DRAFT TRANSCRIPT

Public comment session for the CRSMP workshop on 11/14/2012, 5-8pm

Comments

Richard Harris, San Francisco Public Golf Alliance: An issue of our concern is the Sharp Park Golf Course, and a few comments about it: as I saw the economic analysis [the draft economic analysis plan presented by Peter King], I didn't see any value given to that [the golf course]. It's probably a very valuable facility. The cost to replace the golf course is in the vicinity of 10-20 million dollars. The cost to replace, to build a golf course built by who was probably the greatest golf course architect in world history, a man named Alastair Mackenzie, generally recognized as such in golf circles, can be extremely high. That property is designated a historical asset under CEQA by the City of San Francisco, so [we have an] additional concern on that. We would surely like to see the consideration for beach nourishment, reconstruction, maintenance of the levee, building of the levee, in that area that would protect the golf course and the surrounding neighborhoods. I will be making written comments, including these comments. I would like to know if there was a representative of the City and County of San Francisco, as a landowner of that property, in this discussion that Mr. Diaz referred to [Lee Diaz, a planner for the City of Pacifica, who discussed the earlier workshop that day]. Was there?

AH: I don't believe at that particular discussion, no, although we did have the GGNRA as the landowning agency present in the room, I believe that representative was at a different table working on a different collaboration.

RH: The representative of GGNRA was at a different collaboration – the neighboring property owner.

[Correction: We note that the response above was in error. There was a representative of the City and County of San Francisco at the discussion at the 1pm session.]

RH: Those are my comments. We will make additional comments in writing. We have a concern that the study is – that ESA PWA has been a consultant, a paid consultant, to a private entity, the Wild Equity Institute and the Center for Biological Diversity, in an advocacy paper in which ESA PWA recommended the closure of the golf course. We think that in this position, with ESA PWA representing a private party which has taken an adverse position on this particular point, we think it's a, lawyers would call it a conflict of interest, and we are uncomfortable with that. We'll raise that issue as well, thank you.

AH: Thank you so much, we appreciate your comment.

Mark Stechbart, Pacifica: I'd actually like to expand upon the ethical and possible conflict of interest of ESA and Bob Battalio and this other fellow Peter Baye. In February 2011, their client Wild Equity made a presentation to the City and County of San Francisco that called for letting the westside levee deteriorate and build two levees on the north side and south side of the golf course in the name of preservation. Wild Equity wants it to be an open space wetlands snake and frog preserve, golf would no

longer be exercised there, and it basically would be an open space park. That would materially affect Pacifica's efforts to make Main Street reality and anchor it for a visitor-serving community amenity. I'm with the Chamber of Commerce on the government affairs committee. There's actually six other members of the Chamber here. The Chamber is on record as maintaining the golf course is a vital activity consistent with environmental regulations, easily done, that's established law.

However, Battalio is on the February 2011 report with Baye. I think he is conflicted. He has made 200 pages of argument to let the golf course go. In fact, Wild Equity has a map on their website that shows just that: the western levee gone, the north and south levee for neighborhood preservation next to the golf course, uncontrolled flooding from the sea and from inland water. That same map shows up on the littoral study on page 41 of SF Estuary user files [referring to the read-ahead packet distributed before the meeting, available at http://www.sfestuary.org/userfiles/workshop_packet_final_small.pdf]. The basic same map shows up with the western levee gone, and two levees on the north and south side of the golf course. So the question is: who approved that? Was it chance, was it planned? Was that a policy of the Water Board? I don't understand why, for instance, reefs are proposed for defense of Rockaway, but a reef was not proposed for defense of the Golf Course. Why did Wild Equity's apparent material end up in this report? Who did it, and who knew about it? And when? When was the contract signed, and when did ESA start? When was the Wild Equity contract done, arguably Feb 2011. I think this should go to an ethics officer immediately, or an inspector general to the extent the Water Boards has one, or the state attorney general's office. I think in the meantime ESA should be suspended from the project, pending an adjudication. That concludes my statement.

AH: Thank you very much, we appreciate your comment.

Jim Wagner, Chamber of Commerce, Board of Directors: I just want to reiterate that our Sharp Park Golf Course is indeed historical, there's many historical sites on that whole property, including the Sharp Park internment camp from World War II (back closer to the archery range). That said, I just find it odd that we walk down the coast, we see what I consider mitigation measures to stop something from happening, and then at the Golf Course itself we see managed retreat. I'm concerned that we have overlapping agendas from different parties that are merging, in whatever way they can merge, into a basic concept that 'this is accepted by all: let's go forward, let's give it up,' because that's what would happen. I know Dianne Feinstein back in April of I believe it was this year touted a $1 million fundraising effort to build levees down in the South Bay to protect all the high tech companies that are down there, and I would think that if they're going to go down and put levees up to protect the high tech, that maybe we should have some kind of an idea what we can do to protect our historical assets.

