MEETING NOTICE
AND AGENDA

SHORELINE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
The Shoreline Preservation Committee may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, March 4, 2004
11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Rob Rundle   Jennifer Cordeau
(619) 699-6949  (619) 699-7312
rru@sandag.org  jco@sandag.org

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.
SHORELINE PRESERVATION COMMITTEE  
March 4, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>INTRODUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes from December 4, 2003 and February 5, 2004 meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Meeting Time Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the February 5 meeting, members of the Committee proposed changing the meeting time to 10 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. The Committee will discuss the proposed change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RECOMMEND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Beach Replenishment in the Regional Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the February 5 meeting, the Committee recommended that they meet to discuss funding options in the Regional Comprehensive Plan for beach replenishment. The relevant shoreline preservation sections, including the current funding recommendations, are attached. Also included is an attachment which was distributed at the March 2002 meeting that discusses potential funding options. Marney Cox from SANDAG will also be present to discuss the relationship of the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy to the Regional Comprehensive Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comments and Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Meeting Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is suggested that the Committee’s next meeting be scheduled for Thursday, May 6 or Thursday, June 3, 2004.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
February 5, 2004

TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee

FROM: SANDAG Staff

SUBJECT: December 4, 2003 Meeting Summary

Members in Attendance:
Councilmember Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, Chair
Councilmember James Bond, City of Encinitas, Co-Chair
Councilmember Jerry Finnell, City of Del Mar
Mayor Doug Sheres, City of Solana Beach
Supervisor Pam Slater, 3rd District County of San Diego
Councilmember Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach

Technical Advisory Members:
Bob Hoffman, NMFS
Kim Sterrett, CA Dept. of Boating & Waterways

Community Advisory Members:
August Felando, CA Lobster & Trap Fisherman’s Association
Dedi Ridenour, Sierra Club
Steve Aceti, CalCoast
Cami Mattson, San Diego North CVB

Others:
Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado
David Oakley, Seacoast Preservation Association, Encinitas
Danny L. Schrotberger, City of San Diego
Shannon Bryant, Army Corps of Engineers
Raynor Tsuneyoshi, CA Dept. of Boating & Waterways
Eric Munoz, City of Carlsbad
Jon Campbell, City of Carlsbad
Bud Carroll, City of Carlsbad
Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Dick Bobertz, San Dieguito River Park JPA
David Altman, Noble Consultants, Inc.
Susie Ming, USACE
Sachiko Kohatsu, 3rd District County of San Diego
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas
Brian Leslie, City of Encinitas
Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Mark Carpenter, KTDA
Jennifer Bethel, Hofman Planning
Jack Gorzeman, Coastal Planning & Engineering, Inc.
1. Welcome and Introductions

Councilmember Kulchin welcomed everyone and conducted the meeting.


The meeting summary was approved by the Committee.

3. Local Funding For Fiscal Year 2005 Shoreline Monitoring Program

The Committee approved to continue the local funding for the shoreline monitoring program in FY2005.

4. Nearshore Habitat Inventory Web Site

Holly Henderson, Merkel & Associates, presented the project. The project has been a cooperative effort between the Coastal Conservancy and SANDAG, with input provided by the Department of Fish and Game, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Coastal Commission. Representatives from each of these organizations were members of steering committees that guided the program from goals, to content, to completion of the project.

The project was initiated because there was a need for a regional program that could pull together existing nearshore data and could also generate a regional map of all coastal resources to be used by resource managers. The main goal of the project was to provide a comprehensive inventory of nearshore and marine habitats, and to put the information into a user-friendly database that would be accessible to everyone. In the San Diego region, there has not been a comprehensive map available on nearshore resources. Before this program the existing data consisted primarily of many different small-scale data sets that were out of date, not digitally available, or not available publicly. The program can be used as a regional planning tool for environmental risk assessments, and impact analysis for large-scale actions, but does not replace the need for site-specific surveys.
The work on the program was completed in two phases. The first phase involved the collection of existing data and the creation of a habitat classification system. A GIS database and web site were created to make GIS mapping tools available to the public, to provide a spatial bibliography, and to supply other educational and scientific tools. The second phase involved supplemental field data collection.

