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To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.
### SHORELINE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE

Thursday, June 2, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Meeting Summary for February 3, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to a lack of quorum at the April 7, 2005 meeting, the February 3, 2005 minutes need approval. The February 3, 2005 meeting summary is enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Meeting Summary for April 7, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The April 7, 2005 meeting summary is enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Public Comment and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public interested in addressing the Committee may do so during this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Update on the Port of San Diego Dredging Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ilene Maher from the Port of San Diego will provide the Committee with a report on their dredging project, which placed sand on the beach in Imperial Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Webb from Moffatt &amp; Nichol will provide the Committee with a progress report on the SCOUP project, including an overview of the project description and timeline for the preparation of the environmental document. Additionally, staff will update the Committee on the status of a proposed second environmental document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Future of the Shoreline Preservation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At their May 13, 2005 meeting, the SANDAG Executive Committee voted to continue the Shoreline Preservation Committee as the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group). The Working Group will report to the Regional Planning Committee, providing advice and input on shoreline erosion issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
+8. Shoreline Preservation Working Group Charter

SANDAG’s Executive Committee has requested that each lower-level working group or committee that reports/makes recommendations to the Board of Directors or one of its five Policy Advisory Committees prepare an updated charter. The charter describes the group’s purpose, line of reporting, responsibilities, membership, and other details. Attached is a draft charter for the Working Group to review.

9. Legislative Update

The CalCoast representative will discuss the status of state and federal legislation, including SB 658 and AB 1269.

10. Next Meeting Date

It is suggested that the Committee’s next meeting date be scheduled for Thursday, August 4, 2005.

11. Adjourn

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
DATE: February 24, 2005

TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee

FROM: SANDAG Staff

SUBJECT: February 3, 2005 Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance

- Councilmember Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, Chair
- Councilmember James Bond, City of Encinitas, Vice-Chair
- Councilmember Carrie Downey, City of Coronado
- Councilmember Jerry Finnell, City of Del Mar
- Councilmember Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
- Councilmember Philip Monroe, City of Coronado
- Councilmember Dave Roberts, City of Solana Beach

Advisory Members

- Steve Aceti, California Coastal Commission (CalCoast)
- Robert Hoffman, NOAA Fisheries Service
- August Felando, Calif. Lobster & Trap Fisherman’s Assn.
- Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club

Staff Working Group

- Steven Apple, City of Solana Beach
- Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado
- Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
- Danny L. Schrotberger, City of San Diego
- Don Hadley, City of Oceanside
- Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
- Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
- Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas

Others

- John Campbell, City of Carlsbad
- Bud Carroll, City of Carlsbad
- Clif Davenport, Calif. Geological Survey/Coastal Sediment Management
- Shawn Dressel, HPA
- Dick Erhardt, City of Carlsbad
- Teri Fenner, EDAW
- Karen Green, SAIC
- Marianne Greene, City of San Diego
- David Griffin, California Coastal Commission (CalCoast)
- Lawrence Honna, AMEC
- Brian Leslie, City of Encinitas
- Anne-Lise Lindquist, Moffat & Nichol
- John Metz, Oceanside Harbor & Beach Advisory Committee
- David Oakley, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Assn.
- Wenkai Qin, Noble Consultants, Inc.
- Terry Rodgers, Union-Tribune
- John Steel, City of Solana Beach
- Susan Steele, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Assn.
- Chris Webb, Moffat & Nichol
- Rob Rundle, SANDAG
- Shelby Tucker, SANDAG
1. Welcome and Introductions
   Councilmember Kulchin welcomed everyone and conducted the meeting.

2. The Meeting Summary for December 2, 2004
   Meeting Summary from the December 2, 2004 meeting was approved.

3. Public Comment and Communication
   David Oakley, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Association, indicated that the benefits of beach nourishment were clear during the previous week’s rain. Oakley noted that as a result of the added sand, water was prevented from reaching the seawall until January 8, 2005.

