



**Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup
San Francisco Littoral Cell
Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan
Public Meeting Summary**

DATE: Tuesday, December 2, 2015
WORKSHOP: 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
LOCATION: Pacifica Community Center
540 Crespi Drive, Pacifica, CA 94044

I. Introduction – Meeting Overview and Participants

The Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW) held a public meeting on December 2, 2015 focused on the development of the draft San Francisco Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (SFLC CRSMP). During the meeting, CSMW members provided an overview of the SFLC CRSMP, including its purpose and key components. The meeting also included an update on the SFLC CRSMP development process to date, as well as next steps in the Plan development process. The meeting agenda can be found in Appendix A.

The stated objectives of the public meeting were to:

1. Provide an overview of the CSMW and the SFLC CRSMP, including its purpose and key components;
2. Provide an update on the SFLC CRSMP development process to date;
3. Discuss next steps, including release and public review of the draft Plan;
4. Share information about other recent local coastal planning efforts; and
5. Answer questions from meeting attendees.

Over 35 people attended the meeting, including members of the general public, staff from the City of Pacific and San Mateo County, representatives from regional, state and federal agencies, local elected officials and their staff, representatives from local nonprofit organizations, CSMW members, supporting consultants, and local press. A full list of meeting participants is included in Appendix B.

This document summarizes the presentations made during the workshop, as well as questions and comments received and responses provided. It is not intended to serve as a detailed transcript of all comments made. Pacific Coast Television filmed the meeting, and a link to the video is available on the SFLC CRSMP project webpage (www.sfestuary.org/coastal-regional-sediment-management-plan-2015-16).

To begin the meeting, Eric Poncelet, consultant (facilitator) with Kearns & West, welcomed attendees and introduced CSMW co-chair Chris Potter. Chris provided brief opening remarks on behalf of the CSMW and invited other CSMW members in attendance to introduce themselves. Eric Poncelet recognized elected officials and representatives of elected officials in attendance, including Pacifica Mayor Pro Tem Sue Digre, Pacifica Councilmember John Keener, and Chris Hunter on behalf of San

Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley. Michael Barber, on behalf of San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine, also participated in the meeting.

Eric then reviewed the meeting objectives and provided an overview of the workshop agenda and proposed meeting ground rules.

II. Overview of CSMW and SFLC CRSMP

John Dingler, Assistant Project Manager, USACE San Francisco District, presented overview slides, including background on the CSMW, regional sediment management, the purpose of the SFLC CRSMP, and its key components. The CSMW is a state-wide collaborative taskforce of state, federal, regional, and local entities concerned with the adverse impacts of coastal erosion on coastal habitats. John invited attendees to visit the CSMW website (www.dbw.ca.gov/csmw) for more information about its work. John then displayed a map of California regions that have completed or are currently developing a CRSMP. He explained that the network of CRSMPs will collectively inform development of a Sediment Master Plan, which will address the entire California coast from a regional perspective and support coastal sediment management project implementation.

John explained that the state Sediment Master Plan is a compilation of coastal regional sediment management plans (CRSMPs), and that it includes all the information and guidance documents compiled and available in the CSMW library. The purpose of CRSMPs is to provide sufficient information for decision makers to develop policies or execute projects for the future vitality of the entire California Coast, particularly in the context of sea level rise. In addition, CRSMPs benefit homeowners, communities, and cities by helping to protect built structures from washing away and improving and maintaining safety of public access.

John further explained that the SFLC CRSMP is important to local jurisdictions because it will: support regional management of sand where sand moves from one jurisdiction to another; support economies of scale; and help agencies and jurisdictions to access more funding for sediment management. Additionally, state grant programs for Local Coastal Program (LCP) updates to address sea level rise encourage communities to include regional sediment management in their LCP updates. John noted that the CRSMP is not a prescriptive or one-size-fits-all document.