The program study area includes the nearshore area from Dana Point to the International border, and the area extends from the beach seaward to one nautical mile offshore. The study area does not include lagoons, bays, or estuaries, but can be incorporated at a later date when data becomes available. The web site address to access the inventory is http://sccoos.ucsd.edu/nearshore. Scripps Institution of Oceanography is hosting the web site and is participating in the program which relates to its Coastal Ocean Observing System program.

5. CA Department of Boating and Waterways Budget and Master Plan Effort

Kim Sterrett, CA Dept. of Boating and Waterways, stated that some of the responsibilities of the department are to provide boating access grants to regional, local, and some federal entities in California. The department is also involved with public and private marina loans, which grant money to marinas for vessel pump-out stations to deal with water quality issues. Other responsibilities include providing research grants through Scripps Institution of Oceanography, yacht and ship licensing, and boating safety programs. About 80 percent of the annual budget is for infrastructure, which goes back to local and regional governments for improvements on lakes, rivers, bays, and marinas for boating facilities.

Rayor Tsuneyoshi, CA Dept. of Boating and Waterways, discussed the potential for merger with Parks and Recreation, and funding of the department. Parks and Recreation, Fish and Game, and Boating and Waterways may be combined into one department headed by one person. The Department of Boating and Waterways has dedicated funding sources received from trust funds, money repaid from loans, and a portion of the registration from boats. For about 10 years, the finance department has given approximately $11.5 million a year of their budget to Parks and Recreation, to use at facilities where boating is a recreational activity. In the last 2 years, an additional $15.5 million was taken from the budget, forcing the department to use money from their reserve fund, which has been almost depleted. By 2006 the funds will be gone and the department will not have money to build facilities, to use for loans or grants, and may have to cut programs. Boating activity generates around $68 billion in direct and indirect revenues, and $1.5 billion flows into the state in taxes. If the department does not receive funding, it will deteriorate assets that many of the cities and the county depend on for the recreational dollars that are generated. There were about $180 million worth of projects unfunded this year because of the budget.

6. Progress on Encinitas Opportunistic Sand Project

Councilmember Bond reported that the Parks and Recreation Department has approved and is supporting the project, and has allowed the sand to be transported across the parking lot out to the beach. He thanked the Coastal Commission for their continuous pursuit of moving the material to the beach. KSL, the builders of the beach hotel, have requested that they be the lead agency in getting the sand moved from their development down onto the beach, which needs to be worked out. Reports received on Encinitas beaches show that the sand from the Regional Beach Sand Project is still there and the ecosystem has hugely improved. Lobster and
The fish catch in the area has gone up over the last 2 years since the placement of the sand on the beach.

7. Legislative Report

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, reported that there was not much to report on state legislature. There is a leftover bill from last year that they are working on with the Department of Boating and Waterways trying to get money reprogrammed from a fund that had a 50/50 split state local match to an 85/15 match. For Federal legislature, the President signed the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, and among the things in the bill are the federal, state, and local matches to the beach projects.

8. Public Comments and Communications

Councilmember Kulchin announced that Dan Muslin is retiring from the Navy and Patrick McCay will be taking his place on the Committee.

Kim Sterrett noted that they are embarking on a cooperative project with the Federal Minerals Management Service and the CA Geological Survey in looking at sand and gravel in Federal waters. San Diego County, Orange County, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara will be the areas of concentration.

9. Next Meeting Date

It is suggested that the next Committee meeting be scheduled for Thursday, February 5, 2004.

10. Adjourn
March 4, 2004

TO: Shoreline Preservation Committee
FROM: SANDAG Staff
SUBJECT: February 5, 2004 Meeting Summary

*NOTE: During SANDAG's recent office move, the attendance sheet was misplaced

1. Welcome and Introductions

Councilmember Kulchin welcomed everyone and conducted the meeting.


Approval of the meeting summary was postponed due to the lack of a quorum.

