California Coastal Sediment Master Plan
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation

Stakeholder Meeting 1 (Orange County and Los Angeles County Coasts)

June 12, 2014 (10:00am to 12:45pm)
Southern California Coastal Waters Research Project (SCCWRP)

Notes

1. CSMW Welcome (Chris)

Chris Potter called the meeting to order at 10:05am and he welcomed everyone to the meeting on behalf of the State of California and Coastal Sediment Management Working Group (CSMW). Chris briefly reviewed the meeting agenda, which is provided in Attachment A.

2. Introductions (All)

Chris had everyone around the room introduce themselves.

3. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Overview (Chris & Clif)

Chris and Clif delivered an introductory presentation to set the stage for the rest of the meeting. The presentation included information regarding the sediment master plan, coastal processes (physical and biological), resource protection, and regulatory issues. A summary list of activities implemented by or with assistance from the CSMW was presented, along with some context regarding how the resulting product(s) were used by stakeholders for sediment management activities. The final point made during this presentation was that the next step in the sediment master plan effort is to utilize the information prepared to date (since 2004) to prepare a statewide Sediment Master Plan based heavily on the information in the coastal regional sediment management plans prepared over the past six to seven years. The SMP is slated for completion in 2015 so timely input from stakeholders will be important in meeting that timeframe.

4. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary (David)

David delivered a presentation that summarized the overall scope of work for the current project. He also presented a list of the primary objectives for Stakeholder Meeting 1. He directed the stakeholders to keep these objectives in mind as we move through the meeting agenda, in particular when we get to Agenda Item 8 (Stakeholder Input).

5. Orange & LA County Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David)

David delivered a presentation that summarized both the Orange County Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (OC CRSMP) and Los Angeles County Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (LA CRSMP). David informed the group that the Final OC CRSMP was completed last summer while completion of the Final LA CRMSP is still in process. A stakeholder asked when the Final LA CRSMP would be complete. Susie Ming (USACE-LAD) informed the group that the Final LA CRSMP has not been completed yet because it is tied to the Draft Coast of California Storm and Tidal Wave

Study (CCSTWS), which is pending external peer review. She indicated that she is working to identify funding sources to conduct the extended peer review of the CCSTWS, thereby facilitating completion of the Final LA CRSMP.

6. Orange & LA County Coastal Sediment Management Activities (David)

David delivered a presentation that summarized the types of information to be included in the sediment management activities list to be prepared as part of the Plan Formulation component of the current project. Three categories (Project, Study, and Research) were identified to better frame the discussion and, ultimately, the sediment activity list task. For each category type (*e.g.,* Project) David presented examples to help facilitate stakeholder discussion during Agenda Item 8 (Stakeholder Input).

7. GIS/Web Mapper (Alyssa)

Alyssa delivered a presentation that summarized Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and the specific web mapper GIS tool developed to assist coastal sediment activities. She walked through various screen shots to illustrate various capabilities of the GIS web mapper tool. Alyssa concluded with directions for stakeholders to access the GIS web mapper tool as well as CSMWs Coastal Sediment References searchable database, and she provided contact information for stakeholders that want/need more information.

8. Stakeholder Input (David/All)

David opened up the meeting to stakeholder discussion and input. Stakeholders were asked to provide input regarding any and all topics discussed during the presentations in the context of facilitating preparation of the overall Sediment Master Plan. Notes taken during this portion of the meeting are presented in Attachment B (Stakeholder Input).

9. Next Steps (David)

David delivered a presentation that summarized the next steps to be conducted to complete the scope of work for the current project. The next steps included information regarding both the stakeholder outreach and plan formulation components of the scope of work. In addition, timeframes (e.g., Summer 2014) were provided for each outreach and plan formulation task in the scope of work.

10. Adjournment (All)

David adjourned the meeting at 12:45pm.