4. Presentation of Award of Recognition to Mayor Terry Johnson and Councilmember Doug Sheres
   Councilmember Kulchin thanked Mayor Terry Johnson for his service and hard work on the Shoreline Preservation Committee and presented him with an Award of Recognition. Mayor Terry Johnson thanked the Shoreline Preservation Committee (SPC) members for their commitment to the region and described the SPC as an example of how regionalism can work.

5. Storm Water Runoff and Beach Sand Replenishment
   John Robertus of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board) discussed detention basins, the material contained in them, and its disposal. The Regional Board has become involved due to their regulation of erosion on construction sites. That erosion often results in sediments trapped in detention basins that can be used for beach nourishment. Robertus suggested that the cleaning out of catch-basins on construction sites has created a new opportunity for beach nourishment. He explained that catch-basins are usually dumped illegally due to costly and time consuming permit processes, but that the sediment in these basins could be cleaned and used on beaches. Robertus advised that a regional approach be taken to obtain waivers, which should include all jurisdictions between Laguna Beach and Imperial County. He explained that the regional board is working to identify the location of catch-basins and also to develop a schedule for their cleaning. The sediment from these basins could be screened and washed, vegetation and pollutants would be removed, and it could then be sold for nursery stock and used for beach nourishment, as well as returned to streams.

   Robertus alerted the SPC to the opportunity for intercepting sediment above coastal lagoons by placing catch-basins on each of the main tributaries above the lagoon. The sediment collected would be washed and screened for use on the beach. Robertus also notified the SPC of the private and commercial interests that might want to become involved in the process. Sediment from catch-basins is currently dumped in landfills and could be used more productively. Robertus recommended that if sediment from catch-basins was used, the cost of moving that sand to the beach could be overlapped with what cities already pay to clean these basins. Steve Aceti, CalCoast, noted the similarities between Robertus’ proposal and
work being done as part of the California Coastal Sediment Master Plan (CCSMP), which includes identifying dammed reservoirs and catch basins. Robertus reiterated that the board’s policy changes (storm water regulations) will result in an increased number of catch-basins and available sediment.

6. **Beach Replenishment Funding Strategy**

SANDAG staff explained that a real-estate transfer tax is not something SANDAG would have the legal authority to levy. Individual cities do have the ability to levy that tax on their own. Staff also discussed the regulations that would apply if SANDAG developed a quality of life measure; a memo detailing this issue was provided in the agenda packet. Further research will be done to determine whether beach nourishment funding can be included in a quality of life measure. The SANDAG board will make the final decision as to whether another tax measure is presented to the voters and what is included in the measure. The board is currently focused on TransNet and its related projects, but have committed to addressing the issue of another quality of life measure within the next four years. Councilmember Kulchin suggested that it is the SPC’s responsibility to convince the board that beach sand nourishment should be included in a future quality of life measure if there is one. Julie Wiley, SANDAG attorney, explained that staff is working to determine if current legislation would allow for beach sand in a quality of life measure. If it is determined that beach sand could not be included, further legislation will be needed to clearly identify beach sand as something SANDAG can levy a tax for. Wiley noted that this year’s legislative program includes conducting discussions with lobbyists to determine if adding to current taxation would be supported and also if there would be any sponsors.

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, feels that if current legislation allows for preserving habitat, beach sand would be included. He added that if the statute did have to be amended, Senator Ducheny and Assemblymember Lori Saldana have both expressed an interest in shoreline issues and might be willing to help. Councilmember Bond is concerned that beach nourishment wouldn’t receive adequate funding if grouped with other environmental issues. Bond advocated that the committee work on their own to get something on the ballot, as he does not see the political will on the board to do so. Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club, indicated the important link between the region’s beaches and its economy. She suggested that this could help the community see the beach as an important resource on various levels and also that a tax to support beach nourishment could be argued for on the grounds of economic prosperity.

