

**California Coastal Sediment Master Plan
Public Outreach and Plan Formulation
Stakeholder Meeting 5 (Santa Cruz Littoral Cell)
September 25, 2015 (9:00am to 12:00pm)
USGS Office (Conference Room)
2885 Mission Street Extension
Santa Cruz, California**

**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**

Meeting Notes

1. Introduction

John called the meeting to order at 9:10am, and he welcomed everyone to the meeting on behalf of the State of California, Coastal Sediment Management Working Group (CSMW), and USACE. John briefly reviewed the meeting agenda and had everyone introduce themselves.

2. California Coastal Sediment Master Plan (SMP) Overview

John delivered an introductory presentation to set the stage for the rest of the meeting. The presentation included information regarding the principles of regional sediment management, the CSMW Sediment Master Plan (SMP), 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 products are being used by stakeholders for sediment management activities. The final point made during this presentation was that the next step in CSMW's effort is to utilize the information prepared to date (since 2004) to prepare a statewide SMP based heavily on the information in the coastal regional sediment management plans (CRSMPs) prepared over the past six to seven years. The SMP is slated for completion in early 2016, so timely input from stakeholders will be important. John suggested that people check out the CSMW website for more detailed information and he noted that the presentation would be loaded to the CSMW website (www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw).

3. Public Outreach and Plan Formulation Summary

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 5. He directed the stakeholders to keep these objectives in mind, in particular during Agenda Item 8 (Stakeholder Input). David explained to the stakeholders that the focus of this meeting would be different than the first three meetings that were conducted in southern California between June 2014 and October 2014. This is because the Santa Cruz Littoral Cell (SCLC) CRSMP has not been

completed yet, so the focus of this meeting will be modified to encourage stakeholders to provide input relative to the completion of the SCLC CRSMP. David made it clear that the stakeholders are also encouraged to provide input relative to development and implementation of the overall SMP. Finally, David informed that stakeholders that the presentation would be loaded to the CSMW website (www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw).

4. Santa Cruz Littoral Cell Regional Sediment Management (RSM) Plan Overview (James)

James presented a summary of the SCLC CRSMP prepared for the CSMW by the USACE-SFD. James informed the stakeholders that the SCLC CRSMP generally covers the region from Pillar Point to Moss Landing and that the document is organized into nine sections. There are some areas where beach erosion is problematic so a process was developed to identify beach erosion concern areas (BECAs) and sediment impaired coastal habitats (SICHs) that included input from the public as well as utilization of standard data/information sources. Potential RSM strategies were recommended to address these problems without being overly prescriptive. James presented an example from the SCLC CRSMP by looking at potential RSM measures for Surfer's Beach. James informed the group that the presentation will be loaded onto the CSMW website (www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw). Finally, James mentioned that the Draft SCLC CRSMP is currently posted on the CSMW but the Final SCLC CRSMP should be posted in the near future.

5. Santa Cruz Littoral Cell Sediment Management Activities

David indicated that the sediment management activities list will consist of the types of information: (i) Projects, (ii) Studies, and (iii) Research. He provided examples of each type of sediment activity taken from work in southern California. One of the examples he mentioned was the Broad Beach project in northern Malibu, which he mentioned as an initial example of a project involving private-public partnership. Someone asked what the goal of the Broad Beach project was and David indicated that it has several goals, one of which was to protect septic fields in the backyards (ocean side) of coastal residential properties in the Broad Beach neighborhood.

David mentioned that sediment management activities could include both large and medium-scale beach nourishment projects as well as opportunistic sand placement. The San Diego Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSPII) was mentioned as an example of a large scale beach nourishment project. Someone asked if a MOU/MOA was developed for the RBSP? David indicated that an MOU/MOA was not prepared for the RBSP; however, Clif Davenport mentioned that such an agreement was not needed because the project was implemented by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), which is a Joint Powers Authority so the necessary agreements between the various entities (e.g., coastal cities) was already in place.

As an example research project, David mentioned the beach processes study that was conducted by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to study how sand placed at Torrey Pines Beach during the RBSPII moved over time.

David mentioned that the development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL's) for pollutants could impact regional sediment management because in some locations TMDLs are being developed/could be developed for sediment as a conditional pollutant. The TMDLs usually target fine-grained sediment, which is usually

associated with pollutants; however, measures aimed at trapping fine-grained sediment also trap coarse grain sediment, including sand.