3. Regional Beach Sand Project Shoreline Monitoring Results – Year 2

Craig Leidersdorf and Rick Hollar, Coastal Frontiers, reported on the monitoring results. Precipitation and streamflow were well below average during the two-year RBSP monitoring period, while the wave conditions were relatively mild. The primary implications of these environmental conditions are 1. The absence of large wave events following the implementation of the RBSP helped to prolong the life of the beach fills; 2. The scant precipitation and low stream flows failed to deliver significant quantities of beach-quality sediment to the coast; and 3. The low streamflows failed to flush coastal sediment from the lagoon entrances in the Oceanside Cell.

The combination of beach fills and mild wave conditions during the monitoring period proved to be extremely favorable for the San Diego County coast. Although the twelve receiver sites tended to experience shoreline and volume losses subsequent to fill placement, many of the adjacent beaches benefited as the material was dispersed along the coast. As a result, wider beaches resulted in all three littoral cells. The greatest increases occurred in the Oceanside Cell, where more than 85 percent of the RBSP nourishment material was deposited.

The two jetty-stabilized lagoon entrances, Agua Hedionda and Batiquitos, remained open to the full range of tidal exchange throughout the RBSP Monitoring Period. Of the three unstabilized entrance channels, San Elijo and San Dieguito closed twice while Los Peñasquitos closed three times. Nevertheless, the closure frequencies of these channels were less than or similar to the closure frequencies that preceded the RBSP. In addition, mechanical intervention to restore or enhance tidal exchange was required on fewer occasions than in the recent past.

4. Regional Beach Sand Project Biological Monitoring Results – Year 2

Lawrence Honma, AMEC Earth and Environmental, reported that since implementation of the RBSP, intertidal surveys conducted during Year 2 revealed exceptionally high sand levels at Cardiff Reef, but similarly high sand levels also occurred at the control area (Scripps Reef). Peak
sand levels at Cardiff Reef affected a narrow zone of intertidal life that was buried or perhaps scourred (including low-lying mussels, barnacles, anemones, turf algae, and surfgrass). Sand levels were low at Cardiff the following spring.

Several monitoring locations in the shallow subtidal area have experienced changes in sand cover. Most of these changes were similar to levels observed prior to construction suggesting no impact from the beach replenishment program (i.e., natural sand transport). However, sand levels increased above levels observed prior to construction at one monitoring location at Solana Beach and Batiquitos. Small portions of reef were buried along with several kelp species. Further surveys will document the change in sand cover and attempt to determine if the increase is due to nourishment operations. The largest changes in sand cover were observed at control locations further suggesting there is a great deal of seasonal sand transport in the region, and observations suggest that the majority of the sand has migrated downcoast along the shoreline from the receiver site.

5. Regional Comprehensive Plan – Beach Replenishment Funding

There is currently no revenue source to implement the beach replenishment program, although the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) suggests the transient occupancy tax as an option. Members of the Committee stated that there were other options, and that these should also be listed in the strategy as well. Councilmember Monroe stated that the IRIS should not address specific funding options for beach replenishment. The Committee agreed to meet the following month to discuss a funding strategy for beach projects in the Regional Comprehensive Plan.

6. Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System

The Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System (SCCOOS) is a consortium of ten Southern California universities and laboratories that extends from Northern Baja CA in Mexico to Morro Bay at the southern edge of central California. SCCOOS aims to streamline, coordinate, and further develop individual institutional efforts by creating an integrated, multidisciplinary coastal observatory in the Bight of Southern California. By leveraging existing infrastructure, partnerships, and other resources, SCCOOS plans to develop a fully operational coastal observation system designed to address issues related to coastal water quality, marine life resources, and coastal hazards. This system, based on new sensor and information technologies and providing seamless links between observations, data management, and modeling, would provide scientists, water quality managers, natural resource managers, and policy makers with a solid scientific basis for evaluating the effectiveness of present management strategies, the design of new approaches, and serving as a risk management and early warning tool.

7. Coastal Sediment Master Plan/Department of Boating and Waterways

Steve Sachs briefly discussed the Coastal Sediment Master Plan. The Master Plan is an innovative collaboration between the State Resources Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It will result in an integrated strategy for nourishing the state’s beaches and dealing with the problems of sedimentation in wetlands and harbors. It will also focus on problems and solutions on a regional basis, and provide a framework for directing state and federal resources to help regional and local entities implement projects and programs.