Staff explained that if a tax were passed, it would need two levels of approval. The board would have to decide to place a measure on the ballot, and voters would then have to pass it with a 2/3 vote. Staff also encouraged using the economic prosperity argument to gain support for a beach nourishment tax. Councilmember Bond reminded the committee that the entire region uses the beaches and that a regional effort would be the best solution. Councilmember Downey, City of Coronado, suggested that if a tax were collected separately, it may also be used separately. She indicated that SANDAG was created as a regional organization and recommended that the SPC focus on getting a percentage of any future quality of life measure. It was also suggested that partnerships between individual cities and public and private agencies be formed for some projects.
7. **Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP)**

Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol, discussed the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP). Currently, beaches in the Oceanside littoral cell that would be appropriate for opportunistic beach fill are being identified. SCOUP will produce a set of guidelines that can be used by any jurisdiction to implement opportunistic beach fill programs. A compatibility analysis protocol will be established to compare opportunistic beach sand to sediment currently on the beach. Based on the protocol, a streamlined process for the approval and use of opportunistic sand will be developed. A CEQA document will also be prepared and will serve as a set of guidelines to secure future permits.

Webb presented a list of the criteria being used for site selection, which included support from the public and impacts to existing harbors, among others. Webb noted that beaches not selected for this project could still be candidates for future projects. The sites that have scored highest at this point are in Encinitas and also near the San Dieguito River. The site selection process is not yet completed, but will be by the next SPC meeting. SPC members were asked if there were any sites that should be considered and had not been and also if they felt that any of the sites that had received a low score should be given further consideration. Councilmember Bond recommended a site on Batiquitos Lagoon that ends at Ponto Beach. He recalls the beach receiving sand in the past and inquired about its elimination. Webb explained that he had looked into the site and that it may have been eliminated due to miscalculation. He agrees that it would be a good site. Councilmember Kulchin asked about a site in North Carlsbad near the Buena Vista Lagoon. Webb’s response was that the site is in the running, but has a low rank due to poor access and previous opposition to beach replenishment projects. Webb reiterated that although the pilot beach would be in the Oceanside littoral cell, the plan that will be developed as a result will be useful to any jurisdiction attempting to get sand on their beaches.

Webb indicated that sand sources are also being looked into and that they plan to identify as many as possible within a 20-mile radius of the coast. A solicitation was sent out from SANDAG to each jurisdiction’s public works department asking for their input on flood control management facilities and flood control maintenance activities. They were also asked to identify sand sources as well as places sand might be stored or “staged.” Staging areas have been identified in most areas, but in some cases, they are working to identify areas closer to the beach.

8. **Legislative Update**

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, discussed a symposium that will be held in Sacramento April 5 and 6. Terry Tamminen, Governor’s Cabinet Secretary, and Mike Chrisman, Resources Secretary, have been confirmed as participants, and legislators are also expected to speak at the event. Aceti noted that CalCoast has been working with the California Shore and Beach Preservation Association to prepare legislative staff and legislators for upcoming funding needs. He explained that funding needs have increased as a result of projects along the coast going through the feasibility phase, which increases the non-federal cost needs.
Aceti remarked on an article from CalCoast’s newsletter, which he will distribute at the next SPC meeting. The article discusses the EPA’s proposal for a new off-shore dumpsite for sediment from the Santa Ana and L.A. rivers. Aceti recommended that the issue be looked into and noted that CalCoast will be sending in comments. He also suggested that SANDAG and individual cities should send comments before the comment period ends in March. Robert Hoffman suggested that the material in question would be from ports, which would make it unsuitable for the beach. He also suggested that the material would most likely be used by the ports. The SPC should, however, still take the opportunity to comment.

The American Shore and Beach Preservation Association (ASBPA) recently passed a legislative agenda, which was described as being focused on the federal beach program. Aceti will e-mail a copy of the agenda to staff for distribution at the next SPC meeting. The ASBPA is holding a congressional summit March 8 through 11 where Senators and house members are expected to speak, as well as representatives from other states, who will discuss their beach programs and lobbying activities. Aceti closed by informing the SPC of opportunities to lobby on the state level in April and on the Federal level in March.

9. **Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting will be held Thursday April 7, 2005.

