MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, February 5, 2009
11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker
(619) 699-1916
stu@sandag.org

Guiding Principles:
• commitment to unified approach for local decisions on sand replenishment;
• address local needs and maximize positive regional impacts;
• encourage cooperation and coordination;
• contribute equitable fair share from local participants; and
• promote opportunities for beach sand replenishment

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS
• SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY WAVE INUNDATION MODEL
• REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II
• MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) during this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2008, MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The December 4, 2008, meeting summary is attached for Working Group review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SCRIPPS INSTITUTION OF OCEANOGRAPHY WAVE INUNDATION IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michele Okihiro from the Coastal Data Information Program at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography will discuss a new research project to study wave inundation of low lying areas in Southern California. A brief overview of the project will be presented including a description of the current inundation warning system and field observation program. Assistance is being sought from coastal cities in identifying problem areas and documenting wave flooding events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>PROPOSITION 84 FUNDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG staff will discuss the status of the funding request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Chris Webb, Moffatt &amp; Nichol, will provide information on the preparation of the preliminary engineering and design for the Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSP II). Proposed sand footprints, and alternative projects including sand retention will be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. SANDAG staff will discuss with the Working Group the next steps related to implementation of the RBSP II. Each Coastal City will provide input on whether they plan to participate in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT (MLPA) INITIATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG staff will provide an update on the status of MLPA initiative efforts and existing efforts undertaken by SANDAG and regional stakeholders to ensure beach replenishment issues are considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>COASTAL REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Webb, from Moffatt &amp; Nichol, will provide the Working Group with an update on the status of the Draft Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (Plan). The deadline to provide comments on the draft plan has been extended to February 13, 2009. The draft plan can be found at <a href="http://www.sandag.org/crsmp">www.sandag.org/crsmp</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>LEGISLATIVE UPDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Aceti, from CalCoast, will discuss the status of state and federal legislation related to shoreline management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next regularly scheduled Working Group meeting is Thursday, April 2, 2009, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2008, MEETING

Members in Attendance:
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach
Kevin Faulconer, City of San Diego
Carl Hillard, City of Del Mar, (Alt.)
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Al Ovrom, City of Coronado
Ester Sanchez, City of Oceanside
Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego
Eileen Maher, Port of San Diego
Mitch Perdue, U.S. Navy

Advisory Members in Attendance:
Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition
August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fisherman’s Association
Marco Gonzalez, Surfrider
Bob Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service
Michele Okihiro, Scripps Institute of Oceanography

Staff Subgroup
Adam Birnbaum, City of Del Mar
Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Y. Sachiko Kohatsu, County of San Diego
Leslea Meyerhoff, City of Solana Beach
Danny Schrotberger, City of San Diego
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas

Others:
Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Assoc.
David Schug, URS
Darryl Hatheway
Jonathan Hardy, Senator Denise Ducheny
Teri Fenner, EDAW
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol
Shelby Tucker, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
John Dorow, SANDAG
Marina Som, SANDAG
1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, was nominated as Temporary Chair in the absence of Chair, Ann Kulchin, and Vice Chair, Jim Bond. Motion was moved by Al Ovrom, City of Coronado, and seconded by Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach. Motion carried.

2. **Public Comment/Communications**

Members of the public had the opportunity to address the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) on subject matter that is not on the agenda.

Rob Rundle, SANDAG, announced that Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, passed the California BAR Exam.

3. **Agenda Item #3, Summary of the October 2, 2008, Meeting**

Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, motioned to approve the summary. Mr. Kellejian seconded the motion, which carried without opposition.

4. **Agenda Item #4, Regional Shoreline Management Program Guiding Principles**

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, recommended that the Working Group approve the inclusion of an additional Guiding Principle. The addition would state, “Contribute equitable fair share from local participants.” Unlike the 2001 Beach Sand Replenishment Project (RBSP) that was primarily funded by the U.S. Navy and the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW), current efforts toward the second RBSP (RBSP II) will be funded by DBW with matching funds to come from the participating coastal cities. The additional guiding principle would reflect that local funding for the RBSP II will come through an equitable fair share distribution agreed to by all of the coastal cities.

Ms. Slater-Price motioned to approve this recommendation, which was seconded by Mr. Janney. Motioned passed without opposition.