The Master Plan process will span 3 to 5 years and will provide the opportunity for local, regional, state, and federal collaboration to generate support and funding to preserve and enhance the state’s shorelines. In support of the Master Plan, SANDAG has agreed to undertake
the public outreach portion, and the creation of a regional opportunistic sand template. The public outreach effort will be conducted by a series of public workshops around the state that will introduce the Plan objective's and elicit participation in its development. The first workshop was held directly after the Shoreline Preservation Committee meeting.

8. Legislative Report

Steve Aceti, CalCoast, announced that there will be a legislative breakfast held in Sacramento on April 7 and 8.

9. Public Comments and Communications
There were no public comments.

10. Next Meeting Date

It is suggested that the next Committee meeting be scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 2004.

11. Adjourn
CHAPTER 7

INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY (IRIS)
Ensuring the Foundation of our Vision for the Future

INTRODUCTION

The first hint of trouble came during the late 1970s and early 1980s; policy makers, engineers, and economists across the nation expressed their deep concern about the nation's inadequate infrastructure investments. This concern quickly spread to the states. In California, landmark reports like Rusty Hinges on the Golden Gate released during 1983 identified the many reasons for inadequate infrastructure investment, although the report suggested things were not as bad in California as they were elsewhere in the nation.

Since the release of that publication, Sacramento policy analysts have produced a virtual flood of reports identifying the state's infrastructure inadequacies and a range of proposals to remedy the problems. During the late 1990s, the Business Roundtable and the state's Legislative Analyst Office produced a series of publications on reforming infrastructure policy, stimulating renewed interest in planning issues in the state. More recently, the state's Commission on Building for the 21st Century assessed the state's infrastructure issues and formulated policy options for improving infrastructure quality. About the same time, the Public Policy Institute of California commissioned three studies on infrastructure policy and institutional planning.

While all the hand wringing has gone on at the national and state level, regions have suffered. More recently, they have begun to act.

In the San Diego region, for example, more local funding sources have been developed to fund needed improvements to our infrastructure, such as transportation systems and schools. More recently, the water agencies in the southern California region signed a joint agreement to reduce California's over-dependence upon the Colorado River. For those closely watching these events, none were easy, but each represents progress in solving our regional infrastructure issues.

Will this trend stick? Will regions become more responsible for planning and paying for their own infrastructure solutions? The lack of available resources at the national and state level may make this our best option. This is not to say we don't need state or federal funds that help finance infrastructure planning, programming, and maintenance. But it does seem that regions are being asked to increasingly leverage or match state and federal funds with local money or programs that help fill the infrastructure gaps.
A key source of uncertainty lies with the fact that, except in the City of San Diego, waste collection and disposal in the region are performed by private companies. Although the county is responsible for preparing the Integrated Waste Management Plan, it lacks the means to undertake the necessary investment and other actions to implement the plan's recommendations.

The "gap" with respect to solid waste infrastructure has less to do with funding and more with an appropriate authority to implement the long-term plan, although, a revenue source is needed to exercise such authority. The most suitable revenue source is a fee or charge for solid waste collection, which is already levied by most jurisdictions. It is recommended that jurisdictions that do not currently charge fees for solid waste collection do so and that a portion of the fee revenues be used to implement the goals of the Integrated Waste Management Plan. As recommended in the City of San Diego's Facilities Financing Study (July 2002), implementing a user fee for residential refuse collection could generate over $32 million every year.

Education - K-12 and Community Colleges. New K-12 schools and community college facilities are funded from a combination of state and local funds. In order to generate local matching funds and, in some cases, to supplement state funding, local bond issues will be needed. Proposition 39, passed in 2000, reduced the voting requirement for bonds to finance construction of K-12 schools and community colleges from two-thirds to 55 percent. School districts, as well as other infrastructure and service providers, will likely be impacted by the general plan changes called for under the RCP. Channeling growth into existing urban communities will likely increase school enrollment, where land is scarce and expensive. School districts should consider different kinds of sites, more vertical and shared resources, to cope with a more urban setting.

