

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

Stakeholder Meeting 3 (Santa Barbara Littoral Cell)

**October 2, 2014 (9:00am to 12:00pm)
City of Ventura Council Chambers
501 Poli Street, Ventura, California**

Notes

1. CSMW Welcome (Brian Brennan)

Brian Brennan called the meeting to order at 9:05am and he welcomed everyone to the meeting on behalf of BEACON, State of California, Coastal Sediment Management Working Group (CSMW), and USACE. Brian briefly reviewed the meeting agenda, which is provided in Attachment A.

2. Introductions (All)

David Cannon had everyone around the room introduce themselves.

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

Chris and Heather 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 3. 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. Santa Barbara Littoral Cell Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David)

David delivered a presentation that summarized the Santa Barbara Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (SBLC CRSMP) prepared for BEACON by Noble Consultants.

6. Santa Barbara Littoral Cell 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 3 (Ventura County & Santa Barbara County Coast)

October 2, 2014 (9:00am to 12:00pm)

**City of Ventura (Council Chambers)
501 Poli Street
Ventura, California 93002**

**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. Introduction (Brian) [5 min]
2. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan Overview (Chris & Heather) [20 min]
3. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary (David) [15 min]
4. Ventura/Santa Barbara County Regional Sediment Management Plan Overview (David) [15 min]
5. Ventura/Santa Barbara 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 3 (Santa Barbara Littoral Cell)

1. It was suggested that the issue of regulatory agencies (e.g., EPA) classifying sediment as a conditional pollutant should be pursued at a policy level.
2. The group discussed the Broad Beach Project as an example of a private beach nourishment project to frame advantages and disadvantages. The Broad Beach Project proponents formed a Geologic Hazard Abatement District (GHAD) and used the GHAD to pursue the project. The formation of the GHAD allowed the project proponents to pursue the project under a CEQA exemption so environmental review requirements were reduced compared to the typical project implementation process that requires review under CEQA. This was considered an advantage by the project proponents. On the other hand, the lack of CEQA review meant that no alternatives were formulated for consideration to meet project objectives and minimize impacts to the environment and this slowed down the permitting process with the California Coastal Commission because the Coastal Development Permit approval process requires an alternatives analysis.
3. Several stakeholders wondered why the San Diego area appeared to be so successful in implementing large-scale and small-scale beach nourishment projects. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has conducted two large-scale beach nourishment projects (RBSP I and RBSP II). The US Navy funded most of the RBSP I to streamline approval of the Navy Homeporting Project in San Diego Bay back in the late 1990s. SANDAG was able to secure additional funding from the state of California Department of Boating and Waterways to fund the rest of that project. The DBW and SANDAG member cities funded the RBSP II with a proportional payment system worked out between the cities based on size, shoreline mileage, and other factors. Implementation of the RBSP I made it easier to obtain the necessary permits and approvals to conduct RBSP II so, in that sense, SANDAG was able to build off the success of ‘demonstration project’ RBSP I and the associated information (EIR/EA, monitoring data, funding methods, etc.). The cities of Encinitas and Solana Beach have been successful in implementing small-scale beach nourishment projects using opportunistic sand obtained from projects conducted in upland areas within the cities. This was enabled through the development of the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP) that was funded by the CSMW through SANDAG and some of the member cities (e.g., Encinitas and Solana Beach). In addition, the CCC requires the payment of a sand mitigation fee for the construction of seawalls along the coastline of these two cities and the funds are retained in a fund to be utilized for beach nourishment projects.
4. The group discussed the importance of maintaining and improving the flow of sand to the coast line via natural processes, primarily stream and river flow. It was noted that sand and gravel mining operations conducted within rivers and streams is reducing the amount of sand reaching the coastline and that this practice should be addressed at a policy level. Likewise, sand trapped in debris basins should be bypassed to downstream river and stream reaches to allow that sand to reach the coastline. There was general agreement that if these two issues could be addressed through regional sediment management it would substantially improve the condition of beach sand supply in the regional. If such practices cannot be stopped then, perhaps, a fee system should be put in place to fund the future implementation of projects that would mitigate

for the loss of this sand from the coastline. It was noted that the Santa Barbara County Flood Control District has been pursuing several demonstration projects to remove debris basins over the past few years; however, the projects were stopped because the National Marine Fisheries Service is requiring a level of monitoring (e.g., fish surveys) that cannot be covered under the level of funding allocated for these demonstration projects. NMFS, like many agencies, wants to see proven approaches used for such projects, which is difficult to impossible given that there is little to no experience with such projects; hence, the need for demonstration projects.