5. **Agenda Item #5, Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan**

Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol, presented information on what would be required, expected, and/or needed from local agencies to implement the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (Plan). He presented the Working Group with a brief background of the regional shoreline erosion problem and discussed two management scenarios for the restoration and maintenance of the shoreline. Scenario one considers nourishment of the shoreline only, while scenario two coupled nourishment with sediment management devices. Mr. Webb identified short-term and long-term tasks for cities to implement the Plan and asked cities to review the Plan when it comes out.

A draft of the Plan will be available on December 15, 2008. Staff requested that the Working Group review and comment on the draft Plan. The Plan will be finalized in February 2009 and brought back to the Working Group for further discussion.
Mr. Kellejian inquired about the deadline for comments. Comments on the Plan must be received by Friday, January 16, 2009. Ms. Tucker announced that a copy of the Plan can be found online at www.sandag.org/shoreline and a link to the Plan will be sent through the Working Group distribution list.

6. Agenda Item #6, Regional Beach Sand Project II

a. Dave Schug, URS, provided information on the RBSP II preliminary planning activities that occurred during the months of October and November. Offshore investigations were conducted in two phases to locate suitable sources of sand for the RBSP II. Phase one involved marine geophysical surveys and phase two consisted of vibracore explorations. Preliminary assessment found new sand resources as well as revealed that some previously dredged areas were mined out. Sand quality for the assessed areas ranged from marginal to excellent. Eight potential borrow sites were identified as a result of this work. These sites were found in or around previously dredged area or in entirely new areas.

Mr. Webb discussed the project description for environmental review. He asked if coastal cities would like their project description to mirror the prior RBSP or modified. He requested that comments be sent to Ms. Tucker. The preliminary design is anticipated to be completed in late-winter and included in the design.

Mr. Kellejian inquired about the sand quality of the new borrow sites for Solana Beach. Mr. Schug stated that sand quality ranged from good to excellent. Better, courser sand material had been found for Solana Beach closer to shore and in a wider area, which is a big difference from the previous RBSP operation.

Marco Gonzales, Surfrider, commented that as a surfer he has seen significant lasting benefits from the RBSP, especially at Georges Surfing Beach located between Encinitas and Solana Beach. The RBSP restored this severely eroded stretch of beach and brought back beach activity to this area. He suggested that the sand grain size from that borrow site be considered as optimum for retention because of the lasting benefit that is still seen there today, seven years after the RBSP. It disheartens him to see reports stating that the these projects have a fleeting benefit because the resources at Georges is significantly different from ten years ago.

Ms. Slater-Price suggested to Mr. Gonzales that Surfrider could write an article about this because of Surfrider’s creditability.

Mr. Gonzales stated that a technical overlay is also needed to explain this qualitative assessment.

Mr. Kellejian stated it is very important to inform everyone that the RBSP is a viable project and can be done successfully.

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, remarked this type of antidotal observation would be an added benefit to the monitoring efforts because no other region has attested to it.
b. Ms. Tucker discussed the next step in the implementation of the RBSP II. Staff was successful in securing $6.5 million from DBW but now must identify the $1.1 million (15 percent local match) from the local entities to implement the project. Ms. Tucker discussed two methods in which this match can be met by: (1) participating cities would be required match each DBW installment or (2) each jurisdiction’s contribution toward DBW match would be by task during a specified date.

Staff had prepared a cost breakdown by city for the RBSP II and a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would need to be signed to memorialize the funding contribution from participating local cities. Staff requested that this information be reviewed by the jurisdictions to identify interested cities by the next Working Group meeting.

Mr. Kellejian commented that city money used toward the RBSP implementation will be money well spent because of all the recreation, economic, public safety, infrastructure, and environmental benefits derived from this project. He noted the bad economic condition, but encouraged all of the coastal cities to participate in this project.

Kevin Faulconer, City of San Diego, inquired over the frequency of the match. Ms. Tucker said that the state funds will be received in three increments of $6.5 million each fiscal year from 2009 to 2011, but the match by participating cities would not be required until the money is spent. If matching by task, the Environmental Review will take about a year, thus participating cities and SANDAG would have about a year to then enter into another MOU to do the next phase of the project.

Mr. Faulconer also asked if the Mission Beach and Torrey Pines sites will be included in the RBSP II. Ms. Tucker indicated that those areas will be included.

Mr. Kellejian requested representatives take this back to their city councils and have a decision reached by February 5, 2009.