10. **Adjourn**
DATE: May 2, 2005
TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: April 7, 2005 Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance
- Councilmember James Bond, City of Encinitas, Vice-Chair
- Councilmember Carrie Downey, City of Coronado
- Councilmember Jerry Finnell, City of Del Mar
- Councilmember Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach
- Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, San Diego County

Advisory Members
- August Felando, Calif. Lobster & Trap Fisherman’s Assn.
- Robert Hoffman, NOAA Fisheries Service
- Patrick McKay, NAVY
- Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club
- Sherilyn Sarb, California Coastal Commission (CalCoast)

Staff Working Group
- Steven Apple, City of Solana Beach
- Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
- Don Hadley, City of Oceanside
- Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
- Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado
- Danny L. Schrotberger, City of San Diego

Others
- Angela Lockhart, Carlsbad Beach Preservation Committee
- Dick Erhardt, Carlsbad Beach Preservation Committee
- Geoff Daly, AMEC
- Lawrence Honna, Merker & Associates
- Susan Steele, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Assn.
- Anne Lise Lindquist, Moffatt & Nichol
- Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol
- Karen Green, SAIC
- Dan Muslin, TEC
- Marianne Greene, City of San Diego
- Jerry Hittleman, City of Oceanside
- David Oakley, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Assn.
- Kim Kawada, SANDAG
- Rob Rundle, SANDAG
- Shelby Tucker, SANDAG
- Kristin Green, SANDAG

1. Welcome and Introductions
   Councilmember James Bond, Co-Chair, welcomed everyone and conducted the meeting.

2. The Meeting Summary for February 3, 2005
   David Oakley, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Association, requested that a change be made to the last sentence under Item 3 in the February 3, 2005 meeting summary. This change has been made.
3. **Public Comment and Communication**

There were no public comments or communications.

4. **Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP)**

Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol, updated the Shoreline Preservation Committee (SPC) on the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP) and asked the SPC to comment on the proposed pilot project site. Webb began by discussing the draft report that was submitted to SANDAG and the Department of Boating and Waterways. The report describes completed work, including establishing an approach toward opportunistic beach sand nourishment that can be used statewide, recommendations on how to identify and analyze sand readily available for use and its compatibility for placement in the coastal zone, recommendations on selecting the most appropriate receiver site, and options for transporting material.

The next phase of SCOUP will be to develop CEQA documents for the pilot project. Based on the specific criteria established, south Oceanside beach has been recommended for the pilot project. Webb explained that material will be trucked to the site and that the issues associated with trucking will be carefully considered. Using a site in the Oceanside Littoral Cell for the pilot project is beneficial for the entire region, as some of the nourishment will eventually move to down coast beaches. South Oceanside beach was chosen due to its need for sand, existing low-impact truck route, previously built ramp to dump sediment, lack of sensitive biology and nearby stockpile area. Another benefit to using south Oceanside is that it received nourishment during SANDAG’s Regional Beach Sand Project, which should help with the permitting process.

Webb discussed some of the possibilities for sand placement depending on the type of sand used. He explained that efforts would be made to assure that the project would impact residents and recreational beach users as little as possible. Constant monitoring will occur after the initial nourishment and will include developing beach profiles, an analysis of the grunion, and the effect on beach recreation. Webb also recommended that the surf be documented before and after nourishment to determine the impacts, if any, especially because Oceanside is so heavily surfed. Webb then asked for the SPC’s comments and opinions on the use of south Oceanside beach, explaining that if its use is supported, then the SCOUP can move onto the next phase, which would be to develop CEQA documents and begin initial data collection. Those tasks should be completed by August or September.

Discussion began with a question from Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club, regarding the EIR that will be produced by SCOUP and specifically if it could be used by other projects. Webb explained that it would be limited to the specific project, but that the goal is to have it be a mitigated negative declaration. Other sites could be added to the environmental documents if funding became available, however SCOUP’s budget and scope of work doesn’t currently allow for it. In response to comments made by Councilmember Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, Webb explained that he would hope other projects could use the documents drafted by SCOUP as a resource. Councilmember Kellejian requested that Webb provide a list of the beaches that were considered for the pilot project along with their ranking. Kellejian also inquired about funding opportunities from sources other than the state that would enable the environmental
documents drafted by SCOUP to be more inclusive. Steve Aceti, CalCoast, suggested that grant funding should be considered. Councilmember Bond supported the use of south Oceanside beach, especially since down coast beaches would also benefit from the nourishment. Webb explained that the project’s environmental documents would include an analysis of the project’s effect on down coast beaches. Councilmember Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, suggested that the list of sites considered and ranked as part of SCOUP might be helpful in determining where nourishment is most needed when other opportunities arise. Downey supported suggestions to widen the scope of SCOUP’s environmental documents and asked what the additional cost would be. Webb estimated that the additional incremental cost would be $10,000 per added site. Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club, suggested that the biological benefits of nourishment be analyzed and reported to encourage additional funding from a variety of sources.

