MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

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

Thursday, October 6, 2011
11:30 a.m. to 1 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

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO BRING YOUR OWN LUNCH. LUNCH WILL NOT BE PROVIDED.

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

• REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT

• REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
Phone 511 or see www.511sd.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.
ITEM # | RECOMMENDATION
--- | ---
1. | WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
2. | PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS
| COMMENTS
Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Working Group that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to staff prior to speaking. Public speakers should notify staff if they have a handout for distribution. Public speakers are limited to three minutes or less per person. Staff also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

+3. | SUMMARY OF THE JUNE 2, 2011, MEETING
| APPROVE
The June 2, 2011, meeting summary is attached for the Working Group review and approval.

4. | REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT
| INFORMATION
Greg Hearon from Coastal Frontiers Corporation will provide the Working Group with a presentation on the 2010 Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program Annual Report.

+5. | REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II
| INFORMATION / POSSIBLE ACTION
SANDAG staff will provide the Working Group with an overview of the Regional Beach Sand Project II budget and next steps. Attached is a copy of the current construction bidding schedule.

6. | LEGISLATIVE UPDATE
| INFORMATION
Steve Aceti, CalCoast, will discuss the status of state and federal legislation related to the shoreline management program.

7. | ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING
| INFORMATION
The next regularly scheduled Working Group meeting is Thursday, December 1, 2011, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment
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AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF JUNE 2, 2011, MEETING

File Number 3200200

Members in Attendance:
Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, Chair
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, Vice Chair
James Bond, City of Encinitas
Barbara Denny, City of Coronado
Lee Haydu, City of Del Mar
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Eileen Maher, San Diego Unified Port District

Advisory Members in Attendance:
Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition (CalCoast)
August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fishermen’s Association (CLTFA)
Robert Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

Staff Subgroup:
Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Leslea Meyerhoff, City of Solana Beach
Frank Quan, City of Oceanside
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Katherine Weldon, City of Encinitas

Others in Attendance:
Karen Green, SAIC
Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Associates, Inc.
Cindy Kinkade, AECOM
Sachiko Kohatsu, County of San Diego
John Metz, Oceanside HBAC
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
Shelby Tucker, SANDAG
Katie Levy, SANDAG
1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, called the meeting to order at 11:36 a.m. and welcomed the group.

2. Public Comments/Communications

No public comments.

3. Summary of April 7, 2011, Meeting

After indicating the correction on the organization on page 9 as Coastal Commission instead of CalCoast, Vice Chair Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, motioned to approve the summary of the April 7, 2011, meeting, and James Bond, City of Encinitas, seconded the motion. The motion carried without any objections.

4. Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan

Heather Adamson, SANDAG, provided an overview of the Draft 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the blueprint for keeping pace with the mobility and sustainability challenges in the growing region. The SANDAG Board of Directors released the Draft 2050 RTP for public review and comment on April 22, 2011. The close of the comment period is June 30, 2011. The DEIR is anticipated to be released in early June 2011. Workshops and public hearings will be held during the public comment period. The Board is anticipated to adopt the 2050 RTP in fall 2011. Ms. Adamson highlighted key new areas, the outreach process and next steps, including the following points:

• The bulk of funding is from local sources and is based on reasonable and current funding available. A total of $192.6 billion in total revenue is phased through 2050 in the year of expenditure.
• Social equity is included in the RTP and involved input from a diverse range of stakeholders and communities as well as results from a more robust regionwide environmental justice analysis. The Draft 2050 RTP includes metrics and performance measures to gauge access to jobs, health care, schools, parks, beaches, and how well the investments are distributed.
• Half of funding is programmed for public transit, which is a big change from the previous RTP. Public transit projects include: double-tracking for the COASTER and SPRINTER, express bus service, extending light rail to University Towne Center, four new trolley lines, a trolley tunnel in Downtown San Diego, and several rapid bus lines.
• The Sustainable Communities Strategy, a new element of the RTP, will show how the region will meet the targets established by the California Air Resources Board for per-capita greenhouse gas reductions from passenger cars and light-duty trucks.
• For the first time within the RTP, there is full funding in the amount of $3.4 billion for Active Transportation, including the implementation of regional and local routes for pedestrian, bicycle, and safe routes to school projects.
• Using Systems Management for more efficient infrastructure through measures like pricing programs, signal coordination, and “smart cars” formerly called Intellidrive.
• Incentives for alternatives to driving alone, such as ridesharing, vanpooling, and carpooling.
• To learn more about the Draft 2050 RTP and submit comments, interested persons are encouraged to attend one of the workshops or public hearings or visit www.sandag.org/2050rtp or envision2050sd.com.