Doug George and Dave Revell discussed the issue of cobbles. They pointed out that although a lot of effort has gone into the study of sand and some effort has gone into the study of fine-grained sediment no effort has been expended on increasing knowledge of cobbles (e.g., extent, importance in overall coastal sediment budget, transport processes). This raised the question of how research conducted under the sediment master plan is being incorporated into sediment management activities. The group indicated that they would like to see this addressed as part of the next steps in the sediment master plan effort.

The issue of the 80/20 rule was raised by several stakeholders. Allan Ota (EPA) pointed out that the 80/20 rule is a “rule of thumb” intended to provide initial screening guidance. The 80/20 “rule of thumb” basically states that dredged sediment containing more than 20% fines (less than 80% sand) will not be readily considered for beneficial use as beachfill without additional testing for contaminants (may be present in higher content fine grained sediments) and conducting grain size analysis at the potential receiver site which may contain higher percentage of fines. Demonstration projects at Santa Cruz Harbor and Tijuana Estuary have been conducted over the past five to ten years to study the impact of placing sediment with high portions of fine-grained sediment on nearshore biological resources. This information has been developed to assist regulatory agencies in making decisions regarding beneficial use of sediment with portions of fine-grained sediment higher than 20%.

Fine grain sediment can have beneficial uses in wetland habitats. There are current projects in development where fine grain sediments are contemplated for coastal wetland restoration. The more data that exists to support this, based on science, the better. Fine-grained material can cause greater turbidity and have impacts on nearshore habitats so these issues should be put in the context of turbidity and flood flow events. One stakeholder mentioned concern for spending too much time and resources when we already have good science from the standpoint of a tax payer; however, a point was also made that it is potentially problematic to generalize results from one area to other areas so site specific studies may be necessary.

Clif and Heather mentioned that the IWR will help stitch together the final pieces of the sediment master plan into a final product.

6. GIS/Webmapper

Alyssa discussed the types of data that CSMW is collecting and how the public can access those data online. Integral to CSMW’s data collection and sharing are the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and the specific GIS web mapper tool developed to assist coastal sediment management 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 CSMW’s Coastal Sediment References searchable database, and she provided contact information for stakeholders that want more information. Alyssa informed the group that the presentation will be loaded onto the CSMW website (www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw).

7. Break

8. Stakeholder Input

Chris Potter stated the need to have a research/science needs meeting to memorialize and address issues that were not contemplated at the beginning of the process.

David Cannon informed the attendees that in the beginning of the SMP effort, the idea of regional sediment management based around littoral cells was developed. Now that the SMP effort is winding down a question is whether we should tie the regional sediment management plans together into a master plan (e.g., one master plan document for the entire state). The stakeholders seemed to like the idea of preparing a statewide SMP with consistent methods and information across the state.

Brad Damitz suggested the need to consider sediment management strategy indicative of larger effort, tying together smaller efforts. The vision is a toolbox with RSM plans included as one of the tools.

Tami Grove stated that Local Coastal Plan (LCP) updates could help with implementation of regional sediment management activities as well as other SMP activities. This is a potentially powerful implementation tool that is already available for use. In addition, LCP updates will be performed in the context of the final CCC Sea Level Rise Guidance Policy, which can be easily combined with various regional sediment management activities.

Doug George mentioned that there are several examples from the UK and Western Australia that include high quality mapping and detail, which might be a good place to look as a model for SMP implementation.

Clif Davenport said that a beach erosion concern area (BECA) must be a stretch of coast that has federal, state, and regional designation. David Revell suggested standardizing criteria for BECA's at a statewide level. David Cannon asked Clif if there are plans to update the criteria for determination of BECAs and Clif indicated that there are plans to conduct this update after the SLO RSM is complete. Clif indicated that first a manageable database is needed.

Brad Damitz suggested that the purpose of RSM plans is to focus in on specific BECA's. David Cannon indicated that there is now an opportunity to fold sea-level rise into BECA consideration.