Councilmember Bond mentioned that transporting sediment can become expensive and asked who is usually responsible for those costs and if it will be considered in SCOUP’s environmental documents. Webb explained that transportation costs become greater as sediment sources move further from the shoreline and that the source usually absorbs that cost. Most sources don’t have the funding to cover those costs and often negotiate a solution with the jurisdiction. Webb offered to develop an analysis of trucking costs based on distance from the shoreline to give jurisdictions an idea of transportation costs, thus allowing them to determine how far out they should look for sources. He advised that most jurisdictions would want to locate sources within ten miles of the receiver site. Bob Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service, explained that if 45 percent fines were used, they wouldn’t remain on the beach, but would be pulled off-shore naturally by waves, which would result in a significant amount of suspended sediment that would last for quite sometime. Hoffman felt that this should be analyzed when determining where the nourishment is placed.

Councilmember Bond asked if the SPC would support south Oceanside beach for the pilot project and suggested that opportunities for funding be researched to allow for additional sites to be included in SCOUP’s environmental documents. The SPC supported the use of south Oceanside beach, however, August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fisherman’s Association, expressed that if sites were added, he might have to raise concerns about their environmental impact, specifically if it affects the work of those he represents.

5. Future of the Shoreline Preservation Committee

SANDAG staff explained that each year the Executive Committee reviews SANDAG’s secondary level committees and working groups to determine if they should be maintained or modified. The SPC was discussed at the February 24, 2005 Executive Committee meeting and no final decisions were made, however, they did recommend the SPC report to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) rather than to the Board and requested input from the SPC. Additional options for changing the SPC’s structure were outlined on page 9 of the Agenda Packet and included sun-setting the SPC and restructuring it into a technical working group, which would not include elected officials. Suggestions and comments made by the SPC will be brought to the Executive Committee at their meeting in May.
Councilmember Kellejian expressed that the SPC should include representatives from throughout the region. He then discussed SANDAG’s five committee structure, explaining that those committees include representatives from each sub-region. In order to encourage region-wide concern for shoreline issues, Kellejian would support having the SPC report to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) with its current membership maintained. He added that SPC meetings have notable attendance, demonstrating the public’s interest and concern for the issues addressed by the SPC. Supervisor Pam Slater-Price agreed with Kellejian, explaining that the SPC serves an important and unique role in the region. She suggested that in the future the committee should place a stronger emphasis on developing products and noted that the coastline is an essential resource that should be preserved. Susan Steele, Encinitas Seacoast Preservation Association, spoke on behalf of the homeowners she represents, relaying that the SPC’s work is necessary and that it keeps the region informed of coastal issues. Steele would like the SPC to remain in its current form, but would also support Kellejian’s suggestion, especially if it encouraged additional support for nourishment projects. Councilmember Bond added that SANDAG staff received a number of letters from people unable to attend the meeting expressing similar opinions. He suggested that due to the public’s support for the SPC, it would be important to remain mindful of their concerns and needs, even if elected officials were not able to be members. Bond feels that the SPC doesn’t receive adequate attention from the Board and would encourage additional representatives if it would increase the support given to the SPC. Councilmember Kellejian added that having the RPC’s support would make it easier for the Committee to get things passed by the Board. Councilmember Downey, City of Coronado, suggested that the SPC increase their representation at the RPC. Councilmember Bond agreed, adding that increased representation from the RPC would assure that the RPC was informed of the SPC’s work and progress.