Mr. Bond asked about the tangible planning up through 2050 of the upgrade to highway crossings. Ms. Adamson responded that highway crossings are embedded in individual project costs; details are in the appendices of how many rail break separations. Additionally, there is another section, which discusses the rail breaks that are not tied to specific projects, those will be subject to a competitive process.

Mr. Bond suggested that this information should be more clearly visible within the 2050 RTP. Ms. Adamson stated the language would be clarified for the rail breaks not tied to specific projects.

Chair Slater-Price added that funding should be made available for cities to apply in order to help fund the cost of constructing these rail breaks, as they will be necessary with the proposed increase of freight and passenger traffic. Ms. Adamson responded that regional grade separation funds could potentially be used for these types of projects and she would follow up on clarifying the allowable use of these funds.

Mrs. Tucker requested that information regarding this issue be pulled from the 2050 RTP and sent to the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) members.

Vice Chair Kellejian noted that this information also is available with the Los Angeles - San Diego - San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency (LOSSAN) project, which he can request that it be forwarded to the SPWG. He added that it would be important to be prepared for questions related to rail breaks when presenting at the June 7 public workshop in Encinitas. Ms. Adamson confirmed that the rail staff will be in attendance.

Mr. Bond asked if the LOSSAN corridor has received funding and started developing plans. Vice Chair Kellejian responded that funding for the LOSSAN corridor would be local funding through TransNet, 60 percent from Proposition A state funding and some federal funding.

Ms. Adamson stated detailed costs as well as the whole cost amount can be distributed for rail breaks for specific projects.

Chair Slater-Price noted that as a resident of an area where more rail breaks will be added, she prefers grade separation, way-side horn is a relief, but should not have to pursue grade separation at a later date.

Mr. Bond added that the way-side horn at Leucadia Boulevard does not provide enough relief to traffic and suggested a better solution to have surface transportation moving if plans for adding more tracks move forward.
Ms. Denny commented that she is concerned that there are no plans included in the 2050 RTP for the ferry from Coronado, as this mode of transportation would take residents off the roads to and from Coronado. Ms. Adamson responded that while ferry services are not included, plans for rapid buses from Coronado to Downtown were included after looking at a variety of different transit modes from Coronado to Downtown.

Eileen Maher, San Diego Unified Port District, asked with the planned increase of rail infrastructure, if the 2050 RTP accounted for potential increase in freight rail. Ms. Adamson responded that the highest increase of freight transportation was due to trucks and not rail.

5. Regional Beach Sand Project II

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, updated the SPWG members on the Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSP II) project and schedule. The Draft Environmental Impact Report-Environmental Assessment (DEIR-EA) was released on January 26, 2011, received public comments through March 14, 2011, and the Final EIR-EA was certified by the SANDAG Board on Friday May 27, 2011. The Final EIR was approved with preferred Alternative 2-R, which rebuilds RBSP I with an increased sand quantity at Imperial Beach (up to 650,000 cubic yards).

Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition (CalCoast), requested that the PowerPoint slide be distributed to the SPWG. Mrs. Tucker responded that the updated Final EIR and appendices were posted to the Web site and recipients of the DEIR will be receiving CDs of the Final EIR.

Mr. Aceti followed up by asking if the beaches at Leucadia, Moonlight, and Cardiff will have the same volumes of sand as RBSP I. Mrs. Tucker confirmed that the volumes of sand will remain the same as RBSP I with the exception of Imperial Beach, pending funding availability by the City of Imperial Beach.

Mrs. Tucker explained the next steps in the RBSP II project:

- Continue with California Coastal Commission (CCC) permitting; any letters of support or objection must be sent to the CCC prior to the RBSP II hearing date scheduled for June 15, 2011.
- Prepare final design plans. The lead engineers from the SANDAG consultant, Moffatt & Nichol, have determined that cost estimates will be higher than originally scoped due to inflation.
- Finalize monitoring plan to implement by fall 2011. The RBSP II Project Team has been collaborating with regulatory agencies on requirements for monitoring in order to stay on target to initiate construction bidding by fall 2011.
- Memorandum of Understandings with all coastal cities will be finalized within a few weeks and cities will be billed starting this summer.
- CCC mitigation funds will be used for RBSP II in many cases and will require resolutions by October 6, 2011, from each participating City wanting to use those funds.

