MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

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

Thursday, April 2, 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
• UPDATE ON THE ENCINITAS AND SOLANA BEACH ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECT
• COASTAL REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN
• REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II

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 FEBRUARY 5, 2009, MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The February 5, 2009, meeting summary is attached for Working Group review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4.</td>
<td>UPDATE TO SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP CHARTER AND ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Working Group is being asked to review, discuss, and approve the changes to their charter. The changes are primarily related to changes in SANDAG policy regarding the selection of Working Group chairs and vice-chairs. The Working Group also is being asked to discuss the potential addition of a tribal representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>UPDATE ON THE ENCINITAS AND SOLANA BEACH ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leslea Meyerhoff from the City of Solana Beach and David VanDorpe from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will provide the Working Group with an update on their efforts to implement a beach sand replenishment project in the cities of Encinitas and Solana Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+6.</td>
<td>COASTAL REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Webb from Moffatt &amp; Nichol will provide an overview of the final Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (Plan). The Working Group is being asked to provide a recommendation to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC). The Plan will be presented to the RPC for review on April 3, 2009, where they will be asked to recommend approval to the Board of Directors at the meeting on April 24, 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM #</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7.</td>
<td>REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II (RBSP II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION / POSSIBLE ACTION</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 RBSP II.</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, including an update on which coastal cities plan to participate in the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>UPDATE ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM EFFORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG staff will provide the Working Group with an update on the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative, as well as other efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>LEGISLATIVE UPDATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</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>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next regularly scheduled Working Group meeting is Thursday, June 4, 2009, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
News Release

For Immediate Release
Date: 2/13/2009

Contact: B. Ketterer
Phone No.: (760) 720-7001
Email Address: bketterer@parks.ca.gov

Contact: Angela O’Hara
Phone No.: (760) 458-4654
Email Address: angela.ohara@gia.edu

2nd Annual Carlsbad Beach Festival

Tamarack/Frazee State Beach at Pine Avenue- California State Parks will be hosting the 2nd annual Carlsbad Beach Festival to highlight the local coastal and lagoon waterways found within Carlsbad, raise awareness concerning the effects of marine debris, and provide an opportunity for residents to participate in a beach clean-up.

The event will be held on Saturday, May 2, 2009, from 10:00 AM through 2:00 PM. Informational and educational event booths will be located on the grassy area adjacent to the intersection of Carlsbad Boulevard and Pine Avenue and on the beach directly below.

The event will include a beach clean-up, activities for children, native plant tour, and refreshments. Trash and recycling bags will be made available for the clean-up activities. Those interested in the clean-up are requested to bring gloves.

The event is free and open to the public with the hope of raising awareness and generating support for coastal preservation and stewardship.

Foundations or groups interested in hosting a booth at the event should contact bketterer@parks.ca.gov

For energy efficient recreation –
California State Parks on the Internet: <http://www.parks.ca.gov>
YOU ARE INVITED!

2nd Annual Carlsbad Beach Festival
May 2, 2009 from 10:00 to 2:00
Tamarack/Frazee State Beach
(at the intersection of Carlsbad Blvd and Pine Ave)

- Beach Clean-up
- Activities for the entire family
- Native plant tour
- Refreshments

For further information or to RSVP please call (760) 720-7001 or email bketterer@parks.ca.gov

Hosted by:
California State Parks, City of Carlsbad Beach Preservation Committee, Aqua Hedionda Lagoon Foundation, Batiqitos Lagoon Foundation, and Buena Vista Lagoon Foundation
SUMMARY OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2009, MEETING

Members in Attendance:
Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, Chair
Teresa Barth, City of Encinitas, (Alt.)
Carry Downey, City of Coronado
Kevin Faulconer, City of San Diego
Mark Filanc, City of Del Mar
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach
Eileen Maher, Port of San Diego
Al Ovrom, City of Coronado, (Alt.)
Mitch Perdue, U.S. Navy
Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego
Esther Sanchez, City of Oceanside

Advisory Members in Attendance:
Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition
Loni Adams, California Department of Fish & Game
August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fisherman's Association
Marco Gonzalez, Surfrider
Bob Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service
Michele Okihiro, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Julie Thomas, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

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

Others:
Susan Steele, CalCoast/Seacoast Preservation
Bob Crane, Seacoast Preservation Association
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol
Anne-Lise Lindquist, Moffatt & Nichol
Bud Carroll
Others: (Continued)
Teri Fenner, EDAW
Dennis Simmons, City of San Diego Park and Recreation
Dan Daniels, City of San Diego Park and Recreation
Karen Green, SAIC
John Metz
Frank Quan, City of Oceanside
Darryl Hatheway, AECOM Water
Barry J. Snyder, AMEC
Trinh Duong
Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Assoc.
John Dorow, SANDAG
Keith Greer, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
Shelby Tucker, SANDAG
Marina Som, SANDAG

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and introductions were made.

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. None were received.

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

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

With the Working Group’s permission, Ms. Kulchin moved up Agenda Item 9 - Legislative Update because Steve Aceti had to leave early.

4. Agenda Item #9, Legislative Update

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, announced that Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has submitted a proposal to the State Legislature that would eliminate the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW). If effective, State Parks would assume the activities of the DBW. It is unclear as to how this reorganization would affect the Beach Restoration Program and the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund. Mr. Aceti said that CalCoast had made inquiries to the state and is awaiting a response.

In anticipation of further information from the state, Ms. Tucker asked if the Working Group should hold writing a letter in support of the DBW. Mr. Aceti responded that more information is needed before any action can be taken.
Ms. Slater-Price inquired, what does Mr. Aceti want the Working Group to do? Mr. Aceti said that this is only an informational update but the Working Group should decide on an action plan. He recommended convening a meeting in March as additional information becomes available.

Ms. Thomas noted that this also would have negative impacts on the waves and beaches program at Scripps Institute of Oceanography (SIO) because 60 percent of the program is funded through DBW along with matching funds from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). She questioned how this proposal would affect this collaborative between DBW and USACE.

Mr. Aceti asked Marco Gonzales, Surfrider Foundation, if saving the DBW could be something that his organization could support. Mr. Gonzales indicated that it is. The Working Group determined that Chair Kulchin, Ms. Slater-Price, Mr. Kellejian, Esther Sanchez, City of Oceanside, and SANDAG staff would meet as a sub-group along with Mr. Gonzales and Mr. Aceti to discuss the issue. A Working Group meeting in March would not be set unless deemed necessary.

5. Agenda Item #4, Scripps Institute of Oceanography Wave Inundation in Southern California

Michele Okihiro, SIO, informed the Working Group of a new program, Coastal Data Information Program, to study wave inundation at SIO. Wave inundation, flooding, and overtopping problems near the coastline due to the combination of large waves and big tides, pose severe problems in Southern California particularly during El Niño events and it is expected to get worse with sea level rise and global warming. Ms. Okihiro discussed the goals, approach, and benefits of the study as well as solicited help from Working Group members in gathering onsite observational data and formal documentation of inundation events in their jurisdiction.

Ms. Slater-Price said this is an important study since approximately half a million people live within one mile of the coastline in the inundation area and suggested coupling this effort with the Office of Emergency Services since every jurisdiction is represented there.

Julie Thomas, SIO, noted that SIO is working with the National Weather Service for this study and the program is still in its infancy.

Mark Filanc, City of Del Mar, commented that low tide monitoring in addition to monitoring high tide would be useful since the actual cause of inundation is not fully understood and inquired if SIO will send alerts of when observations should be conducted. Ms. Okihiro said e-mail alerts will be sent if jurisdictions wish to receive them.

Ms. Thomas noted that the current models can predict three days in advance when inundation will occur but this model is not perfect.

Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, asked how inundation will affect the shoreline of Coronado since the topography and location of the city is different from other coastal cities in the region. Ms. Okihiro stated this is the reason why SIO is soliciting help from the coastal cities, to obtain data in order to determine the differential affects of inundation at different localities.

