

**California Coastal Sediment Master Plan  
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation**

**Stakeholder Meeting 2 (San Diego County Coast)**

**July 31, 2014 (9:00am to 12:00pm)  
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)**

**Notes**

1. CSMW Welcome (Chris)

Chris Potter called the meeting to order at 9:05am 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 2. 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. San Diego County Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David)

David delivered a presentation that summarized the San Diego County Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (SD CRSMP) prepared for SANDAG by Moffatt & Nichol with support from Everest International Consultants and SAIC.

#### 6. San Diego 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 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 2015) were provided for each outreach and plan formulation task in the scope of work.

#### 10. Adjournment (All)

David adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**California Coastal Sediment Master Plan  
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation**

**Stakeholder Meeting 2 (San Diego County Coast)**

**July 31, 2014 (9:00am to 12:00pm)**

**SANDAG (7<sup>th</sup> Floor Board Room)  
401 B Street  
San Diego, California 92101**

**Conference Call Info:  
Telephone No.: 888-273-3658  
Access Code: 7951308  
Security Code: 1111**

**Web Meeting Information:  
Website: <https://www.webmeeting.att.com>  
Meeting Number: 888-273-3658  
Access Code: 7951308**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions (All) [5 min]
2. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Overview (Chris & Clif) [20 min]
3. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary (David) [15 min]
4. San Diego County Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David) [15 min]
5. San Diego County Coastal Sediment Management Activities (David) [15 min]
6. GIS/Webmapper (Alyssa) [15 min]
7. Stakeholder Input (David) [90 min]
8. Next Steps (David) [5 min]
9. Adjournment (All)

## ATTACHMENT B – Stakeholder Input

### California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Public Outreach and Plan Formulation

#### Stakeholder Meeting 2 (San Diego County Coast)

1. Garth Murphy indicated that some of the slides in the presentation need to be updated as he believes some of the information shown for Del Mar and Encinitas is incorrect. He suggested that the word “ecosystem” should be used in place of references to “critters.” The master plan should mention the episodic nature of processes along the southern California coastline and within coastal watersheds and this should be considered in the evaluation of risk. Finally, he suggested that different strategies should be developed for beaches in front of lagoons as opposed to beaches backed by cliffs.
2. Mike Hastings expressed concern regarding the impacts of beach nourishment on lagoon maintenance. He would like to see a more comprehensive monitoring program implemented to track beach and lagoon processes so impacts can be better discerned in the future. It was suggested that funding be set aside in a separate account to remediate any unforeseen impacts that might occur following project implementation. Transects at beach nourishment locations were not reflective of sand at inlet locations. He also suggested additional funding be allocated to improve the methodologies developed to predict beachfill performance. For example, funding could be provided to collect beach data to calibrate the shoreline morphology model (GENESIS) used for prior beach nourishment or such funding could be used to select and test new models. Such an extension could also include expanded spatial and temporal monitoring of beach conditions along the entire San Diego County coastline. Finally, Mike suggested that additional economics analyses should be conducted in the future to compare beach nourishment to other options such as managed retreat, and opined that current cost/benefit analyses do not include externalities such as lagoon inlet maintenance.
3. Walt Wilson agreed with Garth’s comment to use the term ecosystem in the development of the Master Plan. He noted that there was very little effort to retain sand, and suggested stopping sand from moving into the submarine canyons and the use of sand fences to block aeolian (wind) transport in areas of active dunes or areas that could support dunes. Walt indicated that he likes the idea of bypassing sand around Camp Pendleton and Oceanside Harbor but this will require a great deal of coordination between the various local, state, and federal agencies, most notably the USMC, US Navy, and US Army. Work should be conducted to further explore methods to get sand trapped behind dams (*e.g.*, San Vicente Lake and Lake Hodges) and debris basins down to the beach and San Diego Bay should also be considered as a potential source of sand for future beach nourishment projects. There might also be opportunities to remove sand from the Santa Margarita River for use in beach nourishment but such activities would have to address impacts to river mouth closure and sensitive species (*e.g.*, least terns). Finally, Mr. Wilson said that explaining how sediment moves within the coastal watershed and along littoral cells is an important concept to explain to the public.
4. Fred Sandquist agreed with Garth’s comment to use the term ecosystem in the development of the Master Plan. He also noted an apparent error on one of the figures in the presentation that showed the beach at Batiquitos so he requested that the information be revised such that it is correct. He informed the group that there is between 200,000 cubic yards and 300,000 cubic yards of sediment in Batiquitos Lagoon that would probably be suitable for beach nourishment. Fred noted that Lake San Marcos is full of sediment and a large portion of that sediment appears

to be contaminated, which creates problems for the lagoon as that contaminated sediment travels downstream and settles in the lagoon. He expressed concern over the lack of maintenance for dams and debris basins, especially in light of the additional erosion that is likely to occur in wet years immediately following periods of drought and associated fires. Finally, Fred informed the meeting attendees that non-governmental organizations (NGO) such as the Batiquitos Lagoon Foundation could leverage a lot of funding to implement studies (*e.g.*, hydrological modeling).

