sediment Master Plan Update: Status Report updated every couple years so it will be updated shortly – last update was May 2009

❖ Other Agency Updates, New Business, and Announcements

- Per previous CSMW discussions, more public outreach type CSMW meetings are desirable so more agencies can participate
 - Possibly 1-2 public meetings per year with public advertisement
- West Coast Govs. Agreement Workshop in Oregon in March as part of Lower Columbia River RSM Plan
- Next meeting: January 26th in-person at BCDC Offices - San Francisco

ADJOURN

NEXT MEETING
Wednesday, January 26th
BCDC Office, 50 California St., San Francisco
Call-In Info Will Be Provided
9:30 AM – 12:30 PM



CSMW PM Report November 30, 2010

A: Outreach

1. Brochure- Heather is working with Everest Consultants to finalize hard copies and electronic version for posting.
2. Nicole Kinsman's research, funded by DBW and describing the effectiveness of retention structures within California was published in Shore & Beach Fall 2010/Winter 2011 dedicated double issue.
3. CSMW provided a comment letter in support of the draft Sand Ordinance contained in BEACON's draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Report, associated with their Coastal RSM Plan.

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 - Brenda Goedan will have update on BCDCs activities this reporting period
4. San Francisco Open Coast: Chris Potter is working to determine ABAGs interest in being the regional partner for the Plan. SPUR invited Kim Sterrett and John Dinger to be technical advisors to their Ocean Beach assessment efforts, which will be big part of the RSM Plan.
5. Eureka Littoral Cell- Work is underway, collecting basic data for the littoral cell. Moffatt & Nichol submitted draft Data Gathering Report which identified sources of information to extract relevant to Plan. Second public meeting is scheduled for December 8 in Eureka.
6. Los Angeles County -Susie Ming 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. BEACON has provided a CD containing maps and shapefiles showing sensitive habitats and critters backdropped against the six shoreline reaches established in their Coastal RSM Plan. Clif is in process of reviewing shapefiles and preparing them for posting on WebMapper
2. GIS User's Survey- CSMW's GIS Advisory subcommittee has been expanded to 28 members (including 2 consultants). Two meetings of the subcommittee have occurred to date, focused on development of a draft Survey, which is expected in early 2011.
3. USACE LAD is developing historical dredging shapefiles, and will provide those to Clif for updating the coastal and offshore potential sediment source shapefiles currently posted to WebMapper.

CSMW Website

1. The website has been updated to:



- a. All information on the various Coastal RSM Plans, including completed Plans and up-to-date information on those currently under development are now available through the "Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plans" link on the homepage.
- b. A "Eureka Coastal RSM Plan" page was developed and posted, and can be accessed through its link on the main Coastal RSM Plan page.
- c. The DOPAA (Description of Proposed Actions and Alternatives) for the San Diego Coastal RSM Plan is available through the Library Page, "Environmental" category.
- d. The "Current Activities" page was updated, including contact information for GIS Technical subcommittee members through the "stakeholders group" link
- e. The "References Review" page was updated with several links, renamed "Coastal References" and moved to the "Library" page
- f. The CBEAS 2010 report was added to the Homepage and to the "Library" page

CSMW Reference Database:

1. No Activities this period.
2. Still awaiting USACE SPN staff's conversion of an older bibliography to the current, searchable Access database which is available through the CSMW website

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

D: Educational Documents

California Beach Erosion Assessment Survey (CBEAS):

1. The report was officially released on October 25, 2010
2. The Ventura County Star had an article on the report and coastal erosion on November 1, 2010
3. Howard Marlowe reported several inquiries and had an article in his company's "Coastal Connection".

Biological Impact Analysis Phase 2:

1. Development of the Natural Resources Protection advisory document is underway.
2. SAIC submitted a plan to address review comments, which was shared with reviewers.

Environmental Document, BEACON:

1. To accommodate CSMW, BEACON extended the comment period to November 5, 2010.
2. Chris Potter submitted CSMW's comment letter regarding the proposed Sand Ordinance contained in the PEIR on November 4, 2010.
3. Several CSMW member agencies submitted comments directly to BEACON on the PEIR/Sand Ordinance.

Environmental Document, Southern Monterey Bay:

1. No CSMW activities this period.
2. John Doughty (AMBAG Executive Officer) is pursuing possible revenue sources to cover their required 15% match- no work will occur until such funding is secured.



E: Demonstration Project

Tijuana Estuary Sediment Study:

1. John Warrick will provide an update describing his analysis of the monitoring results in a near-future meeting.



CSMW ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	E-mail
George Domurat	USACE - SPD	George.W.Domurat@usace.army.mil
Brian Baird	CA Resources	Brian@resources.ca.gov
Chris Potter	CA Resources	Chris.Potter@resources.ca.gov
Clif Davenport	CGS	Clif.Davenport@conservation.ca.gov
Kim Sterrett	CA DBW	Sterrett@dbw.ca.gov
Patrick Barnard	USGS	PBarnard@usgs.gov
Brenda Goeden	BCDC	Brendag@bccdc.ca.gov
Mark Johnsson	CCC	MJohnsson@coastal.ca.gov
Linda Lillycrop	USACE – ERDC CHL	Linda.S.Lillycrop@usace.army.mil
Frank Wu	USACE – SF	Frank.Wu@usace.army.mil
John Dingler	USACE – SF	John.R.Dingler@usace.army.mil
Peter Mull	USACE – SF	Peter.Mull@usace.army.mil
Heather Schlosser	USACE – LA	Heather.R.Schlosser@usace.army.mil
Rachel Grandpre	USACE – IWR	Rachel.N.Grandpre@usace.army.mil
Jim Haussener	CMANC	Jim@cmanc.com
Melissa Scianni	USEPA	Scianni.Melissa@epa.gov
Shauna Oh	CA Sea Grant	ShaunaOh@ucsd.edu
Phyllis Grifman	USC Sea Grant	Grifman@usc.edu
David Doak	USACE – SF	David.V.Doak@usace.army.mil
Steve Aceti	CALCOAST	SteveAceti@calcoast.org
Lisa Andes	USACE – SF	Lisa.C.Andes@usace.army.mil
Stu Townsley	USACE – SF	Edwin.S.Townsley@usace.army.mil
Lynn Martin	USACE – IWR	Lynn.R.Martin@usace.army.mil
Eric Bernsten	SWRCB	EBerntsen@waterboards.ca.gov
Nate West	USACE – LA	Nathaniel.R.West@usace.army.mil