Ms. Thomas said observational data from different exposures are necessary to calibrate the models to get meaningful results.
Ms. Downey inquired if SIO will coordinate this effort with staff. Ms. Okihiro said if staff contacts could be provided, SIO will assist them with whatever is needed.

Mr. Kellejian noted that it would be foolish for coastal cities not to participate and encouraged every coastal city to take part in this program.

Ms. Sanchez said Oceanside will be able to participate in this program.

Mr. Filanc said that the City of Del Mar would be happy to participate as well and inquired if training would be provided to make this an effective program.

Ms. Okihiro said the objective of the program is to make data gathering as easy as possible and training will be provided, if needed, because the more detailed the observation, the better.

Mr. Gonzales, Surfrider, said that this issue had been looked at by his organization in great detail when the Environmental Protection Agency in Maryland issued a paper on inundation, but he questions if setting an objective observational standard is possible.

Ms. Thomas stated that any observation would be helpful in trying to make modeling more sophisticated.

6. **Agenda Item #5, Proposition 84 Funding**

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, gave an update on the request for Proposition 84 funding. Ms. Tucker informed the Working Group that the request is currently on hold. The State Budget has required bonding to be frozen leaving the date for the request to be considered by the California Coastal Conservancy (Conservancy) and the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) is unknown at this point. The goal was to obtain funds to do research, primarily through modeling, to determine the feasibility of various sediment management devices in the region; and the end result was to request additional funding to start a pilot project to construct artificial reefs in the region.

It had been anticipated that the pilot project would occur on the same track as the construction of the Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSP II), but this is no longer the case with the request on hold. Staff does not want to postpone the construction of RBSP II for a pilot project that may have further delays; therefore, the two projects will now proceed on two different tracks. However, staff believes that sediment retention research is important work and will still pursue funding. If funding is ultimately obtained for reef construction, the project does include beach fill that will coincide with placement of each sediment management device. Ms. Tucker requested additional letters of support when this proposal goes before the Conservancy and OPC.

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

Part 1: Chris Webb and Anne-Lise Lindquist, Moffatt & Nichol, informed the Working Group of the next phase of the RBSP II, which is to look at the sand footprint of receiver beaches for beach nourishment and develop concept designs that will be included in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Currently, there are four options for consideration for inclusion in the EIR: a no project alternative and three action alternatives.
The action alternatives are as follow:

- **Alternative 1:** The RBSP II would imitate the 2001 RBSP Project with modifications to the footprints to reflect the “as-built” conditions and the location of receiver sites in Oceanside and Imperial Beach which would move northward towards their respective piers.
- **Alternative 2:** A larger project scope that expands the receiver site both in length and in volume. Encinitas had requested that it would like its sites to remain the same or reduce the volume of one of its receiver sites. The South Carlsbad South Site would be reintroduced with the possible elimination of the Torrey Pines Site.
- **Alternative 3:** At a program/conceptual level Staff would like to designate several suitable locations for sand retention measures to be located. The type of sand retention measure will not be specified.

Each coastal city was asked to provide input on these alternatives.

Teresa Barth, City of Encinitas, questioned the placing of additional sand on sites, such as Fletcher Cove, that is already experiencing good sand retention.

Mr. Kellejian asked what the cubic yard difference is for Encinitas in the two alternatives. Ms. Lindquist stated that Alternative One has about 100,000 cubic yards for Encinitas, while Alternative Two is about 230,000 cubic yards for the city.

Mr. Gonzalez noted the change in kelp canopy will be a critical baseline issue with respect to measuring impacts of sand migration and sand transporting operations from borrow to receiver sites, an issue that did not exist with the previous RBSP.

Karen Green, SAIC, said that kelp canopy was a consideration with the first RBSP and kelp canopy information will be updated and considered in the environmental analysis for the RBSP II.

Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Assoc., noted that there were specific protocols that must be followed regarding kelp beds in the construction aspect of the RBSP.

August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fisherman’s Association, inquired about the basis for determining receiver sites as depicted in the sketches. Mr. Webb said the sketches reflect a wish list of where the initial placement of sand could be, but this will be revised and modeled with regards to sensitive resources.

Mitch Perdue, U.S. Navy, asked if previous post-disposal sand migration data will be applied to the RBSP II. Mr. Webb responded that the previous data will be used as a reality check to calibrate the model but modeling is necessary to obtain permits, address environmental changes, and for analysis in the EIR.

Mr. Perdue asked what the difference was between the monitoring reality and the predictive modeling. Mr. Webb said that he is unable to give a numerical delta or confidence, but they were comparatively similar in terms of the overall dispersion of sand.

Mr. Kellejian said that he is skeptical of the possibility of expanding the sand footprint of Fletcher Cove further north because of environmental and recreational concerns.
Ms. Tucker mentioned that the current budget is for RBSP I rebuild, so this really is a wish list.

Mr. Filanc asked if the hardening of the river mouth at the San Dieguito lagoon had been a consideration because it will change the migration pattern of the sand. Mr. Webb said the hardening of the river mouth as well as its maintenance will be factored in the concept design.

Ms. Sanchez expressed concern over placing a retention structure offshore in Oceanside because of the potential affect on surfing resources. She stated that she would like to see it placed elsewhere.

Ms. Barth asked Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas, if she would suggest adding a potential retention site in Encinitas. Ms. Weldon said that there are concerns over the impact on offshore reefs and surfing resources and Staff must bring it forward to the City Council for approval.

Mr. Kellijian inquired if retention devices could improve surfing conditions if designed correctly. Mr. Webb affirmed that this is true with the exception of beaches with already good existing conditions.

Mr. Gonzalez noted the failure of Pratt’s Reef and cautioned that the addition of a retention alternative might overshadow the beach fill aspect of this project in terms of negative public perception and media reporting.

Part 2: As discussed at the December meeting, each of the coastal cities was to return to their respective councils to determine whether they would like to participate in the RBSP II. Participation includes a financial contribution that will count toward the 15 percent match for Department of Boating and Waterways funds. Cities were asked to provide an update on the status of their council decision.

The cities of Imperial Beach, Oceanside, and Solana Beach have all consented to participate in the RBSP II; while the cities of Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, and San Diego will have it placed as agenda items in February and March.

8. Agenda Item #7, Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative

Ms. Tucker discussed issues that have arisen with the MLPA since the Working Group met in December. A paper released in January called Beach Manipulation was less than favorable toward beach replenishment. SANDAG as well as other entities have prepared a response to the document.

Ms. Tucker thanked the elected officials and others who attended and spoke on behalf of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group during the two Regional Stakeholder Group meetings in January. From the public comment from that meeting, Ms. Tucker said that she was contacted by people from the commercial fishing community as well as a MLPA stakeholders looking to work with the Working Group to identify locations where a “no take” area can be established.

As part of the MLPA initiative process, they are looking for proposals and comments on potential designations. There is a formal process to prepare a proposal that requires the identification of locations throughout the south coast study region. The other option is to provide input through a letter and/or a stakeholder. This must be done by February 18.
SANDAG has two goals. One, SANDAG believes that a letter signed by the mayors from each of the coastal cities should be sent to the MLPA staff. This will again outline that the region needs to preserve its ability to dredge offshore and place material within the mean high tide line. Second, SANDAG would like to submit one or two potential locations. If this is agreed upon by the group, it could be included in the letter. SANDAG has identified two potential areas that do not limit its replenishment goals. These locations are both in the City of San Diego at Marine Street beach at Marine Street south of Beryl Street and south of Ocean Beach Pier at Santa Cruz Avenue to the Green tank in Point Loma. Staff would like input from the City of San Diego as well as input from the Working Group regarding these and other possible locations.

Mr. Felando stated that there is a current effort undertaken with the Port of San Diego (Port) and the Nature Conservancy to revitalize commercial fishing in the region. He inquired of the commercial fishermen that contacted Ms. Tucker and urged caution in looking at the Point Loma area as a potential designation area because this is a critical area for sea urchin fishery and lobster fishing. Mr. Felando suggested Ms. Tucker contact Kelly Falk from the Port in this matter. Ms. Tucker said she had communicated with Buck Everingham who is stakeholder on the MLPA and suggested moving forward with a letter without naming a location.