Ms. Tucker stated that she would be happy to meet with any cities to provide additional information.

Ester Sanchez, City of Oceanside, inquired over the solidity of the funding commitment by the state given the economic condition. She stated that project scheduling seems extremely optimistic. Ms. Tucker responded that the state is committed to this project and the DBW money is from a dedicated funding source from a boating fee.

Mr. Aceti noted that there had been a lot of support from the legislature for this project.

Mr. Kellejian commented that he is confident that the state will continue with the next two phases and that the state will face a lot of scrutiny if it backs out of the project.

Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside, asked if the next match (Permitting Match) will be a year from February (2009) since the environmental review will take about a year to complete. Ms. Tucker affirmed this. She also stated that the estimated dates for DBW match is presented to the cities to help guide their budgeting for this project.
Carl Hillard, City of Del Mar, commented that Del Mar is a small city and would like to be a participant in the RBSP II; but given the financial constraints, he cannot see Del Mar committing to this project. He stated that what would be a relatively small dollar amount for other cities would be large expenditure for Del Mar. He also noted that there has been a lot of community dialogue concerning the beach in Del Mar and there is a belief that Del Mar’s beaches are a regional asset; therefore, there is a need to involve inland communities in this effort to preserve this regional asset.

Ms. Slater-Price commented on the difficulty of obtaining a regional funding source for this project and she believes that it is not going to happen because the argument that beaches are a regional asset cannot be made effectively. She added that coastal cities are constrained in their ability to generate revenues due to the fact that local beach visitors do not contribute to the economies of coastal cities, yet she noted that a countywide initiative similar to TransNet could be a possible solution in trying to equalize the effort from different cities to take care of the beaches.

Mr. Kellejian asked the group if they can first come to an agreement on the environmental review match. Ms. Tucker stated that the group can decide on how to move forward with this project and welcomed an action on the environmental review.

Ms. Sanchez inquired what would happen if there were cost overruns. Ms. Tucker responded that it would be addressed in a contingency match.

Mr. Faulconer stated that he will take this back to his council and subcommittee, and noted that if funds would be received by task it would increase the timetable in getting anything done next year.

Mr. Kellejian noted that Solana Beach had prepared for this type of project with the city’s two percent Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) and seawall mitigation fund. He said that this would be a way to address Del Mar and Oceanside’s concern over funding for the project.

Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach, asked how connected are the first three tasks and if they could be packaged together to garner regional participation after the first MOU. Ms. Tucker responded that the first three tasks are very connected and would make a good package. Mr. Webb added that these three tasks are integrated steps and work better together.

Mr. Kellejian inquired if there was consensus from this committee to move the first three tasks from page 19 of the agenda to each representative’s city council.

Ms. Tucker clarified that Working Group members are asked to take this back to their city councils to make a decision on whether or not they are willing to move forward with this project.

Ms. Sanchez said that she is committed to taking this back to the council but anticipated issues. She sees the total amount required from Oceanside as a sticky point, but the first three tasks would not present a problem.

Mr. Kellejian commented that it is very seldom that a project has 85 percent of funding secured. He stated that they must take advantage of this opportunity and move this project forward.
Adam Birnbaum, City of Del Mar, inquired over the freshness of the environmental review if the project is deferred for some reason. It was stated that permits could be framed to give some flexibility and the construction specifications are going to be good regardless of timing, therefore, the environmental documentation is not going to be wasted.

Bob Hoffman, NMFS, noted that from an environmental timeframe there will not be much of a change except less sand on the beach.

Ms. Slater-Price suggested to Ms. Sanchez that Ms. Tucker give a presentation when this item is placed on Oceanside’s agenda.

Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach, asked if a jurisdiction decides to increase their sand footprint, must that decision be received by the February 5 deadline. Mr. Webb said, yes, and added that it is best to obtain permits for more sand and build less if needed because the opportunity for more sand would be addressed in the environmental document.

Rob Rundle, SANDAG, noted that the last RBSP environmental review tried to cover a project that would have 50 percent more sand. It was determined that a project with three million cubic yards of sand would have significant environmental effects whereas the two million cubic yards would not. He cautions coastal cities to be realistic on the amount of sand they want analyzed because there would be associated environmental issues and consequences.