Mr. Aceti noted that a new commissioner, Brian Brennan, has been appointed from the City of Ventura to the CCC, who is also the Executive Director of Beacon, which is similar to the SPWG. Mr. Brennan may be a supporter able to assist in the permit discussion at the CCC. Additionally, letters of support to the CCC are effective and necessary.
Vice Chair Kellejian recommended that the letters of support to the CCC should be addressed from the cities.

Mrs. Tucker stated that a template for a CCC letter of support was distributed to all RBSP II participating City staff.

Mr. Aceti commented that some cities require a Council vote to send letters of support while other cities only require City Manager’s signatures.

Mrs. Tucker noted that once the CCC staff report is posted, hopefully within 24 hours, the link to their report will be distributed to the SPWG.

Mr. Aceti asked if there were any objections voiced regarding the RBSP II project. Mrs. Tucker responded that comments from Surfrider were received and addressed for the DEIR. Additionally, following the May 27, 2011, Final EIR certification, the Project Team clarified issues further and the reflection of reduced quantities of sand in Solana Beach was helpful in alleviating the organization’s concerns. Mrs. Tucker stated that it is likely that the CCC has contacted Surfrider in their review of the EIR.

Although not a participant of the RBSP II project, Barbara Denny, City of Coronado, requested a copy of the template for a CCC letter of support. Chair Slater-Price asked if the City of Del Mar would also like a copy of the template and Lee Haydu, City of Del Mar, remarked due to several residents submitting comments against the RBSP II SO-5 Borrow Site, Del Mar would not be able to submit a letter of support.

Vice Chair Kellejian detailed the support of the RBSP II project by the SANDAG Board as the Final EIR was approved unanimously.

Mrs. Tucker explained that the State Lands Commission hearing will be occurring in June or August and thus far, all information necessary from the cities has been received.

Mr. Aceti mentioned that he will make an effort to have letters of support written by the local convention and visitor’s bureaus.

Mrs. Tucker stated that she will continue working with Ms. Maher to obtain the Port of San Diego’s Coastal Development permit.

Mrs. Tucker explained that the RBSP II project is still on schedule.

Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Associates, provided an overview of the Draft Monitoring Plan for the RBSP II.

The Final EIR contains a generalized monitoring framework. Development of a more detailed Draft Monitoring Plan is in progress and was based on previous permit conditions, agency input, and lessons learned. In order to complete a Final Monitoring Plan, the contractor will need to be hired. Additionally, a Final Monitoring Plan is considered a permit condition.
Mr. Bond commented that he believed the intent of the Monitoring Plan is to flesh out areas of concern about habitat protection and monitoring before, during, and after construction. Additionally, there was good monitoring data gathered for RBSP I.

Mr. Honma stated that the RBSP II Draft Monitoring Plan was built from RBSP I data. Additionally, the team has been coordinating with agencies in order to minimize impact while recognizing there will be some unavoidable short-term impacts versus long-term benefits of the project.

Chair Slater-Price commented that there has been a very active grunion run this year. Mr. Homna agreed and noted the San Dieguito restoration project had to stop construction for the grunion runs. He added that in preparing the schedule of construction for RBSP II, beaches that are not suitable grunion habitats will be built first as grunion runs are heaviest during the early part of the season. Additionally, once the non-suitable grunion habitats are built, there will be measures to minimize impact.

Mrs. Tucker stated that it is possible for construction to stop due to grunion runs.

Mr. Aceti commented that it would be important to have Mr. Honma and Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol, at the CCC hearing. Mrs. Tucker responded that she will be attending the CCC hearing along with Mr. Honma; Mr. Webb; Cindy Kinkade, AECOM; and Rob Rundle, SANDAG. Additionally, the CCC hearing has a public comment component and welcomed interested parties to attend on June 15, 2011.

6. Legislative Update

Mr. Aceti provided an update to the SPWG on the status of state and federal legislation related to the shoreline management program.

Mr. Aceti reviewed the success of the 2011 Headwaters to Ocean “H2O” Conference that was held May 24 to May 26 at the Catamaran Resort Hotel and Spa on Mission Bay. There were 150 presenters and 300 attendees, with a large group remaining to attend the Thursday closing session.

Mr. Aceti thanked the sponsors in attendance at the SPWG meeting and noted that photographs and presentations from the conference will be posted in three weeks under archives at www.calcoast.org. He added that the presentation on man-made built reefs and agency cooperation in Vancouver would be informative for the SPWG as a future agenda item.

Mr. Aceti noted that CalCoast awarded the Surfer’s Point Working Group for the managed retreat project in Ventura.