Ms. Slater-Price said Del Mar cannot proceed with its Southern California Edison project if a “no take” designation area is placed in the North County.

Mr. Gonzalez noted that passive recreation (i.e., swimming, surfing, canoeing, etc.) are currently not being considered in the potentially restricted areas.

Ms. Sanchez said this is difficult since everyone values their shoreline.

Mr. Kellijian commented that this would be in perpetuity and would adversely affect how beach nourishment activities would operate in the region.

9. **Agenda Item #8, Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan**

Ms. Tucker updated the Working Group on the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan. The Sediment Management Plan was delayed for additional review time requested by the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW). The CSMW will be reviewing in March and the draft plan will be finalized and presented to the Working Group as well as the Regional Planning Committee and Board in April. The time for general comments from the Working Group and the public also was extended to Friday, February 13. The document can be found on the SANDAG Website at [www.sandag.org/crsmp](http://www.sandag.org/crsmp).

10. **Adjournment and Next Meeting**

The meeting was adjourned by Ms. Kulchin at 1:06 p.m.

The next meeting will be on April 2, 2009, 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Shoreline Preservation Working Group Charter

Purpose
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) was formed as a committee in the 1980s and currently provides input to advises the Regional Planning Committee on issues related to the implementation of the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) adopted by SANDAG in 1993. The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region, including specific beach building and maintenance program and on financing and implementation. The Members of the Working Group has have technical expertise and background knowledge of regional shoreline issues, which are are useful in applying the principles and goals laid out in the Strategy and the 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 continues to provide recommendations regarding and oversee implementation of this program.

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.

Line of Reporting
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group, established by the Board of Directors, reports to 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-who are elected officials from the nine coastal cities in the San Diego region, and a representative from the San Diego Unified Port District and the U.S. Navy. Additionally, the Working Group has several advisory members, which-who are representatives from community groups and organizations, environmental groups, state and federal agencies, tribes, 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 also are also selected by the bodies they represent and are categorized as either Technical or Community Advisors, who 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.
Shoreline Preservation Working Group Charter

Meeting Time and Location
The Shoreline Preservation Working Group meetings are held bimonthly at 11:30 a.m. on the first Thursday of every other month. Meetings are normally held in the 7th floor conference room at the SANDAG offices.

Selection of the Chair
The Chair of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group shall be appointed by the Board Chair of the SANDAG Board of Directors in February of each year, or as vacancies occur. The Working Group Chair can be a primary or alternate member of the Board, but must be a primary member of the Regional Planning —Policy Advisory—Committee to which the Working Group reports. The appointments shall go into effect immediately unless otherwise directed by the Board Chair.

Selection of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group’s Chair and Vice-Chair is done at the first meeting subsequent to the appointment of the Working Group Chair by the Board Chair. This process begins with recommendations made by Working Group members to select one of its primary voting members as the Vice Chair. 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 that reports to the Regional Planning Committee. 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 of all lower level SANDAG committees and working groups.
March 5, 2009

Dear Chairman Janney:

The Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA) has, since January of 2007, had a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in which our agencies agreed that SCTCA representatives would have an advisory role on the Board of Directors and relevant Policy Advisory Committees (PAC). As we have become more involved in the regional planning process through our inclusion on various PACs, including the Regional Planning Committee, we have identified several working groups in which we feel it would be beneficial to the planning process to have tribal representation.

One such work group is the Shoreline Preservation Working Group. The tribal nations in what is today the San Diego region migrated seasonally between fishing villages on the coast to the inland mountains and desert. As the coastline has shrunk over the years, those historic villages have been submerged in what is today off shore. As the activities of this working group are often funded by federal grants which invoke the Native American Graves Protection and Restoration Act of 1990 (NAGPRA), we believe it would be beneficial to both SANDAG and the tribes to have a tribal representative on this Working Group.

Therefore, we have authorized our representative on the Regional Planning Committee, Chairman Johnny Hernandez, to request, on our behalf, that Mr. Louis Guassac, our tribal representative, be allowed to join the Shoreline Preservation Working Group. Mr. Guassac has been appointed by a vote of the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association (SCTCA).

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to hearing your decision.

Regards,

Chairman Robert H. Smith
Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association

Cc: Chair Kulchin, Shoreline Preservation Working Group
    Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director
COASTAL REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN  

File Number 3002800

Introduction

In 2007, SANDAG was awarded a grant from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) for the preparation of a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (Plan) for the San Diego region. Since that time, SANDAG staff has been working with the State of California and the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) to prepare the Plan for adoption by the SANDAG Board of Directors.

Recommendation

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group is asked to recommend that the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) take action recommending that the Board of Directors adopt the Plan.

Discussion

DBW funded three pilot Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plans throughout California. Plan preparation is part of efforts undertaken by the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW). CSMW is a task force made up of state, federal, and local/regional entities concerned about adverse impacts on our coastal habitats associated with our urbanizing society, and committed to Regional Sediment Management (RSM) as the means to best protect, restore, and enhance our coastal habitats.

Some coastal areas are eroding from reduced sediment supply while others are being deluged with excess sediment. Sediment is an integral component of the coastal ecosystem, representing a public good that must be managed to provide for quality of life, natural resource protection, and economic sustainability. Sediment imbalances resulting from alteration of the natural environment therefore threaten the viability of the public good and require management to restore the natural balance. Coordinated beneficial reuse of sediment resources within a regional context helps to restore natural processes and simultaneously address sediment imbalances. RSM can be thought of as “ecosystems management for sediment.”
The CSMW is developing a coastal Sediment Master Plan for the state to guide efforts in addressing political, regulatory, environmental, educational, and process-related issues anticipated to arise when implementing RSM. On a local level, regional plans are being prepared throughout the state. The regional Plan is a guidance and policy document that will discuss how management of sediment targeted at coastal erosion can be implemented in an expeditious, cost-effective, and resource-protective manner throughout the San Diego region.

A copy of the Executive Summary for the Plan is attached. Preparation of the Plan is the next step in implementing RSM in the San Diego region. It is to act as a reference, providing guidance for those wanting to implement sediment management activities within the region. The Plan builds upon what has been laid out as part of the region’s 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 that includes sand nourishment, sediment management devices, and policies and regulations regarding the use of the shoreline and its development.

The Plan provides in-depth information about the regions’ coastal processes, potential coastal receiver areas for placement of sediment, habitat and sediment quality constraints, sediment sources from upland, coastal, and offshore, an approach for sediment management based on sediment type, solutions to decreasing amounts of sediment available in the region, economics, and recommendations for governance and implementation of the Plan as well as other useful data and information.

Pending a recommendation by the Working Group, the RPC will be asked to recommend that the Board of Directors adopt the Plan at the April 3, 2009, meeting. The Board of Directors will consider the item on April 24, 2009.

Attachment: 1. Executive Summary

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916; stu@sandag.org
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
This San Diego Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (“Coastal RSM Plan” or “Plan”) has been developed by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the California Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW). This Plan was developed to inform the public and decision-makers on sand deficits and related issues within the region, and proposes solutions for existing sediment management problems along the coast. Insufficient sediment or sand volumes exist along the San Diego County shoreline, leading to coastal erosion, narrowing of beaches, damage to infrastructure, habitat degradation, and reduced recreational and economic benefits. Historical records indicate that regional urbanization and the associated development of flood control works and harbors have reduced the supply of sand to the shore by approximately 400,000 cubic yards per year. SANDAG prepared the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (SPS) in 1993, concluding that the region needed approximately 30 million cubic yards of sand to restore the coastline and nearly 400,000 cubic yards per year thereafter for maintenance. This information establishes a baseline guideline for the level of comprehensive nourishment needed for the San Diego region considered within this Coastal RSM Plan.