7. Agenda Item #7, Marine Life Protection Act Initiative

Ms. Tucker presented information on the efforts SANDAG had undertaken to provide input in the Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative process. The Working Group had expressed the desire to become a stakeholder in this process when representatives from the MLPA gave a presentation to the Working Group in October, but this did not come to fruition. Ms. Tucker stated, however, they are open to receiving comments and information from the Working Group. She asked that the Working Group review and comment on an attached letter from Gary Gallegos, which asks decision makers involved in the MLPA Initiative to consider issues relating to beach replenishment and restoration when designing marine protected areas in the San Diego region so that shoreline preservation goals and efforts by SANDAG are still attainable once the designations are in affect.

Mr. Gonzales cautioned that SANDAG must be careful in its deliverance of this message. He is concerned that this will be perceived as a hierarchal structuring of efforts, where SANDAG’s beach sand work should be prioritized above marine protection areas (MPA), even though this is clearly not the case. He suggested that the Working Group move cautiously forward with this letter and reserve the use of stronger language until they see how the marine protected area maps start to evolve. Mr. Gonzales stated that he is committed to working with environmental groups to soften the perception of what the beach sand advocates are trying to accomplish.

Ms. Slater-Price asked if Mr. Gonzales had any suggestions on how to change the letter.

Mr. Gonzales suggested that language be changed in the second sentence of the third paragraph, which states, “Expansion of existing MPAs in the region could negatively impact the goals and objectives set forth in the Strategy, limiting the types of restoration and maintenance activities allowed to occur in the future.”
Mr. Aceti commented that this sentence is a statement of fact. He additionally noted that the issue of beach replenishment is being represented in the MLPA Initiative process because San Clemente, which has a similar beach project, has a councilmember who is a part of the Stakeholder Group.

Mr. Kellejian directed the Working Group’s attention to the second paragraph, page 26 of the agenda and stated that Ms. Slater-Price would like to see a slight change of language in this section.

Mr. Rundle commented that this sentence was intended to be neutral, simply stating that SANDAG wants these programs to coexist.

Mr. Gonzales commented that the Surfrider Foundation vehemently opposed beach sand replenishment in the East Coast and had been very careful in supporting these types of programs on the West Coast. Support for West Coast sand replenishment projects had been under the caveat that there would not be negative impacts to the environment and surf resources. He stated that Surfrider would not be able to support sand replenishment programs if it needed to choose between that and the MLPA.

Mr. Kellejian asked how and where in the letter would language need to be changed.

Mr. Rundle suggested that language in the last sentence of the third paragraph (pg. 25) be modified. Mr. Gonzales suggested the replacement of the words “could negatively impact” with “should consider” in that sentence.

Mr. Wade commented that this change in language would not consider the establishment of new MPAs.

The Working Group passed a motion that the language of the last sentence of the third paragraph of the letter to be changed to state that the expansion of old and/or creation of new MPAs in the region should consider the goals and objectives set forth in the Strategy.

8. Agenda Item #8, Proposition 84 Funding Request

Ms. Tucker provided the Working Group with information on the progress of the Proposition 84 funding request. Staff had prepared a draft scope of work to be submitted to the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) and California Coastal Conservancy (Conservancy) for funding consideration. Ms. Tucker asked that any suggested changes and comments on the draft scope be sent to her. She noted that the OPC hearing will be in February and if approved, this request will go to the Conservancy in March or April. SANDAG is hopeful that funds will be received by May or June to begin the implementation of the sand management device study. Ms. Tucker expressed appreciation for the letters of support that she had received regarding this request and noted that additional letters of support would be of great use from representatives of the Working Group that had not yet submitted one.

Mr. Kellejian commented that he would like to see unanimous support for this.

Mr. Aceti stressed the importance of the cities and county to express their support in order to get this approved by the OPC and Conservancy.
Ms. Tucker commented that letters of support are needed all the way up to the hearings in February.

9. **Agenda Item #9, Legislative Update**

Mr. Aceti provided a handout of the updates and noted a correction in item 1; legislators were sworn in on Monday, December 1, 2008, and not on Thursday, December 4, 2008, as written in the handout.

10. **Agenda Item #10, 2009 Shoreline Preservation Working Group Meeting Schedule**

Attached to the agenda is a list of upcoming meetings for 2009.

Mr. Kellejian commented that he has no problem if an emergency meeting is called for if additional input is needed for project implementation.

11. **Agenda Item #8, Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Ms. Kellejian at 1:18 p.m.
The next meeting is scheduled for February 5, 2009, 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.