5. Steve Aceti suggested further consideration of Walt's suggestion to engage the USMC, US Navy, and US Army regarding the use of Camp Pendleton as a potential sediment source for future beach nourishment activities. He suggested that the CSMW reach out to these agencies to explore potential partnership opportunities. Steve informed everyone that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Encinitas & Solana Beach Storm Damage Reduction Project is the only active such federal project in San Diego County at the present time. Heather Schlosser gave a brief overview of the project along with a status update in which she indicated that the USACE is trying to get a policy waiver to be move forward with the project.
6. Barbara Denny first informed everyone that she is attending the meeting as an individual and, as such, her comments do not represent the City of Coronado, for which she is currently serving as mayor pro-tem. Barbara agreed with Garth's comment to use the term ecosystem in the development of the Master Plan. She suggested that additional information should be provided in the master plan on coastal hazards such as floods, tsunamis, droughts, and faults. She would not like to see the master plan effort lead to the formation of additional governmental bureaucracy but she would like to see businesses and business groups (*e.g.*, chambers of commerce) assist in addressing this issue. She indicated that she would like to see the buildup of kelp on beaches addressed in the master plan. The City of Coronado is not currently protecting the Coronado Dunes, although Barbara feels that this is a mistake so she recommends that the master plan consider this in future activities. Finally, Barbara said she would like to make sure that the pollution plume that forms off of the Tijuana River is considered in the planning, design, and monitoring of projects and activities associated with the master plan.
7. Tom Cook indicated that he believes the regional sediment management approach is a good model for ecosystem management but he feels that more robust monitoring is needed along and near the shore. For example, more beach profile transects are needed at important locations and finer temporal monitoring is needed as well. He expressed concern regarding the placement of large volumes of sand on or near reefs because of the potential for sand to bury reef habitat and modify surf quality. Finally Tom noted that there was no mention of the protection of private property/structures as part of the SD RSM Plan and he suggested that such information be included in the future. This should be done by first developing a standard methodology to value private property/structures for subsequent use in conducting economic analyses that could be used to evaluate other options such as managed retreat.
8. Brian Collins suggested that the master plan identify a dedicated source of funds to pay for remediation measures that might be needed to cover unforeseen issues that arise after implementation of future beach nourishment projects. For example, such a dedicated source of funds could be used to cover the cost of additional lagoon maintenance that might be attributed to additional sand associated with a beach nourishment project. The potential impact of additional sand on lagoon maintenance was analyzed as part of the Regional Beach Sand Project II and funding allocations were developed for each lagoon where such impacts were identified in advance of project construction. In addition, monitoring has been conducted for that project to determine if any impacts to lagoon maintenance have occurred.

9. Kathy Weldon suggested that the master plan look for opportunities to coordinate with watershed managers to address the impact of water quality improvement activities (*e.g.*, TMDLs and hydromodification improvements) on the natural movement of sediment through the watershed towards the coast. She suggested that it might make sense to find a way to have a portion of the development impact fees that are currently paid to the waterboards be used for beach nourishment projects.
10. Leslea Meyerhoff informed the attendees that Dr. Phil King conducted an economic analysis for SANDAG several years ago to identify potential funding opportunities to support beach nourishment projects and studies. The study, which was conducted during the Great Recession, concluded that various methods such as taxes and fees would not likely be supported by city, state, or federal government. However, Leslea pointed out that it might be worthwhile for the master plan to revisit that study given that the economy is in a better condition.
11. Mike Hastings suggested that an economic study should be conducted to identify, develop, and assess funding options for beach projects and studies.
12. Dennis Lees indicated that he would like to see the master plan better address impacts to the offshore borrow sites. This would include the incorporation of traditional sampling in the monitoring program to better determine the impacts to the ecosystem as a whole. He indicated that current sampling methods focus on opportunistic species which tend to have short life spans as opposed to the longer-lived species that make up a portion of the ecosystem and would take longer to recover from dredging impacts. This information could be used to develop design depth limits on offshore borrow sites to better protect these ecosystems, with specific focus on minimizing the chances such sites might become anoxic “dead zones.” This could include the potential for prohibitions on deep (20’) dredging of offshore borrow sites. Finally, Mr. Lees suggested that all attendees view Dr. Reinhard Flick’s presentation on You Tube for information on future changes in tides, storm waves, and mean sea level as well as the impacts of these changes on beach processes.
13. Tony Kranz first informed everyone that he is attending the meeting as an individual and, as such, his comments do not represent the City of Encinitas, for which he is currently serving as a city council member. Like Barbara Denny, he would not like to see the master plan effort lead to the formation of additional governmental bureaucracy but he would like to see the issue addressed by existing government. Budgets are limited now and will likely remain that way in the foreseeable future so regional solutions should be considered to address problems such as beach erosion. In this context, the role of stormwater as a source of beach sediment should be identified in the master plan and work should be undertaken to coordinate with the stormwater regulatory community to address this important issues.
14. Loni Adams asked how often the reference list on the CSMW website is updated and Alyssa Moore indicated that, while there is no set schedule at this time, the list was updated within the last few weeks. Loni indicated that she would like to provide reference information for inclusion on the CSMW reference list and Alyssa indicated that she will update the list once she receives the reference information from her. Loni said that she would like to see more information in the master plan regarding ways to improve the natural movement of sediment through coastal watersheds out to the beaches and nearshore areas. She would like to have such activities considered before the implementation of artificial beach nourishment projects.

15. Gabe Buhr indicated that the California Coastal Commission is generally supportive of the overall master plan with local focus achieved via regional sediment management planning. That said, he indicated that the CCC is concerned about potential impacts to upcoast and downcoast sensitive resources so that agency is pushing for more pre-project and post-project monitoring to assess those potential impacts. The sand used for beach nourishment activities should be consistent with the sand found at the receiver site. Finally, while the CCC is not opposed to the concept of sand retention, any such activities need to consider the impacts to all coastal resources.