SANDAG conducted significant public outreach efforts across most of the County during development of this Plan. Efforts included workshops, mailings, and periodic presentations at the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG), the stakeholder advisory group providing recommendations on shoreline management efforts, including Plan development and its subsequent implementation. Entities within the San Diego region that need to be involved in coordinated coastal sediment management include SANDAG, the CSMW, resource and permitting agencies not included in the CSMW, the County, California State Parks, coastal cities, and local stakeholders (local Watershed Planning Groups, Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), lobster and commercial fishermen, the Surfrider Foundation, Homeowner Groups, and City Beach Erosion Committees).

Coastal Processes
The San Diego region’s coastline is separated into three littoral cells. The Oceanside Littoral Cell stretches from Dana Point in Orange County to Point La Jolla. The Mission Bay Littoral Cell extends from Point La Jolla to Point Loma, and the Silver Strand Littoral Cell covers the reach from San Diego Bay’s entrance to Mexico. The large Oceanside littoral cell is artificially divided by Oceanside Harbor’s north jetty, which effectively eliminates significant transport of littoral sand from the northern portion of the littoral cell to downcoast of the Harbor. The presence of Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (MCB Camp Pendleton) upcoast of Oceanside Harbor limits SANDAG’s ability to coordinate regional sediment management in the northern part of the Oceanside littoral cell. For these reasons, this Coastal RSM Plan focuses on the Southern Oceanside, Mission Bay and Silver Strand littoral cells.

1 Sediment and sand are used interchangeably in this report to refer to relatively small-grained geologic material that composes the sediment lense on beaches and within the shallow ocean. While sediment is a general term for material ranging in grain size from clay to gravel, this Plan focuses on managing sandy sediments that consist of at least 51 percent (or more) sand for contribution to the coastal ocean to increase volumes of sand at the beach.
Coastal processes in this region are affected by waves that drive the rate and direction of longshore currents and sediment transport. This coast is exposed to waves from both the northern and southern hemispheres through a very broad window, from northwest to south-southeast. Consequently, longshore currents and sediment transport vary with season and climatic cycle. Higher energy waves from the Pacific Northwest cause net southerly longshore transport in the Oceanside and Mission Bay Littoral Cells. However, net longshore transport is to the north in the Silver Strand Cell due to local wave refraction around the large bathymetric features of Point Loma and the Tijuana River Delta. Overall, the net longshore transport rate is relatively small in all cells, which indicates significant bi-directional transport throughout the region. All three littoral cells experience sand deficits in their sediment budgets indicating ongoing sand loss. SIO is investigating subcells that may affect sediment transport in the vicinity of the region’s lagoons. Longshore sediment transport appears to change to offshore transport near lagoon mouths.

Climate change, specifically sea level rise, is a concern within the San Diego region as well as elsewhere along the California coast. Projected sea level rise has the potential to inundate critical habitats and important recreational areas, and cause significant economic losses to the region through reduction of tourism revenues and increased storm damages to critical infrastructure. Solutions presented within this Coastal RSM Plan are targeted to address the effects of sea level rise at the critical receiver sites discussed herein. Other solutions, such as managed retreat, may be feasible and appropriate at other locations along the coastline. California State Parks owns many of the beaches within this County and has indicated a disfavor of hard structures at state-owned beaches.

Due to ongoing losses through normal littoral transport processes and the anticipated effects associated with sea level rise, SANDAG has determined that some means to effectively retain the sand for longer periods of time must be found if the nourishment programs are to be effective in maintaining and restoring habitat, recreation, and minimizing economic losses through reduction in tourism and increased storm damage. Based on this advice, SANDAG is investigating the retention of sand through sediment management devices, including modeling to demonstrate their effectiveness.

SANDAG is committed to nourishing the region’s beaches to maintain a high quality of life, and desires to determine whether various types of retention are technically feasible and politically acceptable. Such devices, if determined to be feasible, will then require thorough environmental analyses to assess adverse and beneficial impacts, and rigorous public review to determine political acceptability. Specific sediment management devices are not currently recommended within this Plan, as conditions at specific locations may affect physical feasibility. However, SANDAG has expressed interest in the submerged reef concept, which has the potential to retain sand, minimize adverse visual impacts, increase rocky bottom habitat, and improve surfing conditions.

**Biological Constraints**

Significant environmental constraints exist within this region in the form of sensitive marine and coastal habitat and biota. Existing critical habitat will require pre-project assessments and monitoring during and after nourishment to ensure their ability to support and nurture biota is not adversely impacted. These habitats include nearshore reefs, surf grass beds, kelp forests, eelgrass
meadows, coastal wetlands, sandy beach, sandy intertidal areas, and coastal dune and strand areas. Additional habitats that could be adversely impacted by the addition of sand to the system include offshore rocks/pinnacles, lagoons and estuary entrances, river mouths, and bays and harbors. Most biological sensitivity exists at hard bottom habitats, such as surf grass, kelp, and eelgrass, while other areas such as lagoons and certain sandy beaches also are sensitive due to their inhabitants and site use. Surfgrass can be highly vulnerable to sedimentation impacts and restoration has been difficult, yet stabilization of beach sand has been observed when surfgrass is present in intertidal areas.

While total loads of sediment reaching the ocean have been decreasing, a disproportionate amount ends up trapped in coastal wetlands, due to factors such as unstable inlets, decreased tidal prisms, and ecosystem fragmentation. Healthy beaches are important for maintaining the integrity of the wetland systems existing behind them.

Specific concerns relate to the threatened Snowy Plover’s critical habitat, including nesting and wintering locations, as well as the endangered Least Tern’s nesting locations. The presence of grunion during and after spawning runs needs to be evaluated and protective measures implemented if necessary. Other sensitive biota can be present at or near the project location. Examples include the endangered California brown pelican, several species of protected abalone at some nearshore reefs, and Pismo Clam beds in subtidal and intertidal zones of some beaches. Several state-managed species of commercial or recreational importance such as California spiny lobster and sea urchins are associated with hard bottom or vegetated habitats. Nearshore-dependant fish populations also need to be considered.

Beach nourishment projects need to evaluate potential impacts on the habitat in the project vicinity, and establish protocols that avoid or minimize the negative impacts while increasing beneficial impacts to these vulnerable natural resources. This Coastal RSM Plan takes an important step forward in advancing the protection, enhancement, and restoration of these critical habitats and valuable biota by compiling existing information on occurrence, displaying such occurrence through figures, tables and GIS shapefiles, and describing the steps needed during various project phases to protect and enhance the biota and habitats. Future environmental assessments, permitting, and similar efforts will benefit significantly from this compilation effort.

**Sand Sources**
Potential sediment sources in the region include nearly 60 presently-known sites, including various types of upland sources, coastal wetlands and harbors, and sands located offshore outside of the littoral zone. Each type of sand source is summarized below.

Offshore sources are actively being investigated by SANDAG, SIO, and others. This source type represents the largest economically-viable source of sand within the region. The interruption of sand transport by Oceanside Harbor’s northern jetty has created an extensive deposit of high quality sand upcoast of the jetty, representing a large potential nearshore source if SANDAG and MCB Camp Pendleton can reach agreement on the procurement of that sand.

Many of the coastal wetlands (e.g., lagoons) within the region are in need of restoration due to the accumulation of sandy material, and represent large potential new sources of littoral sand for
nourishment of the beaches in their vicinity. Also, maintenance dredging of active harbors, restored lagoons, and river mouths enables trapped sand to re-enter the littoral zone and replenish sand deficits.

Most viable upland sources exist within the coastal zone, with fewer cost-effective sources located away from the coast. Potential sources of upland sediment include construction projects, highway widening, and various flood control structure. Sediment detention basins could also possibly provide a sustained source of sand. Temporary sediment stockpiling will likely be necessary to facilitate truck delivery from upland sources to the coast. Constraints to delivering upland sediment to the coast include prohibitive trucking transport costs, and limited time windows during the year when trucks can access the beach due to environmental, recreational, or public safety concerns. An additional constraint on upland and wetland restoration sources is the sand size and gradation that can be placed at the beach. An on-going study by the CSMW and its state, federal, and local partners (Tijuana Estuary Fate and Transport Study) is assessing the turbidity and sedimentation impacts associated with upland source materials containing a relatively high percentage of fine-grained sediment.