5. The group spent several minutes discussing the issue of recent monitoring requirements being imposed on regional sediment management projects. Many project proponents indicated that the monitoring requirements are costly, inconsistent, and, sometimes, not even used by the resource and regulatory agencies that require the monitoring. It is sometimes difficult to extrapolate from pilot projects to large-scale projects so such projects (e.g., Goleta Beach Nourishment) should be developed with this in mind. The technical basis of monitoring needs to be examined and, where possible, the bigger picture of how the system works needs to be considered. This issue should be addressed through an approach aimed to address the technical issues but it should also address policy related to resource management. It was suggested that a regional monitoring approach funded via multiple sources (e.g., project proponents, local/state/federal agencies, NGOs, and academia) might reduce costs compared to the project-by-project monitoring approach that is currently employed on projects. Such an approach could also provide more meaningful information.
6. The group suggested that it could be helpful if the federal government, through the USACE, would look into combining dredging projects in an RSM framework. To be successful this would require policy changes within the federal government to change the federal standard, which is, generally speaking, to implement the most cost-effective solution available.
7. The group indicated that the issue of fine-grained sediment needs to be addressed as it relates to efforts to increase the natural flow of sediment to the coastline via streams and rivers. Most people were familiar with the rule of thumb guidance that EPA has developed that typically states that sediment must be at least 80% sand (20% fines of silt and clay) to be considered for beneficial use as beach nourishment via direct beach placement or placement in nearshore waters. It was pointed out that the discharge of the Santa Clara River is composed of sediment with approximately 80% fine-grained sediment and 20% sand and gravel, yet, the beaches in the vicinity of the river mouth are composed of beach quality sand. The value of fine-grained sediment to the nearshore system and offshore areas could be considered in addressing this issue.
8. The government bureaucracy was discussed in relation to the role of various agency staff in approving permits and conducting environmental review. Some stakeholders felt it might be too difficult to resolve some of the issues mentioned thus far since the people conducting the technical work (e.g., permit review) within these agencies are not likely to agree to solutions aimed at reducing their work (e.g., environmental evaluations). It might be necessary to work at a higher level within these agencies to gain approval of approaches aimed at reducing some measures.
9. It was suggested that an arbitration process, at the federal level, might be useful in helping to resolve differences between the resource agencies, regulatory agencies, and project proponents.
10. Several stakeholders mentioned the importance of sand retention demonstration projects. Heather summarized the status of the Oil Piers Innovative Shoreline Protection Measure Demonstration Project and finished by indicating the project is currently on hold. It was suggested that demonstration projects could be pursued for other innovative retention

methods (e.g., artificial reefs) to evaluate the feasibility of implementing such projects in the future. The idea of sand recycling (backpassing the sand to upcoast beaches) near Mugu Canyon was discussed as another potential demonstration project that could feature sand retention measures to trap sand before it is lost to Mugu Canyon. Conducting demonstration projects involving sand retention in combination with beach nourishment could address concerns related to impacts associated with coastal structures. Such concerns could also be addressed through a demonstration project involving a removable groin system that could be used to check actual performance against predicted performance to give resource and regulatory agency staff confidence that a permanent installation could achieve the design objectives while minimizing environmental impacts. Aesthetic impacts could be addressed through implementation of a pilot project designed with groins that mimic natural features (e.g., rocky outcrops). Sand placement at Pierpont Beach was cited as an example of the importance of sand retention as it was pointed out that sand placed on that beach would not stay in place very long because the existing groin field is deteriorating in form and function.

11. The group discussed the need for dedicated sources of funding to conduct RSM projects. It was suggested that it might be possible to pursue some type of federal authority for RSM projects to provide the dedicated funding source. In addition, it was suggested that large, charitable foundations could provide funding for such activities if a viable strategy could be developed to target such foundations. Public-Private Partnerships (P3) could also be explored as a mechanism to fund RSM activities, especially if P3 projects could be connected to climate change resilience. Developing a better method to tap into emergency funding from agencies such as FEMA also offers potential funding opportunities but, due to the nice climate along the California coastline, this funding source is not likely to offer as much potential as it would along the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico.
12. The importance of the natural delivery of sand to the coastline was discussed in the context of climate change resilience. In this sense, the group agreed that sediment should be viewed as an important resource for climate change resilience. The Nature Conservancy's Coastal Resilience Ventura study provides good information related to future sea level rise inundation that supports the important role sediment can play in maintaining or building ground elevations to mitigate this inundation.
13. One of the stakeholders indicated that the Ventura Promenade to the Pier (playground) is a critical component of the coastal area throughout Ventura. The area is okay right now following the recent addition of cobble to the beach but this cobble beach will need to be maintained in the future as erosion issues are ongoing at the site.
14. Given the need to dredge Port Hueneme, Ventura Harbor, and Channel Islands Harbor it was suggested that a regional approach to dredging should be explored. This regional approach could include the purchase or lease of a dredge to conduct maintenance dredging of these areas or the formation of a regional contract that would facilitate better dredging coordination. This would include consideration of the various dredging equipment that would be needed to conduct dredging at all these locations as well as possible cooperation with the resource and regulatory agencies to explore modification of environmental windows for dredging operations. In addition, the feasibility of creating an organization to operate a state or federal purchased dredge could be examined in the future.
15. A couple stakeholders suggested that offshore areas should be explored to identify potential sources of sand that would be suitable for beach and/or nearshore placement. This effort should include delineation of each sand resource, potential sand volumes, and identification of any potential environmental issues (e.g., MPA, cultural resources, water depth limitation) that would preclude or limit use.