AH: Thank you, we appreciate your comment. Thank you for coming out tonight.

Bill McLaughlin, Surfrider Foundation, San Francisco Chapter: I care about all the beaches in this management plan, and we just want to make the point, we understand this is a major challenge, we have a lot of stuff that's been built too close to the water. Our position is to try to preserve and protect beaches as much as possible. We have the science before us, so now is the time to plan ahead. With a

spirit of good faith and compromise we can come up with some reasonable solutions to these challenges.

AH: Thank you very much.

Bill Meyerhoff, Pacifica Manor District and Chamber member:

I noticed I think on one of the slides a part of the town that it stated zoning changes, and I'd just like a clearer definition as to what that means, and talk about individual properties that border the coastline, or if it's an area that includes residential as well as commercial and what that really means.

AH: Thank you very much.

Chuck Gust, property owner at Rockaway Beach (Nick's Restaurant): In Humboldt County, does that include the town of Arcata? [Yes] Is anyone here aware of what Arcata did some 15-20 years ago, with taking the energy out of the wave action and trying to subdue the erosion and everything that was going on up there? Aren't they like giant jacks or something, that they place out in the breakers? To take the energy supposedly out of the incoming water, is that correct?

DG I went to Humboldt State and did oceanography there, so I can talk with you about that. The dolos that they're talking about, those structures are designed to minimize wave closures of the navigable channel into Humboldt Bay, so they've armored the north jetty and the south jetty with those.

CG: Two more questions: You mentioned about sediment coming down from the streams and going into the drainage systems. Sediment ponds that were created years ago, asking ranchers, farmers to do sediment ponds and to take sediment out of the streams. So I am understanding now that as we look back, that that may have not been such a good idea, that more sediment could come to the beaches, to bring sand back to the beaches?

BB: Yes. This is a topic of interest from a range of communities and agencies. The resource conservation service has long focused on retaining sediment and then there's a lot of talk about maintaining clearer water in streams and the like, but I think one of the implications with that, and also these new hydromodifications which limits the effect of permeable pavement on peak flows. These actions do have unintended potentially negative consequences of trapping sediment upstream.

CG: In this report, it shows – I'm just going to call it a sea wall which is out in the surf – I'm not sure what it's called.

BB – That's what we were referring to as an offshore reef, or a multipurpose reef, because it has potentially some benefits to underwater habitat.

CG: So when waves travel, down the main channel, and where the channel narrows, it seems to indicate that as it goes down through valleys and up over things, it raises. So this being out in the ocean, as that force is coming, is that not going to... [gestures, which were not picked up by the recorder]

BB: The intent of offshore reefs are to gather wave energy that is coming towards the shore, cause it to focus by refraction, and then shoal and break on the structure and dissipate energy before it reaches the shore to provide a lower energy shadow behind the structure, that way reducing the potential erosion. Actually what we've found is with these structures, we've had some experience with them, especially these big breakwaters like down in Santa Monica, you tend to have what we call a salient, the sand tends to accrete or accumulate behind the structure, to form a little wider beach there. Because the wave energy dissipation as it reaches that point, but also the waves tend to refract, they change their pattern into a converging pattern, so the sand tends to come together to a point.

CG: As a property owner, I just want to make a statement, because we've been preserving our property with riprapping. I think really it's a tremendous challenge to property owners anywhere on the coast, I really do, with what's going on. And I think someday it will have to be faced. We believe years ago that, number one, the sand vanished prior to the rock being dumped there, there was sand, and it was gone, it just went away, nobody knows where it went, that's what started us dumping the riprap. After years of doing that a contractor actually came in and suggested to us the way to lock the riprap in is actually to lower it in the ground and put a pier so that the rock that was sliding or moving in the ocean coming up would lock itself into some kind of – it would create its own wall because it would lock itself into those piers, and piers would take, if they were down in the bedrock or the clay, a long time to move. This would eliminate a lot of that encroachment the riprap has now taken on the beaches. But that was laughed at when it was proposed to the Coastal Commission. Maybe that's something, an interim solution, to be able to hold back a lot of that riprap, and take Sharp Park and some of those other areas and lock that riprap in until some of these projects can be funded and put together. I know there's other issues with that as far as encroachment goes.