Chair Slater-Price asked if there were any updates on the poly styrofoam bill. Mr. Aceti responded that the bill may possibly go to the floor for a vote today as the bill was amended to include a two-year phase out.

Mr. Aceti informed the SPWG that Lobby Day was renamed Ocean Day and he has been working to get beach replenishment into the fact sheet packet.
Existing laws currently allow cities and counties to assess special fees on the importation of waste from outside of the county to publicly-owned or privately-owned facilities. Under the proposed Assembly Bill 1178 (MA) (AB 1178), a city or county will be prohibited from restricting or limiting the importation of solid waste into a privately-owned solid waste facility based on place of origin. Specific restrictions allowable under AB 1178 would include requiring a privately-owned or operated solid waste facility to accept certain waste, allowing a privately-owned solid waste facility to abrogate certain agreements and ensuring a city or county is not prevented from exercising local land use authority. However, AB 1178 would prevent any restrictions being implemented through an ordinance or initiative enacted by the voters of a city or county.

Currently, the state government implemented a travel ban, which will hinder Southern California from having access to state government representatives. Additionally, there has been discussion on the closure of state parks, which the film industry has lobbied against as they are used for filming locations.

7. **Adjournment and Next Meeting**

Chair Slater-Price requested input from the SPWG members on whether the August 4, 2011, meeting should be rescheduled for special session in September or be cancelled and hold the next regular SPWG meeting on October 6, 2011.

Vice Chair Kellejian motioned to leave the decision open for SANDAG staff to follow up with the SPWG and make the determination depending on status of the RBSP II project. Mayor Janney agreed that the SPWG should cancel the August meeting and have the October 6, 2011, meeting pending SANDAG staff follow up.

Mr. Aceti commented that holding the special session in September would be best as there may be State Land Commission permitting related discussions necessary.

Mrs. Tucker noted that while the SPWG may not be meeting, the RBSP II Project Team will be continuing progress and momentum throughout August and September.

Chair Slater-Price adjourned the meeting at 12:55 p.m. The August 4, 2011, meeting will be cancelled and the next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 6, 2011, 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., unless it is determined that an earlier special session is needed in September.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bid Process - Identified Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 6, 2011</td>
<td>100% plans and specs plus EI form and final EE to LT to create the IFB package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td>Draft spec book package to PM to review (RED FLAG Req, approval memo, ad, and spec book).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
<td>RED FLAG in-house SANDAG approvals of IFB package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20</td>
<td>Place Ads, duplicate spec book for internal team, post IFB on SANDAG website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, Oct. 24 (milestone)</strong></td>
<td>Ads to appear in Dodge Green Sheet, SD Daily Transcript, El Latino, Voice &amp; Viewpoint. LT to send e-mail notice of project release to contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1 (milestone)</td>
<td>Pre-Bid Meeting in SANDAG Board Room (room NOT yet booked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 8</td>
<td>First Addendum issued, with Prebid meeting minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td>Second Addendum issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 21</td>
<td>Third Addendum issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 28</td>
<td>Deadline to receive bidder inquiries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1</td>
<td>Issue final Q&amp;A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 7 (milestone)</td>
<td>Bid Opening in SANDAG Board Room (room NOT yet booked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 12</td>
<td>End of day, deadline for lowest 3 bidders to submit financial data (“orange booklets”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 19</td>
<td>Complete bid evaluation, including evaluation of experience (if needed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 22</td>
<td>Internal memo from PM &amp; RE to Bill and Jim, recommending approval to issue NOITA. Jim signs NOITA letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOSED</strong></td>
<td>SANDAG closed for holiday. No NOITAs can be issued until office reopens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2, 2012 (milestone)</td>
<td>Issue NOITA (starts 5 business day protest period).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>End of Protest Period, end of day. [If there is a protest, add 3-4 weeks to the schedule.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 9, if no protests</td>
<td>If no protest, circulate new RED FLAG Req and memo to get OK to issue contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 19</td>
<td>Receive internal approval to issue contract. Send contract to lowest responsive, responsible bidder. (Contractor has 10 business days to execute.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb. 3</strong></td>
<td>Contract executed by contractor due back to SANDAG, with insurance and bonds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb. 14 (milestone)</strong></td>
<td>SANDAG executes contractor-signed Construction Contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 15</td>
<td>Duplicate confounded spec books with executed contract, duplicate confounded plans, and draft NTP letter for Precon. PM/RE review of NTP letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21</td>
<td>Jim to sign NTP. NTP to be given at Pre-Construction meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 22</td>
<td>Precon Meeting. NTP given to contractor, with start date of Monday, Feb. 27, 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>