Allan Ota mentioned a beach nourishment project that was refused in Crescent City. They needed to get the harbor in better working order after a storm and clean sand existed, but California State Parks (CSP) who managed the beach area preferred to have nature take its course (i.e., no project). CSP did not want to have sand placed there because they were concerned about burying hard-bottom habitat. We should acknowledge that there could be other changes occurring that are not as apparent and should be considered.

James Zoulas said that it might be helpful to look at how infrastructure has impaired lagoon functions.

A stakeholder from Pajaro said that adjacent land ownership should be looked at as well as the potential for mitigation banking. It was also suggested that, moving forward, the stakeholder engagement process needs to target public works and maintenance staff from coastal cities and counties since these groups have not participated in the process.

Bob Battalio feels that the CSMW has done a good job at initiating discussion on coastal zone management. Important to get communities engaged in governance and plan review. Also, it has been found that more data is needed in some RSM plans. Cannon referenced an email that Bob Battalio provided that outlines these data needs. Many more challenges need to be addressed with ecology needs being considered at the same level as infrastructure needs. In addition, fine sediment should be considered a valuable resource for estuaries. David Cannon mentioned that sediment should be considered a resource to respond to sea-level rise. In the future, sediment could be used in wetlands to keep pace with sea-level rise; however, the permitting process would need to be changed to allow this action.

One of the attendees on the phone mentioned that managed retreat should be considered in coastal marsh management and it should be built into any plan, in light of sea-level rise even though in some places it will not be feasible.

Bob Battalio stated that the sea-level rise planning conversation has started, but communities need to have a vision with multiple objectives. This means not just having a "Burger King" value (how many people visit the beach), but also looking at the ecology of the beach. Scenario exercises with future conditions for beaches should be done similar to what has been done for flood management, which is a more sustainable practice. Chris Potter indicated that there is currently a vacuum for governance and accepting plans, policies, and responsibilities. David Revell added that sea-level rise acts as a great catalyst to implement RSM's. Brad Damitz feels there is a disconnect between RSM planning and sea-level rise planning. He would like to see common structure in governance and feels that research needs to be done on governance structures and practices. David Cannon mentioned that implementable portions of RSM plans could be extracted and the resulting plan could be more easily adopted by various governance structures.

A stakeholder from San Mateo County said that vulnerability assessment planning has led to questions of how to quantify beaches and estuaries in addition to homes/businesses because it is important to determine quantification.

Bob Battalio said that it may be worthwhile to have another update on what is happening with the SMP after 2015.

Doug George asked if future SMP work can be conducted within other frameworks (e.g., FWS, LCP's, CZM).

A stakeholder from Monterrey said that there is a need to re-approach regional government on implementation. It is too much to expect to have small governments tackle projects without the technical expertise.

Dave Revell said that there has not been a lot of discussion in Northern California for how sediment is managed by Caltrans, Mining (Oroville, River) so data is lacking. For example, the links to Integrated Water Resource Management Planning (IWRMP) are missing. Watersheds and roadways need to be looked at in more detail.

Chris Potter asked what discussions have happened with the counties about climate change. Debra from San Mateo County indicated that management strategies are being developed now. She said that they are relying heavily on state and federal efforts to lead their process and that she is excited to include sediment in the management strategies for climate adaptation.

Clif Davenport stated that NOAA was involved in the early days in southern Monterrey Bay, San Francisco Bay and the "Doughnut Hole." The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is looking to have a meeting with Pacifica and Daly City to get input and governance structure will be discussed.

Someone expressed concern regarding what will happen with wetlands and marshes. Sand management will be important and collective efforts to leverage funding for projects that will aide in managing sea level rise need to be considered and identified.

Bob Battalio suggested that it may be more effective in the long run to establish a conservation easement. RSM could consider this as a land use/management strategy/solution. Managing expectations will also be important.

David Cannon noted that it is little noticed when land is purchased for solving a problem versus a project that is built that is/is not performing well. Signage could also be used and education to help with making this more successful as a strategy.

Heather Schlosser suggested that the California State Coastal Conservancy could be an agency tasked with collecting in-lieu fees and use those fees for RSM implementation.

9. Next Steps and Action Items

- Locate 1920's aerial maps at UC Santa Cruz for data collection purposes
- Identify examples from the UK and Western Australia for pertinent information
- Consider adding lagoon mouth management to RSM plans

10. Adjournment