Sand Receiver Sites
Twenty-six sites along the coast from Oceanside to Imperial Beach, documented to be eroding or with a deficit of sand, have been identified to be of concern to state, federal, or local agencies. Consequently, these sites are included for consideration in this Coastal RSM Plan. The receiver sites include: 1) onshore locations recommended for opportunistic beach fill programs utilizing upland sediment; 2) onshore placement areas used by SANDAG in 2001 for regional nourishment; 3) onshore and nearshore sites historically used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) or U.S. Navy for placement of maintenance dredging materials from various sources; 4) onshore sites presently used for lagoon and harbor maintenance dredging; and 5) onshore and nearshore placement areas anticipated to be useful for future wetlands restoration and maintenance.

Beach erosion is continually documented by the federal, state, regional, and local governments. The CSMW focuses on addressing statewide sediment management and has systematically inventoried Beach Erosion Concern Areas (BECAs) throughout coastal California, including those of local concern in selected areas of the coast. Additional locations may exist along the coast where other management options (e.g., managed retreat) may be appropriate to address coastal erosion, and future efforts may determine that not all of the BECAs identified within this Plan may be appropriate for sand placement. The current list of proposed BECAs should be considered as a master planning list that can be added to or subtracted from as efforts associated with implementation of this Plan proceed. Table 2 (page 29) and Figures 7 and 8 (pages 31 and 32) identify the BECAs currently identified as of concern to local, state, and federal interests.

Solutions
Restoration of the region’s beaches will require a long-term sustained effort. Two Management Alternatives for the addition of new sand to the beaches are presented for consideration. An adjustment to how sands from harbor and lagoon maintenance are placed along the coastline is recommended. Wetland restoration efforts are anticipated throughout the region, and placement of appropriate sand generated during their restoration on nearby beaches could help both wetland
and beach restoration efforts, and reduce overall costs. Finally, the release and redistribution of sand trapped upcoast of Oceanside Harbor could significantly contribute to the region’s sediment budget. However, this would require regional cooperative agreements with the MCB Camp Pendleton, and project economics would need to be resolved.

Both Management Alternatives assume that new sand from outside the littoral cell will come from opportunistic programs or from offshore sand dredging. One alternative considers nourishment only, while the other alternative considers nourishment and installation of sediment management devices in order to retain more sand over time. Both Alternatives are assumed to counteract effects of reduced natural sand supplies (400,000 cubic yards per year), and to be adequate to achieve SANDAG’s goal of increasing the amount of sand in the region by 30 million cubic yards over 50 years (600,000 cubic yards per year).

Management Alternative One – Alternative One envisions an average placement rate of approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of sand per year on the region’s beaches, and consists of two possible scenarios. Scenario One of Alternative One assumes that opportunistic beach fill programs are fully active and contribute approximately 800,000 cubic yards of sand to the region. The balance of 200,000 cubic yards of sand per year would be provided by larger-scale nourishment programs of SANDAG, the USACE, or both. These larger-scale projects would occur on a less frequent basis, such as every 5 to 10 years, and most likely consist of between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 cubic yards of sand, respectively. Scenario Two of Alternative One assumes that opportunistic beach fill programs contribute very little to no sand throughout the region and the entire 1,000,000 cubic yards of sand per year would be provided by larger-scale nourishment programs of SANDAG, the USACE, or both. These larger-scale projects would likely occur every 5 to 10 years and consist of between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 cubic yards of sand each.

Management Alternative Two - Alternative Two incorporates placement of sediment management devices at appropriate locations throughout the San Diego region, and envisions an average placement rate of approximately 500,000 cubic yards of sand per year on the region’s beaches under two scenarios. This approach is expected to reach SANDAG’s 30 million cubic yard goal quicker than Alternative One. Sediment management devices are assumed to reduce the need for nourishment by 50 percent. Alternative Two also assumes that sand losses are significantly reduced or eliminated, and therefore nearly the entire annual nourishment volume would go toward meeting the 30 million cubic yard regional target for additional sand. This assumption would need to be verified during the technical feasibility analyses. Impacts at the downcoast end of the littoral cell associated with sand being retained upcoast would need to be assessed, but are anticipated to be addressed by nourishment downcoast of management devices.

SANDAG (2007a) recently estimated the feasibility of sediment management devices and concluded that their use would reduce long-term costs by approximately 25 percent. SANDAG is currently developing a modeling study scope to further assess the effectiveness of sediment management devices. Scenario One of Alternative Two assumes that all opportunistic beach fill programs are fully active and contribute approximately 800,000 cubic yards of sand per year (more than the quantity needed). Scenario Two assumes between 2,500,000 and 5,000,000 cubic yards of offshore sand would be provided for nourishment by SANDAG, the USACE, or both every 5 to 10 years.
Project economics for use of offshore sand are favorable for both Alternatives, with an estimated benefit-to-cost (B/C) ratio higher than 1.0. The B/C ratio is less than 1.0 for using opportunistic sand due to the high costs of delivering sand to the beach. Projects should therefore focus on using offshore sand until cost reductions for use of upland sand or additional funding sources can be realized.

**Proportional Placement of Maintenance-Dredged Materials** has the potential to help increase the residence time of placed sands on the beaches and nearshore. Existing practices call for placement of certain sand proportions dredged from lagoons and harbors upcoast rather than downcoast. In proportional placement the sand would be placed primarily downcoast of the dredge site to reduce return shoaling in the source lagoon/harbor, if other conditions do not require its placement at an upcoast site.

**Wetland Restoration** - Sediment deposited in protected and low energy aquatic environments, such as closed (or not yet restored) lagoons, represents new sand that can be added to the littoral zone to offset losses to the region. Sediment from wetland restoration projects will be relatively poorly-sorted and may consist of alternating layers of sandy and finer-grained sediment. This material could therefore potentially possess contaminants in the finer-grained layers. Several lagoons in the San Diego region are proposed for restoration, generating sand can supplant that need from other sources (e.g., upland, offshore) to meet SANDAG’s goal for new sand added to the region’s beaches.

**Bypassing of sand from upcoast of Oceanside Harbor** is recommended to increase sand volumes along North County beaches. Oceanside Harbor jetty retains a wide sandy fillet formation extending several miles north of the jetty into MCB Camp Pendleton (DBW/SANDAG 1994). This material would have naturally migrated to the southern portion of the Oceanside littoral cell had the jetty not halted its migration. Therefore, it represents an anthropogenic sand sink, and restoration of natural littoral cell dynamics could provide a large-scale source of “new” sand for the southern littoral cell. Sand bypassing from this fillet represents one, if not the most potentially productive contributions to the coastal sand budget for the San Diego region. SANDAG investigated this potential source in late 2008 and found it suitable for nourishment, but concluded that additional investigation is needed to better define the highest quality portions of the deposit.

**Vision For The Future**
SANDAG’s vision for the future includes beach nourishment as the means to maintain the quality of life, protect and restore habitat, and reduce economic losses from reduced tourism or storm damage. It is important to implement nourishment-related activities in a cost-effective, resource protective, and politically acceptable manner. Offshore sand represents the most economical source, which can be augmented by upland and wetland restoration sands if and when they become available. Proportional placement of harbor and lagoon dredging materials could increase the residence time of sand on nearby beaches. Restoration of sand movement past the Oceanside Harbor jetty would contribute significantly to the region’s sediment budget. Implementation of sediment management devices to retain sand along the coastline should be investigated in an iterative process. A technical feasibility analysis needs to verify assumptions in Management Alternative Two, and any sediment management device determined as feasible
for a given location needs further assessment for environmental impacts and political acceptability.