BB: That's called a toe wall, and it has been done in other places. It's not an outrageous idea at all from a structural standpoint. There's some pluses and minus with it to talk about. It's been done. The tangent wall, the vertical cylinders in front of the trailer park area (which I think are mostly gone now) were something like that, they just extended up higher. That's not that crazy an idea.

AH: Thank you very much.

Courtney Conlon, head of Pacifica Chamber of Commerce: This is kind of to dovetail off what Richard Harris was saying. With the Pacifica group that we do city work obviously a part of, just wanted to know is there consideration, when you convene again, that it will include private property owners and the business community for input into obviously what represents the community. [Question was directed to a city official and then redirected to Athena Honore]

BB: We're glad you're here, and we've heard your comments, and we appreciate them.

CC: This kind of segues into more of an overarching question. In listening to all the studies about the ocean rise and the erosion that's inevitable, plus taking out the rock armor is just too expensive a solution, I just want to know what we have the business community and the residents, is what studies are being made to address the elimination, or the increasing, of our vital commercial and recreational sections that have provided such an integral economic base for the sustainability of our community and

our tourist industry. I know Huntington Beach, $9 million, whatever they bring in [referring to Phil King's earlier presentation] -- but we have a vital and vibrant commercial and tourist industry that we would like definitely taken into consideration with all of the plans going forward.

BB: [Economist] Phil King from SFSU was here earlier, and he is gathering information, so perhaps we should get him to contact the Chamber of Commerce.

CC: That would be wonderful, we would welcome that.

AH: Thank you for your comments.

Eric Ruchames: I have lived in town for about forty years and lived on the beach and seen a lot of this happening, seen the sand disappear for no reason. I guess my concern about reports like this tend to have a, start a life of their own, and then down the road, become instruments of policy, or policymakers have to use them to make decisions. But they're only as good as the questions that get asked. With all due respect to the science, I think you'll all admit that there's a lot more art to this than science, because what was once standard practice is now no longer done, and it's a tough call, and it's an extraordinarily difficult thing, I think we all appreciate that. I'm really concerned, to echo, what Courtney said, I don't think that our economic impact study is nearly broad enough, as it was laid out, to be of any value whatsoever to when the policymakers have to make decisions. To simply limit it to city owned facilities that are on the shore, really misses the point of a coastal community. And to casually say that from this street to this street is going to be managed retreat, overlooks the fact that there are dozens and dozens of people who live there who are going to suddenly find out they can't live there anymore, and they need to be brought into this process, as to the business and the residential community so that down the road when policymakers have to make choices, they've seen the whole picture, not just what the cost of a pump station was but how about the cost to the neighborhood or the impact to the whole economy and the community. That has to be factored in, otherwise it was all a giant waste of time. And I hope that you broaden that because just casually having us as novices say, well, that's managed retreat, and that's revetment, and that's a seawall, I mean, that's ridiculous, obviously that's not how you protect a coast. There has to be some continuity between the stretch of land, and it makes sense to do certain things and not do certain things, not just because of a political point of view. There has to be some coherent concept to it that I don't see right yet. I think it has to be much broader for this to be useful, because otherwise it's just going to be another document that doesn't help us, and if it doesn't help us with funding sources and it doesn't help us with the overall concept, then it's just a lot of time and effort that is not going to be well spent.

AH: Thank you very much for your comment.

(Nameless commenter) I have a quick question, and this may have been addressed (I came in about an hour ago). Was there a reason that, the way this was set up, that it didn't encompass Montara, El Granada, Moss Beach, Half Moon Bay and the rest of the south coast? Is this being done statewide in sections, because I would think if you're going to do this, the Pacific Ocean runs all the way down. To do one spot here is counterproductive, when this part up here is migrating sand, it's filling up all your groins, that are flipping over, you have a full groin, and then it stops and flows down again.

DG: To answer, I'll take a step back and talk about the whole state first. There are multiple plans like this, some that are completed, some that are in the early stages like we are, some that are in the later stages near completion, and some that haven't started yet. In total there are probably about 9 or 10 of these kinds of plans running from Oregon to Mexico. And eventually the state body, this workgroup that's a combination of federal (the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) and Natural Resources, a state agency, in weaving together all these plans into the California Sediment Master Plan, will be looking at the entire coastline as best they can as a functioning unit. That's the bigger picture in the whole state, what's happening statewide.