ATTACHMENT A

California Coastal Sediment Master Plan
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation

Stakeholder Meeting 1 (Orange County and Los Angeles County Coasts)

June 12, 2014 (10:00am to 12:30pm)
Southern California Coastal Waters Research Project (SCCWRP)

Agenda

11. Welcome by CSMW (Chris)
12. Introductions (All) [5 min]
13. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Overview (Clif) [20 min]
14. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary (David) [5 min]
15. Orange & LA County Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David) [20 min]
16. Orange & LA County Coastal Sediment Management Activities (David) [5 min]
17. GIS/Webmapper (Alyssa) [15 min]
18. Stakeholder Input (David/All) [75 min]
19. Next Steps (David) [5 min]
20. Adjournment (All)

ATTACHMENT B

California Coastal Sediment Master Plan
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation

Stakeholder Input

1. Susan Brodeur informed the group that Orange County is moving forward with a project to dredge Huntington Harbour. A unique aspect of the project is that Orange County is proposing to use the fine grained material dredged from Huntington Harbour to maintain ground elevations in the Seal Beach National Wildlife Refuge. This would mark a beneficial use of fine grained material as wetlands cover and partially offset future inundation of marsh habitat via sea level rise. The project is in the preliminary design and environmental review (CEQA/NEPA) phase. If environmental review, permitting, and final engineering design go as planned construction will commence in December 2014. Finally, Susan indicated that Orange County is actively pursuing grants to fund the monitoring program associated with the project.
2. Susan Brodeur informed the group that Orange County is moving forward with a project to dredge Dana Point Harbor. The dredged material will be beneficially reused as beachfill material via placement at Capistrano Beach. The fate of the fine grained portion of the dredged material is an issue Orange County is currently working to address. The resource and regulatory agencies have requested an extensive monitoring program to determine if the fine grained material will have a significant impact to sensitive resources. Susan indicated that Orange County is actively researching grant opportunities to fund the monitoring program.
3. Lance Natsuhara informed the group that Orange County is moving forward with a project to dredge the lower reach of the Santa Ana River to remove approximately 600,000 yd^3 of sediment that has built up in the river channel from the ocean mouth to the 405 Freeway. Lance informed the group that the project is just getting started with the hiring of an engineering firm to start work on the design. Moffatt & Nichol has been retained under the Orange County On-Call Contract for coastal and civil engineering work.
4. One of the stakeholders asked for a status update regarding the Prado Dam bypassing project. Susie Ming informed the group that the project, which would involve the dredged bypassing of 250,000 yd^3 to 500,000 yd^3, is currently undergoing environmental review under CEQA. She said that if the environmental review process, permitting process, and final design all go according to plan that the project would begin construction in 2015 assuming construction funds are available to build the final project that comes out of the environmental review and permitting process.
5. Darrell Ferguson asked if anyone had any information on the recently completed dredging project at Semeniuk Slough in Newport Beach. No one had much information other than general knowledge of the dredging project and information indicating that beneficial reuse as beach nourishment material with placement in the nearshore area was under consideration at one time. As a follow up to the meeting, David Cannon conducted a web search for this project and found information on the City of Newport Beach's website indicating that the project is in the planning phase. Based on the information on the City's website, nearshore placement of dredged material is not proposed as the material is contaminated and contains a high portion of fine grained sediment; hence it would not be suitable for beneficial reuse. The City has estimated that approximately 10,000 yd of sediment would be dredged, dewatered, and hauled to an upland landfill for a cost in excess of $1 million. The City estimates that construction of the project would start in September 2015.