Beach Sand Replenishment. There is currently no revenue source to implement the beach sand replenishment program, although the start of a strategic plan and capital budget do exist. SANDAG's Shoreline Preservation Committee initiated the plan and several funding options. Under one option, the Shoreline Preservation Committee has proposed dedicating a portion of revenues from the transient occupancy tax to fund the program. The transient occupancy tax would provide a reliable source and is consistent with the goal of improving visitor-serving facilities.

Habitat Conservation. The regional habitat conservation plans (MSCP and MHCP; see Appendix section on Parks and Open Space available at www.sandag.org) have estimated the local jurisdictions' cost to assemble and manage a regional preserve system in perpetuity at $1.3 billion (discounted present value), but the local jurisdictions have not established a funding source to cover this cost.
TABLE 7.1—SOURCES OF EXISTING OR NEW REVENUES FOR INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>REVENUE FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</th>
<th>REVENUE FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing general revenues (streets and highways)</td>
<td>+ TransNet extension (1/2-cent sales tax; highways and transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuation of existing fare/user charges (transit)</td>
<td>+ Gas tax increase (highways and transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuation of income from operations (air and maritime ports)</td>
<td>- Continuation of bond financing based on income from operations and federal and state funds (air and maritime ports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ User charges (land ports of entry)</td>
<td>+ Bond financing based on user charges (land ports of entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing rate/user charges</td>
<td>- Continuation of pay-as-you-go or bond financing based on rate revenues and fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM WATER MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing general revenues</td>
<td>+ Regional storm water impact fee, special assessment, or special tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLID WASTE</td>
<td>+ User charge</td>
<td>+ User charge and bond financing based on user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing rate/user charges</td>
<td>- Continuation of pay-as-you-go or bond financing based on rate revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing general revenues and state funding (K-12)</td>
<td>+ Local bond financing (K-12, community colleges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuation of existing tuition/user charges, donations, and state funding (CSU, UC)</td>
<td>- Continuation of state funding (K-12, community colleges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Special assessment or special tax (beach sand replenishment, habitat)</td>
<td>- Continuation of local funding (donations) and state funding (CSU, UC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK AND OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing general revenues</td>
<td>- Continuation of existing pay-as-you-go based on impact fees (local parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Special assessment or special tax (beach sand replenishment, habitat)</td>
<td>+ RTP / TransNet mitigation bank (habitat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ Special assessment or special tax or TOT (beach sand replenishment, habitat)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table summarizes types of revenues that are currently used to fund operations and maintenance or capital investment (-) or that are proposed as new funding sources to meet the infrastructure needs of the RCP (+); see text for discussion of new funding sources and appendix sections for discussion of existing revenue sources.
Parks and Open Space

1. Local jurisdictions, acting through SANDAG, should consider the feasibility of leveraging a portion of transportation funding (RTP and TransNet) required for the biological mitigation of transportation projects to maximize benefits for the region’s habitat conservation programs. To this end, the local jurisdictions should:

   - Establish a regional habitat mitigation bank consisting of priority habitat acquisition lands identified by the region’s habitat conservation programs (MSCP and MHCP) and use its credits to mitigate the biological impacts of transportation projects.

   - Consolidate the mitigation budgets of separate transportation projects to fund the establishment and management of the regional mitigation bank.

   - Allocate a portion of the consolidated mitigation budget for the long-term management and monitoring of other preserve lands which currently do not have funding for those purposes.

   - Establish an entity, such as a conservancy, which will conduct the management and monitoring and obtain additional funds for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring.

   - Work with other regional infrastructure providers, such as for water, wastewater, or energy, to consolidate mitigation banking needs, thus improving the efficiency and effectiveness of mitigation actions to further the goals of the regional conservation plans.

2. Local jurisdictions should consider the availability of local, active parks and the possibility of obtaining additional park resources, such as through joint-use of school playgrounds and athletic facilities, in identifying and prioritizing smart growth opportunity areas.

3. Local jurisdictions should take advantage of the strategic plan which they prepared, acting through SANDAG’s Shoreline Preservation Committee, to finance shoreline sand replenishment by dedicating a portion of the transient occupancy tax collected throughout the region.