**Funding Sources**

A dedicated source of funding is highly desirable if this regional program is to be successful. Incremental costs associated with longer transport distances, additional handling, or other efforts associated with regional sediment management need to be covered. There are a number of possible local and regional sources that could potentially help cover funding requirements of the recommended solutions for addressing sand deficits in the San Diego region presented within this Plan. These funding sources include both existing and newly created funding sources. Existing funding sources include the state Ocean Protection Council, California Coastal Conservancy, and the California Coastal Commission mitigation funds currently administered by SANDAG. New potential funding sources include user fees such as rental car fees and parking fees at the municipal beaches, as well as additional sales taxes, development impact fees, property tax assessments, and transient occupancy tax increases. Each of these mechanisms can generate additional revenue for implementing Plan activities, and more than one source may be needed at any one time to render the proposed actions viable. A more detailed analysis of potential funding sources should be conducted in the future to determine the optimum mixture of revenue streams and to prepare a strategy for pursuit of those potential funding sources.

**Permitting Requirements**

Implementing the Coastal RSM Plan will require permits from several agencies, including the USACE (Section 404 and Section 10 permits), California Coastal Commission (Coastal Development Permit or Consistency Determination), State Lands Commission (Lease), Regional Water Quality Control Board (Section 401 certification), and potentially the California State Parks (Encroachment Permit) and Department of Fish and Game (Streambed Alteration Agreement), depending on location. Local agencies also will require other permits such as grading permits, Coastal Development Permits (if authorized), and variances to applicable ordinances. The most expeditious manner to implement this Coastal RSM Plan would be to secure general permits from all agencies to streamline regulatory compliance.

Similar to opportunistic beach fill programs, regional general permits (or RGPs, such as existing RGP 67 of the USACE, Los Angeles District) could be established to provide advance approval in concept of beach fill meeting certain criteria. These approvals would require additional notification prior to each placement to confirm the quality of the fill and operations of the project. The USACE Los Angeles District Regulatory Branch is currently processing a number of 5-year permits at many of the potential sand sources and receiver sites discussed above. Most of these permits are directly applicable to comprehensive sand management as intended by the concept of regional sediment management. Binding these permits together under the auspices of the Coastal RSM Plan program could provide the basis for a regional general permit covering the permitted locations.

Compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) will be required for all projects conducted as part of the regional sediment management program. Those efforts will necessarily focus on the potential adverse impacts associated with activities in the region. Although the CRSM Plan is exempt from CEQA
and NEPA for adoption, a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (PEIR/EIS) may be an appropriate document to secure permits for individual actions. Preparation of the PEIR/EIS is recommended as a future task for the permit approvals.

Governance Structure and Implementation

Adoption of this Coastal RSM Plan by SANDAG is the first step towards a more coordinated approach to regional sediment management. This Plan is to act as a reference, providing guidance for those wanting to implement sediment management activities throughout the San Diego region. SANDAG is best positioned to maintain the regional perspective needed to coordinate the various activities identified in this section and ensure that the Plan’s goals and objectives are met. Integration of the Plan into CEQA Guidelines, the California Coastal Act, Local Coastal Programs, Local Zoning Ordinances, General Plans, and local permit processing are recommended means to enhance the effectiveness of the Plan and ensure its use for future sediment management activities. These efforts would be focused on requiring project proponents to address consistency with the Plan for projects within the coastal zone, or justify why compliance with the Plan is not feasible.

Other means are recommended to better provide for Plan utilization. A “Sand Shed/Littoral Cell” Planning entity could be created to proactively research and identify sediment that is compatible and could be contributed to the coast, and to coordinate with watershed and other groups for the re-use of sediment to maximize compliance with the Plan. Reducing project fees when nourishment contributions are made could create economic incentives for developers to comply with the Plan. Finally, establishment of a general permit program that could streamline environmental review and permit approval by all agencies represents an effective way to implement the Coastal RSM Plan.

Coordinate with State Regulatory Programs

California has important regulatory efforts directed at coastal resource protection that could potentially limit the effectiveness of regional sediment management and implementation of the recommendations contained within this Coastal RSM Plan. SANDAG, the CSMW, and other stakeholders have and should continue to work with agency staff involved in these important efforts to highlight needs and identify mutual goals and objectives so that all these important efforts can succeed.

The Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) initiative determines the sensitivity of offshore areas throughout California, including the San Diego region. Marine Protected Area (MPA) designations have the potential to inhibit the dredging of offshore sources and placement of sand or sediment management devices on the beach and nearshore. The Coastal RSM Plan and MLPA need to be integrated to meet the needs of both programs. Meeting mutual needs could be accomplished through coordination and information sharing between the groups leading these efforts, and developing respective plans consistent with the constraints of the other program. SANDAG and local cities will work within MPA designations to identify locations for future sediment management activities and conduct nourishment in an environmentally sensitive manner.
Future Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulations for sediment being set by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) have the potential to further reduce delivery of beach-compatible sand to the coast. SANDAG and the SPWG should continue to actively work with the RWQCB to find ways to differentiate between coarse and fine sediment and to allow for the transport of sand to the coast when developing TMDLs and permitting sediment detention basins.

**Monitoring**

SANDAG’s existing monitoring program is successful at quantifying shoreline changes and habitat conditions for actions spawned from the SPS (1993). That monitoring program can be modified or optimized for recommended RSM Plan projects. Monitoring and reporting that builds on current efforts will be required to assess biota, beach profiles, and lagoon shoaling in order to verify potential impacts and refine the Coastal RSM Plan. Monitoring results will be incorporated into this Coastal RSM Plan to optimize it and improve its effectiveness through adaptive management.

**Data Gaps**

Existing data gaps need to be filled to implement the Plan. For permitting, sand gradation data for several Coastal RSM Plan beaches is needed to establish appropriate grain size envelopes for receiver sites. Additionally, more complete and updated sand source information is needed throughout the region so that a standardized inventory/repository of data can be prepared for targeting promising opportunities for sediment placement.

Additional analyses also are needed for implementation and are listed below.

- The effects of appropriate sediment management devices on reducing future nourishment quantities, the time-frame to accomplish the 30 million cubic yard goal for the region, and the ability to adjust to sea level rise need to be determined;
- Appropriate proportional placement scenarios for lagoon and harbor maintenance need to be developed through evaluation of the most recent longshore sand transport data from SIO’s Coastal Data Information Program (CDIP);
- Quantification of the risk to sensitive hard-bottom areas from sedimentation relative to sand placement volume or frequency is necessary;
- SIO needs to refine their lagoon subcell hypothesis;
- Continued evaluation of potential offshore sources of sand through sampling, multi-beam bathymetry (backscatter), and seismic reflection/refraction profiling must occur;
- Estimation of environmental habitat benefits expressed as dollars for future benefit/cost analyses would be helpful for state grant funding; and
- Evaluation of actual project performance as compared to model predictions will improve the models for future use.
Recommended Next Steps
Short- and long-term actions that can be coordinated through SANDAG’s SPWG to initiate Plan recommendations are listed in Section 11 and summarized below:

Short-Term

- Work with local agency staff to communicate the need for and benefits of the Coastal RSM Plan and develop strategies for them to integrate it within their jurisdictional authorities. Recommended efforts include: 1) confirm that proposed BECA sites are acceptable; 2) explore interest in sediment management devices; 3) acquire sand gradation data for receiver sites not sampled since 2005; 4) update list of possible sand sources; and 5) assess possible stockpile locations.

- Continue working within the MLPA initiative process to inform policy and decision-makers of the need for and benefits of nourishment, and with the San Diego RWQCB to consider transport of sand to the coast when developing TMDLs and permitting sediment detention basins.

- Update the Shoreline Preservation Strategy to include new information from the Regional Beach Sand Projects, and advances in science and technology since its adoption.

- Prepare a programmatic CEQA/NEPA document for implementation

- Develop an appropriate monitoring program to monitor all elements of the Coastal RSM Plan. This program should include: 1) lagoon sedimentation for maintenance dredging; 2) waves and longshore sand transport; 3) grain sizes best suited for certain sites after monitoring results are assessed; 4) river discharge; 5) sedimentation/erosion along the coast from beach profiles; 6) sedimentation at nearshore reefs; and 7) effects on surfing and other recreational activities along the coast and in the nearshore.