6. Cesar Espinosa inquired about the process used to develop the stakeholder list and he expressed concern that the meeting invite did not reach enough stakeholders. Susie explained the process used to develop the list based on the CSMW list serve and stakeholder list developed for the LA County CRSMP effort. She indicated that additional methods would be considered in developing the stakeholder lists for future stakeholder meetings.
7. Karen Martin, Bryant Chesney, and Bill Paznokos informed the group that more monitoring information, specifically post-project monitoring compared to pre-project baselines, is needed to better understand the impacts to biological resources associated with sediment management activities. This should include impacts to borrow sites as well as impacts to receiver beaches. Karen mentioned that most of the monitoring work that has been done in the past was for east coast and gulf coast projects, hence east coast and gulf coast conditions. Such information could be used to address a lot of issues and questions, including whether or not borrow sites would become sediment traps that could serve to trap sand for subsequent reuse for projects in the future. Bryant indicated that he would like to know to what degree post-project monitoring activities have been effective in helping to determine the level of impacts caused by past projects. To this end, Bryant, Karen, and Bill felt that better dissemination of project-related monitoring data would be helpful.
8. Karen Martin, Bryant Chesney, and Bill Paznokas indicated that the development of a regional monitoring framework might be helpful in helping to address the impacts of projects on biological resources. Such a framework would standardize methods thus making it easier to utilize data collected at intermittent intervals (*e.g.,* project duration) by different parties (*e.g.,* consultants, academia) across different spatial scales. Clif Davenport indicated that Phase 1 of the Biological Impact Assessment (BIA) work currently underway had identified and recommended standard pre-, during and post-monitoring activities and mitigation methods for both receiver sites and borrow sites, and that Phase 2 (Resource Protection Guidelines) had been developed and was undergoing peer review by the Ocean Sciences Trust to ensure scientific rigor within the recommendations. The guidelines would include recommendations for consistent monitoring methods so that should help address this issue.
9. David Cannon suggested the possibility of tying into an existing regional monitoring program might be one approach for addressing the regional monitoring issue. For example, perhaps sediment management activities could be monitored in a regional context through the monitoring that the Southern California Coastal Waters Research Project (SCCWRP) does for NPDES point sources (*e.g.,* publicly owned treatment works). Such an approach could take advantage of a "monitoring infrastructure" that is already in place to conduct such monitoring activities. This would also help address the issue of monitoring data availability since such a monitoring program such as the one lead by SCCWRP, already has an extensive program in place to disseminate data and related information (*e.g.,* analysis results).
10. Chris Potter suggested that regional sediment management be considered as a tool for climate change resilience. The primary mechanism would be to address the impacts of sea level rise on wetlands habitats but this could include other mechanisms as well (*e.g.,* impacts of sea level rise on beaches).
11. Bryant Chesney suggested that sand retention structures should be considered as an option to better manage existing sand sources (inland and coastal) and provide an improved economic return on public fund investments. The use of retention structures could prove more economically viable in the future as a measure to address impacts to beaches associated with projections of mean sea level rise. Chris Webb (via written comment following meeting) suggested that efforts could be undertaken to have sand retention added to the California Coastal Commission sea level rise guidance document as a strategy for addressing sea level rise-

induced impacts to beaches. Furthermore, Chris suggested that funding for sand retention projects could come from the Ocean Protection Council (OPC). He mentioned that the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) applied twice for an OPC grant but was denied so, perhaps, there is a policy issue here that could be explored and, possibly revised to address this potential funding source.

12. Clif Davenport asked for a status update on the Oil Piers Project. Susie Ming informed the group that the project has been delayed due to funding constraints. She said that the cost of the project is currently estimated at about $5 million. She has been working over the past year or so to make sure the project is well positioned to receive the required funds should such funds become available. She did indicate that there have also been some problems (*e.g.,* key staff member loss) with the current design-build vendor (ASR) that was selected for the project so that is another issue the USACE-LAD is working to address.
13. Lance Natsuhara asked if there was an organized effort at the federal level to coordinate the message regarding the need to fund the work in the regional sediment management plans as well as to continue funding completion of the master plan. Susie indicated that such an effort does not exist to her knowledge. Susan Brodeur informed group that the upcoming Coastal Engineering Research Board (CERB) meeting would provide an excellent opportunity to organize such an effort.