Regionally, they are breaking it into small sections and doing it section by section, a section at a time. That's where Phil King talked his work on one of these in Huntington Beach; he was part of the one [the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan] for Orange County. There was one in San Diego County, one for Santa Barbara and Ventura County, etc. They are defined both by political boundaries and by the geographic boundaries of the littoral cell, which we were talking about earlier: it's basically a unit in the ocean, a sand circulation unit. They're bound by headlands, they're bound by submarine canyons or things like that, natural areas that contain these littoral cells. That's how these projects are mostly defined. So you have a San Francisco littoral cell which is from the southern Golden Gate down to Point San Pedro. We have another cell that starts a little bit further south at Half Moon Bay, and it goes down to Moss Landing. That cell is being looked at in a different way. Each one of the cells has its own plan like this that's being looked at. There's not one cookie cutter to fit all of them obviously, because they have different needs and geologies, etc. What you're looking at right now, this stretch of Pacifica is part of a much bigger regional and much bigger statewide process that started about five years ago and will continue for another several years until the state has filled in all the gaps in understanding each cell.

Chuck Gust: The work that you're doing in Southern California, with the sand relocation -- are those areas going to be studied to see if they work? We just had a comment made about 'don't send sediment down the streams,' and somebody saying now that maybe that wasn't a good idea. So how do you know that what you're doing down there, and everything that you're moving around, is going to be the right thing in the next 5-6 years?

DG: To answer your question about [post-project] monitoring, I'm going to ask Clif Davenport, who is with the CSMW, to talk about what's going on in Southern California.

Clif Davenport, Department of Conservation and CSMW representative: We have three plans that have been completed to date: one is Southern Monterey Bay, the second one is Ventura-Santa Barbara Counties, the third one is San Diego County. The plans went through the process that you're going through right now and they came up with several recommendations that were based on the needs of that particular region. For example San Diego had a need for something like 400,000 yards of sand a year for a long period of time, and they felt that they needed 2,000,000 yards of sand to get caught back up to where they should be. They had a recent program where they had gone with 8 or 9 different beaches, and they procured sand from offshore -- we heard about it earlier – and they placed sand at these 7 or 8 different locations. That's part of what they decided they needed to do. Ventura and Santa Barbara was kind of a different situation, they had different physical processes going on there. They

didn't feel like they could just go and put the sand and leave it there, because the littoral drift and ocean currents would just basically wash it away unless they put some sort of retention structure there to intercept the sand and keep it from moving. So what they're focusing on is working with the land use agencies, flood control agencies, that sort of thing, trying to take advantage of opportunistic sediment that may be trapped in dams, debris basins, that sort of thing, and see if they can't get that to the beaches to keep the system going. The challenge of each of these plans is in the implementation and were' still working through those issues but we're basically trying to do all we can.

Q: It's ongoing, essentially?

CD: Definitely, it's ongoing, it's a living document, a living effort, adaptive management, however you want to characterize that; basically, you do something, you learn from it, you adjust, and you move to the next step.

Q: Of all the agencies involved, is the Coastal Commission involved in this?

AH: Yes, they're represented on the CSMW workgroup, and they're also part of the Stakeholder Advisory Group that is advising this plan.

Len Stone, City Council of Pacifica: I have a question about this process, and where this came from. Was there an Assembly bill that was passed? We have a lot of things that come down through ABAG or CCAG or what have you, like AB32, or at the county level, and we all can point to the legislation or the body that set that in motion. Can you help me out with that?

CD: Back in the '90s, there were a number of different types of sediment management plans trying to address coastal erosion or wetlands that were filling up too fast or whatever that was going on, and people were looking at it on a site-specific basis: meaning OK, we have erosion here, let's just fix the problem right here. They weren't taking a more holistic view to figure out what's the cause, why is it eroding, is there some sort of regional imbalance that's going on, such as the loss of sediment to the coast that these guys have talked about before. Folks started realizing that we need to do that, we need to start looking at things more regionally, trying to understand what's going on as a basis, and instead of trying to fix just one little problem here let's try to fix the bigger problem, and that will take care of the smaller problem. In 1999 I believe, the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Agency signed a Memorandum of Understanding to implement this paradigm called Regional Sediment Management, which is basically trying to figure out if you have too much sediment over here and not enough sediment over here, let's try to solve both problems at the same time. As a result of that, the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup was formed. I started working for them in 2003. We had multiple thrusts that we were going after: we knew there were a lot of issues that people had questions on, like how do you get a beach nourishment project going, what are all the regulatory requirements that you have to deal with, how can we conduct these activity without causing harm to critters and habitat, all these different kinds of things. We worked on putting together documents compiled by our scientists and consultants that would address these different types of issues. And then we held a series of workshops along the California coast from San Diego to Eureka. We got people to come and talk to us and say, what are your issues, what are your concerns, we're trying to do this thing, what do you think? We got a lot of input,

and probably the single most repeated comment we got was, 'things are different in our region, our region is not like the next region, we have our own set of problems, and we need solutions that are specific to this particular region.' So we said, OK, we want to do this statewide plan, but clearly we can't do the whole state at one time, so let's chop the state up into sections, let's look at these problems on a regional basis, and try to figure out solutions region by region. That's where the idea of a Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan came about. Each plan was focused, like Doug just said, on a physical boundary or a political division that included at least a littoral cell because we felt that a littoral cell was the minimum planning area that made sense.