- Conduct a study to determine the feasibility of installing off-loading sites, where appropriate, as part of any railroad double-tracking project to facilitate transport by rail.

- Coordinate with each watershed manager to facilitate continued coastal sand yield.

- Incorporate inland aggregate and sand mining information.

Long-Term

- Establish a “sand shed” authority to coordinate sand availability and include their participation on the SPWG.

- Integrate longshore sand transport estimates from the SIO CDIP program and incorporate lagoon subcells as appropriate.

- Take a systematic approach to local agency implementation when projects are applied for, with city staff or the sand shed authority performing the initial evaluation for candidacy.

- Establish one or several Regional General Permits from all agencies for all sites.
• Assess the feasibility of sediment management devices, determine their optimum locations and designs, obtain funding, and install if and as appropriate.

• Implement action steps at each city such as:
  o Identify opportunistic sand during project processing;
  o Identify funding sources (or incentives) to implement opportunistic projects;
  o Perform opportunistic beach fill projects (and monitoring);
  o Amend LCPs and General Plans as needed to be consistent with the Coastal RSM Plan; and
  o Install any needed infrastructure to enable sand delivery (e.g., ramps to the beach).

• Establish uniform monitoring procedures and implement strategic monitoring to support decision-making relative to adaptive management (e.g., optimizing sand placement volumes or frequency in areas with sensitive resources) on a regional level.

• Create a secure funding stream by establishing a funding strategy, including linkage of watershed and sediment management planning in order to leverage federal and state funding.

• Assess the feasibility of imposing a fee on dam owners that impound sand upstream of the coast.

• Utilize data from pilot projects such as the Tijuana Estuary Fate and Transport Study to update this Coastal RSM Plan.

Updates and Disclaimer
This Coastal RSM Plan should be considered a “living” document that is periodically updated based on new information, monitoring results, and filling of data gaps to optimize and adaptively manage sediment around the region. SANDAG may need to reconsider the Coastal RSM Plan elements on a five- to ten-year basis to keep the plan current and to coordinate information presented in this Plan and the Shoreline Preservation Strategy.

Funding for this project was provided to SANDAG by a California Department of Boating and Waterways grant on behalf of CSMW’s efforts related to implementation of their Coastal Sediment Master Plan. SANDAG has utilized the funding to develop findings and recommendations consistent with local issues and needs, and the CSMW has participated in an advisory role to help maintain consistency with similar projects elsewhere in coastal California. Recommendations are presented in this report solely for consideration by government agencies, organizations, and committees involved in the management and protection of coastal resources in the San Diego Region. This document was prepared with significant input from CSMW members but does not necessarily represent the official position of any CSMW member agency.
REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II

Introduction

SANDAG applied for and received funds from the California Department of Boating and Waterways for the planning and construction of a Regional Beach Sand Project (Project). These funds have been provided in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 budget for the State of California and the contract is currently being routed at the state level for signature. Funds also were provided in the FY 2010 budget. The coastal cities have been asked to determine whether they will participate in the project by providing the required 15 percent in matching funds for the first three project tasks. This commitment will then be memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding between SANDAG and the participating coastal cities.

Recommendation

In an effort to move forward on implementing the Project, SANDAG staff is recommending that the coastal cities who have taken action on providing the required local match to state funding, move forward with finalizing the Memorandum of Understanding (Attachment 1).

Background

SANDAG has been working with the coastal cities to secure matching funds. Several of the coastal cities have taken action in support of the Project, authorizing their city manager to enter into the MOU. And, other coastal cities have not made a final decision. Since it is unknown as to when the remaining coastal cities might take action on the item, SANDAG staff is recommending that the cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad (assuming their participation), Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Imperial Beach finalize the MOU and move forward with the first three Project tasks. This will include issuing a task order for our consultant team to begin work.

SANDAG staff would like to leave open the potential for the currently undecided coastal cities to participate in the Project. This can be done as long as they take action in support of the Project and decide to participate within a reasonable time subsequent to the initiation of the task order. The goal has always been for this to be a regional Project and SANDAG staff is willing to make every effort to include all cities interested in participation. However, funds from DBW must be spent within three years and delays in decision making will unnecessarily penalize those cities who are ready to move forward. Therefore, SANDAG staff recommends that a decision regarding participation must be made no later than October 1, 2009, or the Project will proceed without them.
The request for cities to make a determination on participation first came at the December Working Group meeting and was reiterated at the February meeting. This timeframe was intended to provide ample additional time for decision making to take place and SANDAG hopes that all coastal jurisdictions will find funding to support their cities participation in the first three Project tasks.

If the currently undecided coastal cities decide to participate, the MOU is written to allow additional coastal cities to be added at a later date without all of the parties re-executing the MOU. Additionally, the task order issued to the consultant will include language that provides for the inclusion of the currently undecided coastal cities, should they decide to participate.

The funding chart outlined below will not change. SANDAG staff anticipates that cost savings can be used to cover any shortfall that may occur in the short run if a city decides not to participate. However, it is likely that costs associated with long-term tasks will need to be modified if one or more of the coastal cities decides not to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Environmental Review Match</th>
<th>Permitting Match</th>
<th>Final Engineering Plans and Specifications Match</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>$13,058</td>
<td>$9,141</td>
<td>$26,118</td>
<td>$48,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>$11,335</td>
<td>$7,934</td>
<td>$22,668</td>
<td>$41,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>$12,699</td>
<td>$8,890</td>
<td>$25,399</td>
<td>$46,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>$4,159</td>
<td>$2,911</td>
<td>$8,319</td>
<td>$15,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>$4,956</td>
<td>$3,469</td>
<td>$9,913</td>
<td>$18,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$27,817</td>
<td>$19,471</td>
<td>$55,632</td>
<td>$102,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>$3,767</td>
<td>$2,637</td>
<td>$7,533</td>
<td>$13,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,791</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,582</strong></td>
<td><strong>$287,826</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment:  1. Memorandum of Understanding

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916; stu@sandag.org
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND SAN DIEGO REGION’S PARTICIPATING COASTAL JURISDICTIONS
REGARDING REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PROJECT II

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made and entered into effective as of this Insert_Text day of Month, Year, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") and the City of Carlsbad, City of Del Mar, City of Encinitas, City of Imperial Beach, City of Oceanside, City of San Diego, and City of Solana Beach ("Coastal Cities").

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Agreement:

WHEREAS, in 1996, SANDAG adopted the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy) that outlines an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region, containing a comprehensive set of recommendations on the beach building program and on financing and implementation; and

WHEREAS, in 2001, SANDAG successfully implemented a Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP) that placed 2.1 million cubic yards of sand on 12 beaches in the San Diego region; and

WHEREAS, in 2004, SANDAG adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which is a strategic land use planning framework for the San Diego region through 2030 that supports the continued implementation of the Strategy, outlining the preservation and enhancement of the region’s beaches and nearshore areas as environmental and recreational resources that must be protected; and

WHEREAS, the San Diego region is committed to implementing the Strategy and RCP; and

WHEREAS, the region’s Coastal Cities, including the City of Coronado, City of Del Mar, and City of San Diego, have expressed an interest and desire to implement another such project, the Regional Beach Sand Project II (the “Project”) on a regional basis, as economies of scale and efficiencies would likely result in a more productive and successful project; and

WHEREAS, a number of benefits, including recreational, economic, and public safety enhancements, protection of infrastructure, and increases in habitat would occur as the result of beach nourishment; and

WHEREAS, in September 2008, SANDAG received a grant for Project funding from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) for $6.5 million for the first year of Project implementation in the San Diego region; and
WHEREAS, SANDAG expects to receive additional funds for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 in the amount of $6.5 million for each fiscal year for Project implementation; and