SANDAG staff presented some of the comments received from those unable to attend. Councilmember Janney, City of Imperial Beach, and Councilmember Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, expressed that the SPC should remain as it is, but that they would support having the SPC report to the RPC. Councilmember Monroe, City of Coronado, feels strongly that shoreline issues are an important part of the RCP and that the SPC would be better served under the RPC. Councilmember Bond then suggested that members of the RPC should serve as members on the SPC. Supervisor Slater-Price advised that the SPC support reporting directly to the RPC and that the best ways to implement that change be considered prior to the next meeting. She also pointed out that rethinking the SPC’s structure has the potential to make the committee stronger and encouraged the RPC’s increased involvement. Educational outreach will play an important role in informing inland jurisdictions of coastal issues and related technical and scientific processes. Making sure that the entire region is informed of the SPC’s work is important and would be aided by increasing coordination with the RPC. Reaching a larger audience would also be helpful in passing any future voter initiatives. Bond added that RPC members should serve on the SPC and that they should report to the RPC on the SPC’s work. He recommended that at least three members of the RPC regularly attend SPC meetings. SANDAG staff provided the example of the Energy Working Group (EWG), which has appointed the Co-chair as a liaison to the RPC and also gives reports on the EWG’s progress. A member of the RPC has also been appointed to attend EWG meetings. Councilmember Bond would support a similar process as long as the representatives committed to attending meetings and also advocated for more than one representative. Kellejian recommended that the SPC appoint a liaison and alternate liaison to ensure attendance. Councilmember Downey suggested that at least one of the RPC members chosen as a liaison
be from an inland jurisdiction and would also like to see the liaisons report back to the RPC.
Councilmember Bond agreed that it would be important for inland jurisdictions to understand
the economic value of the shoreline. Downey added that it would be important to show the
Executive Committee how well attended SPC meetings are and that so many members of the
public attend. Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club, expressed that the SPC should become more
product oriented and that they might consider reporting to the Executive Committee once or
twice a year to show their progress and ask for any additional input.

Councilmember Bond wrapped up discussion, explaining that SANDAG staff would bring the
SPC’s input to the Executive Committee at their meeting on May 13, 2005. Staff noted that the
Executive Committee meeting would be held before the next SPC meeting, but that the
Executive Committee meeting is open to the public.

6. Legislative Update

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, discussed SB 658, sponsored by Senator Kuehl and co-sponsored by
CalCoast and the San Francisco Open Space Council. The bill would create a coastal mitigation
fund to deal with the impact vehicles have on the coast and would establish a voluntary
system allowing coastal counties to decide whether or not to impose the vehicle registration
fee. 30 percent of the revenue collected will go directly to the county and 70 percent will be
administered through the Coastal Conservancy and returned to the county. CalCoast has been
in discussions with Kuehl’s staff to change the ratio to 50/50. Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and
San Francisco are in support of the bill as it stands and, if passed, will institute the fee. The bill
is also supported by various environmental groups and the legislature. CalCoast is working to
get support from the private sector and the Governor’s office. Aceti noted that the bill is
important, as it allows for beach restoration funding.

Aceti explained that he and Supervisor Slater-Price recently met with the Conservation
Strategy Group (CSG), an organization that has written a number of the most recent environ-
mental bonds and also that CalCoast has had discussions with the agency to encourage that
beach restoration be included in future water and park bonds. CalCoast and the Wetlands
Recovery Project had worked to pass propositions 40 and 50 based on the assumption that
they would have a stake in future bonds. At the meeting attended by Aceti and Supervisor
Slater-Price CSG agreed to include a beach restoration item in SB 153, which could amount to
$40 or $50 million. Aceti noted that this would have the potential to take state programs like
the beach erosion control and public beach restoration programs created by AB 64 to the next
level. Additional state funding is important and can also be an important tool for procuring
federal funding.