LS: So basically from a Memorandum of Understanding of the Corps of Engineers in 1999?

CD: It was between the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Agency in about 1999 – it might have been 1998 -- somewhere in the late 90s.

LS: Is there federal funding?

CD: There is both federal and state funding.

John Dingler: The Corps of Engineers has an item in their annual budget, actually a line item; so we get a certain level of funding. And then the State through the Natural Resources Agency (CIAP) gets a certain amount of funding. We work together to maximize, to get maximum value for those dollars.

AH: We are over time. I see a few people have additional questions. I see additional people – let's take those three questions, and then we'll adjourn. I know this is a long night for people.

Courtney Conlon: I just have a question about the groups that were brought together up and down the coast, what type of representation of groups did you bring together from the 90s up through this time. We representing the business community don't feel like we had any representation at all, until now, and I'm glad we're here because we're now feeling the importance of us being part of this process.

CD: I understand, and we're glad you're here. The way that we went through the process of trying to figure out the participants in each one of these coastal RSM plans was, we did two things: we developed a Stakeholder Advisory Group, we looked to local agencies and regional entities and NGOs as a first cut to participate and brainstorm with us on the practical applications, regulatory considerations, the kinds of things that agency staff could bring to the table to help figure out how they could happen. The second thing that we did was to hold a series of public meetings such as what we're doing right now to try to get local folks, such as yourself, business folks, to come to the meetings. The biggest challenge has always been to try get the word out, and get the people to attend, and I gotta throw kudos to Athena because I think she's done a heck of a job in getting the word out and getting folks to attend this meeting. But basically it's kind of a two-prong approach. We've kind of adapted, we've morphed and figured out some things along the way, but that's basically how we go about trying to maximize our input.

Richard Harris: This is a question for Bob Battalio about the cliff erosion that you're seeing at Mori Point that he referred to. There was some beach buildup at Solana Beach that appears to be proliferating the

sand. A couple of questions about that: How significant is that beach buildup? Is it also feeding some kind of development of a bar offshore, and what are the implications of that for the survival of the existing levee at Solana Beach?

Bob: We are not collecting data offshore, into the surf zone for this project. We do have some data from USGS, so we have some idea of the way the bed is shaped at the time of deposition. But we actually don't know what happens offshore in a scientific sense. Having witnessed the sand accretion, I think that it's been beneficial to the area in terms of widening the beach and dissipating the waves. At one point the sand came up pretty high against the levee, and it looked like that caused the waves were running up close against the levee and allowing it to overtop. That could be considered negative, a very light overtopping. Overall I think it's probably a positive.

RH: Positive for protecting spots behind the levee?

BB: Yeah, the wider beach dissipates the incident waves and actually protects the levee. If you had this natural accretion, which would be similar to a beach nourishment operation, you place the sand, so in that way it's kind of similar to a mitigation.

AH: Thank you, last question.

Stan Zeavin: It's not a question, I would like to make a statement. I'm a resident here, and I don't know how this is all going to play out, but I can't believe there isn't a person in this room who doesn't want to get as much information as they can before these decisions have to be made. The bottom line is we're all, everyone sitting here, everybody in California, is going to have to pay for whatever is done, and we need to know where the money is best spent. People are going to be unhappy in certain areas and very happy in others and there's a point where, me personally, I don't want to pay for something that's going to cost $100 million to protect if it would cost $50 million to move the people. I don't know how this is going to work, I don't know how they're going to make the decisions, but let's collect the data and then have this discussion.

AH: Thank you very much.

AH: I did close the comment period, so that will be our final comment of the night. I wanted to briefly go over again the future of this process. Next steps will be for the consultant team to draft the first draft of the plan, that's coming together, anticipated over the next couple of months and we can expect to have a draft available for all of you to review and comment on. We'll have a comment opportunity when it's completed. If you are not on our email list, please do provide your information on the signup sheet. If there are people you know of that you would like to get information about this process, please take my card, which is on the back table, and have them get in touch with me to get on our email list, that's one of the best ways for people plug into this process. After that point, we'll be looking at a final plan some time later in the next year.

I appreciate all of you coming out; it really helps us to hear from you. Thank you for coming and spending your time with us and making your voices heard. Perhaps we'll see you again next year in our workshops for the plan draft and final plan.