WHEREAS, the DBW funding requires a 15 percent local match to be paid by the San Diego region for all DBW funds expended on the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Coastal Cities will enter into an MOU reflecting their commitment to provide the 15 percent match; and

WHEREAS, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved the allocation of funds among the Coastal Cities for the planning and construction of the Project, which is based upon a methodology that includes weights for three factors; and

WHEREAS, the Project methodology to allocate the 15 percent match required by DBW among the Coastal Cities includes 60 percent amount of sand received, 10 percent miles of coastline restored, and 30 percent population; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG requires a funding commitment from each Coastal City prior to work commencing on each of the Project tasks; and

WHEREAS, the total estimated Project cost of approximately $22.9 million included $500,000 in preliminary planning activities, which has been paid by the Coastal Cities and the City of Coronado, City of Del Mar, and City of San Diego; and

WHEREAS, the preliminary planning activities, which began in September 2008, included an investigation of offshore sand sources and preliminary project design for the preparation of the Project; and

WHEREAS, this MOU is intended to commit the parties to working on the Project beyond the stage of preliminary planning activities; and

WHEREAS, the Coastal Cities agree to pay their proportional share of the Project for the first three project tasks: environmental review, permitting, and final engineering plans and specifications; and

WHEREAS, the Project will be implemented based upon the following Guiding Principles approved by the Shoreline Preservation Working Group:

- commitment to unified approach for local decisions on sand replenishment,
- address local needs and maximize positive regional impacts,
- encourage cooperation and coordination, and
- promote opportunities for beach sand replenishment; and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to memorialize their agreement in this MOU to carry out the purposes set forth above;
AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

SANDAG AGREES:

1. Manage the Project in coordination with the Coastal Cities through the Shoreline Preservation Working Group; and involve the Coastal Cities in the implementation of all phases of the Project.

2. The SANDAG Project Manager will invoice the Coastal Cities a minimum of 30 days prior to the start date of each phase of the Project to ensure prompt payment by all parties timely invoicing.

3. The proportional share provided by each Coastal City shall be expended by SANDAG solely for the Project. Any funds not used will be kept by SANDAG in an interest-bearing account with interest credited to each Coastal City prorated to reflect its contribution to the Project as compared to other Coastal Cities’ contributions until the completion of the Project. Unused funds will be returned to each City on a similarly pro-rated basis.

4. Neither Coastal Cities, and each of them, nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, SANDAG shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless the Coastal Cities, and each of them, and all officers and employees thereof from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by SANDAG under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to SANDAG under this MOU.

COASTAL CITIES AGREE:

1. Each has approved their appropriation outlined in the chart—Contribution Schedule below, being its proportional share of the required DBW 15 percent match for the environmental, permitting, and final engineering plans and specifications, which funds will be paid to SANDAG prior to the start date of this phase of the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Environmental Review Match</th>
<th>Permitting Match</th>
<th>Final Engineering Plans and Specifications Match</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>$13,058</td>
<td>$9,141</td>
<td>$26,118</td>
<td>$48,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
<td>$11,335</td>
<td>$7,934</td>
<td>$22,668</td>
<td>$41,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinitas</td>
<td>$12,699</td>
<td>$8,890</td>
<td>$25,399</td>
<td>$46,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solana Beach</td>
<td>$4,159</td>
<td>$2,911</td>
<td>$8,319</td>
<td>$15,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar</td>
<td>$4,956</td>
<td>$3,469</td>
<td>$9,913</td>
<td>$18,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$27,817</td>
<td>$19,471</td>
<td>$55,632</td>
<td>$102,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>$3,767</td>
<td>$2,637</td>
<td>$7,533</td>
<td>$13,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,791,45,018</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,453,31,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,582,90,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>$287,826</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. The Coastal Cities understand that SANDAG would not proceed with the Project without the assurances set forth in this MOU, reflecting the Coastal Cities’ approvals of their respective appropriations, the aggregate of which will fund the Project.

3. Each Coastal City shall pay SANDAG amounts invoiced for the Project, up to its respective funding total set forth in the Contribution Schedule, within 30 days of being invoiced by SANDAG.

4. Neither SANDAG nor any officer thereof is responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by one or more of the Coastal Cities under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to the Coastal Cities under this MOU. It is understood and agreed that, pursuant to Government Code Section 895.4, the one or more of the Coastal Cities shall fully defend, indemnify, and save harmless SANDAG, all officers and employees from all claims, suits, or actions of every name, kind, and description brought for or on account of injury (as defined in Government Code Section 810.8) occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by the Coastal Cities under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to the Coastal Cities under this MOU.

5. It is understood that the Coastal Cities are not responsible for any damage or liability occurring by reason of anything done or omitted to be done by one or more of the other Coastal Cities under or in connection with any work, authority, or jurisdiction delegated to the Coastal Cities under this MOU. Each Coastal City is responsible for its own city’s actions alone.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. That all obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this MOU are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by SANDAG, and the Coastal Cities, and the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors.

2. That the City of Del Mar and the City of San Diego (“Potential Coastal Cities”) will not be executing this MOU concurrently with the Coastal Cities. If, however, one or both of the Potential Coastal Cities determine prior to October 1, 2009 that they wish to become parties to this MOU, the Coastal Cities herby agree to allow the Potential Coastal Cities to become parties via an amendment to this MOU. If the governing bodies of one or more of the Potential Coastal Cities authorize such an amendment it shall be executed by the Potential Coastal City and SANDAG without need for further approvals by the Coastal Cities. After such an amendment is executed the Potential Coastal City(ies) shall become a Coastal City as defined in this MOU, subject to the same rights and obligations as stated herein as the rest of the Coastal Cities, and the Contribution Schedule will be updated and provided to all of the parties to the MOU.

3. Should one or both of the Potential Coastal Cities fail to become a party to this MOU by October 1, 2009, SANDAG shall provide an updated Contribution Schedule if SANDAG determines changes are needed.

4. Any notice required or permitted under this MOU may be personally served on the other party, by the party giving notice, or may be served by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the following addresses:
5. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, this MOU shall terminate on 

\textbf{Insert\_Date June 30, 2011}, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in 
writing. Or this MOU shall continue in effect unless and until a party to the MOU gives 60 
(sixty) days written notice of its desire to withdraw from the MOU. If such notice is given, the 
MOU shall continue to be binding on those parties who have not formally withdrawn.

6. The indemnification provisions of this MOU shall survive termination of the MOU.

7. This MOU shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. If any 
action is brought to interpret or enforce any term of this MOU, the action shall be brought in 
a state or federal court situated in the County of San Diego, State of California.

8. All terms, conditions, and provisions hereof shall inure to and shall bind each of the parties 
hereto, and each of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns.

9. For purposes of this MOU, the relationship of the parties is that of independent entities and 
not as agents of each other or as joint venturers or partners. The parties shall maintain sole 
and exclusive control over their personnel, agents, consultants, and operations.

10. No alteration or variation of the terms of this MOU shall be valid unless made in writing and 
signed by the parties hereto, and no oral understanding or agreement not incorporated 
herein shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

11. Nothing in the provisions of this MOU is intended to create duties or obligations to or rights 
in third parties to this MOU or affect the legal liability of the parties to this MOU to third 
parties.

12. This MOU may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be 
deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same 
instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this MOU effective on the day and year first above written.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

FULL NAME OF OTHER PARTY – City of Carlsbad

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Office of General Counsel

FULL NAME OF PERSON SIGNING
Title

FULL NAME OF OTHER PARTY – City of Encinitas

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Legal Counsel

FULL NAME OF PERSON SIGNING
Title

FULL NAME OF OTHER PARTY – City of Imperial Beach

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Legal Counsel

FULL NAME OF PERSON SIGNING
Title

FULL NAME OF OTHER PARTY – City of Oceanside

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Legal Counsel

FULL NAME OF PERSON SIGNING
Title

FULL NAME OF OTHER PARTY – City of Solana Beach

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Legal Counsel

FULL NAME OF PERSON SIGNING
Title