Supervisor Slater-Price explained that she would not support any measure that allowed
revenue to be taken from the region. She does not agree with SB 658’s 70/30 split and would
prefer to see more, if not all, revenue returned directly to the county. When money is passed
through other agencies, less is returned to the county. Slater-Price would also like to see the
funding slated to go through the Coastal Conservancy go directly back to the county instead,
ensuring that there are less opportunities for loss of revenue. Aceti explained that by passing
some of the funding through a state agency, it becomes more accessible to non-profits,
wetlands, and watershed groups looking for grant funding. Slater-Price added that it would
be important to get support from some of the more conservative counties that are still undecided and also to show ground level support. Aceti added that safe guards are built into SB 658 to ensure that revenue can not be put into the general fund and must be used on the coast. He explained that SB 658 and SB 153, although not cure-alls, present the opportunity for organizations promoting beach restoration and related efforts access to a steady funding source, rather than having to find funding in revolving funds each year. CalCoast will be working to assure that the bond measure is passed through the legislature and put to a vote and have been asked to deliver local government and private sector support for the bill.

Councilmember Bond feels that both bills seem promising and specifically mentioned SB 153. He noted that beaches should be considered parks and that the state should provide for their maintenance in a similar fashion. Supervisor Slater-Price added that the Governor doesn’t want to rely on bond measures in the future and has been encouraging other funding mechanisms, of which the vehicle licensing fee presents a good example. Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club, noted that vehicle impacts are often overlooked in mitigation funding and suggested that the vehicle registration fee would be a good source of funding and would also allow revenue to be kept locally. Councilmember Bond and Patrick McKay agreed that mitigation funding for beaches is often overlooked and should be given further consideration.

7. **Next Meeting Date**

SANDAG staff noted that the February 3, 2005 meeting summary hadn’t been officially approved and that there was no longer a quorum. Suggested changes will be made and brought to the next meeting for approval.

The next meeting will be held Thursday June 2, 2005.

8. **Adjourn**
Shoreline Preservation Working Group Charter

Purpose
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) was formed as a committee in the 1980s and currently advises the Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) adopted in 1993. The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region. It contains a comprehensive set of recommendations on the beach building program and on financing and implementation. The Working Group has technical expertise and background knowledge of regional shoreline issues, which is useful in applying the principles and goals laid out in the Strategy and SANDAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2004). Continuing to support the region’s ongoing and future beach nourishment efforts is a top priority for the Working Group. Additionally, in 1996, SANDAG enacted a shoreline monitoring program and the Working Group will continue to oversee and implement this program.

Line of Reporting
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group, established by the Board of Directors, advises the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on issues relating to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy and the Regional Comprehensive Plan. Based on the Working Group’s input, the RPC makes policy recommendations to the SANDAG Board of Directors. Regular updates on Working Group activities should be made to the Regional Planning Committee to update them on current programs and projects and further strengthen the connection between the two groups.

Responsibilities
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group’s main responsibilities are to make recommendations to the RPC on issues related to the implementation of the adopted Shoreline Preservation Strategy and Regional Comprehensive Plan, focusing on future beach nourishment opportunities and the shoreline monitoring program.

Membership
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group has 11 voting members, which are elected officials from coastal cities and a representative from the San Diego Unified Port District and the U.S. Navy. Additionally, the Working Group has several advisory members which are representatives from community groups and organizations, environmental groups, state and federal agencies, and other interested stakeholders. Voting members of the Working Group and their alternates are selected by the bodies they represent. Non-voting members of the Working Group are also selected by the bodies they represent and are categorized as either Technical or Community Advisors and provide added knowledge and input to the Working Group. In the event of a lack of participation by a member of the Working Group or the group/agency the member represents, the Regional Planning Committee may approve allowing the Working Group to modify the membership roster in order to achieve a quorum and full participation.
**Meeting Time and Location**

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group meetings are held bimonthly at 11:30 a.m. on the first Thursday. Meetings are normally held in the 7th floor conference room at the SANDAG offices.

**Selection of the Chair**

Selection of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group’s Chair and Vice-Chair is done simultaneously and begins with recommendations made by Working Group members. The final decision is then made based on a vote of the Group’s voting members.

**Duration of Existence**

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group was originally created as a committee in the 1980s. The Working Group’s current status is that of a standing working group. An evaluation of the group’s work will be conducted annually as part of the SANDAG Executive Committee’s annual committee/working group review process.