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses regarding the CSMW and SFLC CRSMP

- Question (Q): What is the relationship between the California Coastal Commission and this process? Do CSMW and the Coastal Commission share definitions as to what is and is not considered a coastal resource?
 - Response (R): At the staff level, the Coastal Commission's coastal engineer and coastal geologist are active members of the CSMW. To some degree the Coastal Commission and CSMW use the same vernacular. The Coastal Commission is a regulatory body, whereas the CRSMP is not prescriptive, but rather serves as a guidance document.
 - R: Agencies, including the Coastal Commission, are not bound by CSMW recommendations. They still need to follow their own rules and regulations. As such, the CSMW needs agencies to participate in Plan development.
 - R: CRSMPs are developed at the regional level, with local communities contributing their thoughts in concert with the advice of consultants and technical experts. The Coastal

Commission has not yet seen the draft Plan. To enact recommendations from the Plan, communities would need to work with the Coastal Commission. (Brenda Goeden, BCDC)

- Q: Will the SFLC CRSMP be voted on? Will the public have the opportunity to provide input on the Plan?
 - R: The SFLC CRSMP is a guidance document, intended to convey the present state of coastal sediment within the SFLC, what will likely happen in 50 years if no action is taken, and what kinds of reasonable engineering approaches may be available for different parts of the Plan area. The purpose of the Plan is to inform local jurisdictions about the situation and options they may pursue, and then the local jurisdictions will decide what they want to do.
- Q: Can you provide an example of what has happened elsewhere after a CRSMP has been completed?
 - R: BEACON, a joint powers authority (JPA) in Santa Barbara County, is a good example. The completed BEACON CRSMP identifies a number of alternatives for addressing erosion issues, and was followed up with a strategic initiative plan that includes a series of projects identified as important for the community to prioritize, such as work with local watersheds and beach nourishment. Also, San Diego County (through SANDAG, a JPA) used information from its CRSMP to help prioritize beaches for nourishment.
- Q: We know of examples in Southern California where communities use a CRSMP to raise money for beach nourishment. Has anyone used a CRSMP to affect local coastal planning?
 - R: The draft Plan for Eureka is serving as a launch pad for sea level rise adaptation planning in Humboldt Bay. Sediment management projects have been initiated following discussions within that draft Plan.

III. SFLC CRSMP Development to Date and Next Steps

John Dingler presented key information that will be included in the draft Plan. He clarified that the Plan is based on existing information, and that the consultant that drafted the Plan was not charged with conducting additional scientific or technical research. As time goes on and more technical information becomes available, the Plan could be updated to reflect new information. John explained that the plan is not a list of pre-approved projects. He described how the information contained in the Plan links to other coastal programs and planning, including local coastal programs, sea level rise, coastal resiliency, and the San Francisco Bay CRSMP which is being led by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC).

John reviewed the contents of the draft Plan. He then described CSMW's engagement steps from 2012 to inform the development of the draft SFLC CRSMP, which included public meetings, Stakeholder Advisory Group meetings, a municipal workshop, and meetings with staff from the cities of Pacifica, Daly City, and San Francisco.

John explained that in 2012, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) was presumed to be the agency that would lead governance for the SFLC CRSMP. This governance approach changed, which led to a project hiatus until fall 2015 when CSMW was able to obtain funding to hire Kearns & West to help develop a governance structure for the SFLC CRSMP. At this point, development of the preliminary draft Plan has resumed, with a particular focus on governance.

Eric Poncelet presented on next steps to complete the draft Plan. He shared that governance is the final chapter in need of completion. Eric stated that Kearns & West and CSMW are currently exploring

potential governance structures for the SFLC CRSMP. He explained that given that sediment management transcends jurisdictional boundaries, it is important that governance supports cross-jurisdictional cooperation.

Once the governance chapter is completed, next steps in the Plan development process include:

- **Public review:** The draft SFLC CRSMP is anticipated to be released for public review on January 4, 2016, and will undergo a 30-day public review period.
- **Public meetings:** In January, during the 30-day review period, the CSMW will host two public meetings to solicit input on the draft Plan.
- **Governance meeting:** During the 30-day review period, the CSMW will host a meeting with jurisdictions to discuss governance options for the SFLC CRSMP.
- **Final version of the Plan:** Following the January public review period, the CSMW will incorporate public comments into the Plan, and will then release the final version of the Plan. The SFLC CRSMP will ultimately inform the California Coastal Sediment Master Plan.

Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses on SFLC CRSMP Development and Next Steps

- C: Hilary Papendick, staff member from San Mateo County, described the County's coastal planning efforts. The County received funding to conduct a study of what types of assets (built, natural, community) are at risk of impact from sea level rise. The County has developed maps and a list of assets by city, and plans to share this information at a public workshop on January 23, 2016. The website seachangesmc.com contains information regarding a vulnerability assessment, which will in turn inform adaptation planning steps throughout the County. The County is also coordinating with the CSMW in the SFLC CRSMP development process.
- Q: With information from San Mateo County's study, what percentage of the SF Littoral Cell is already armed for sea level rise, and how does that compare to other similarly developed littoral cells? Are you looking at how armed areas affect non-armed areas?
 - R: This information can be found in the draft Plan. In developing hazard zones, the consultant identified length and type of structures. Existing structures are considered in the no-action alternative, in terms of how they inform the presence or absence of long-term erosion. The Plan does not go into detail regarding what happens in the area where a structure ends and leaves a non-structured length of coast.
 - R: CSMW [Web Mapper](#) is an additional resource that shows where armoring exists. Web Mapper contains a data layer that depicts armoring in San Francisco and statewide.
- Q: For at-risk areas, the Plan offers certain solutions and it is up to the community to determine which option to use. Does the Plan go into detail about the outcome of each option, or is the option simply listed?
 - R: The Plan does not present great detail, but does provide information about how an area would respond. For instance, beach nourishment is a way to delay coastal erosion because it provides a wider stretch of beach that will protect the back portion of beach. However, when a community is considering implementing a response, it will need to work with a consultant to develop detailed plans and at that point the community will receive more information.
- Q: Looking at old photos of Pacifica, you see areas that once had houses, but where houses no longer stand because they fell into the sea in the 1990s. Yet it seems that things have not changed as much as in the south end of Pacifica as they have in the north end. Is this something that the CSMW is able to identify? It seems there are two different processes taking place, based on geography. What is the connection to climate change?

- R: Climate change is considered in the report. Different stretches of coast respond differently because of different types of coastal setting, and different near shore bathymetry. Impact to stretches with many homes is more noticeable than impact to stretches with fewer homes. In the report, the consultant highlighted and focused on several coastal areas of high concern. The Manor District is an area of high concern.
- Comment (C): Brenda Goeden of BCDC provided an update on the San Francisco Bay RSMP planning effort, and how it relates to the SFLC CRSMP. The bay side Plan is different from an outer coast plan because the San Francisco Bay is enclosed and supports activities that don't take place on the outer coast (e.g., marsh restoration, refineries, dredging). The Bay RSMP must address how to get enough sediment onto the marshes to allow them to keep up with sea level rise. The Central San Francisco Bay (lower Marin, Corte Madera to Oakland) is the target for BCDC's work through CSMW because it is the sandier portion – and sand is CSMW's focus. BCDC hopes to complete the draft Plan by the end of 2015, followed by a review process through CSMW and other agencies, followed by public review in spring 2016.
- Q: Does this study talk about managed retreat?
 - R: Several types of potential actions are included in the Plan, including soft structures; do nothing; hard structures; and managed retreat, where a community plans over time to let the coastline move landward. Managed retreat is different than doing nothing because it entails active study and proactive steps, such as moving infrastructure. The Plan presents managed retreat as one option among others. Ultimately the community needs to decide what measures it will take.
- Q: What was the source of information for sea level rise?
 - R: A combination of USACE and the California state government's information was used and modeled along with historic erosion rates from USGS studies. For each scenario and alternative, the consultants modified the response according to conditions (whether it was armored, nourished, do-nothing, retreat). The consultants also conducted a complete economic and ecological analysis.
- C: It is important to emphasize that the Plan presents scenarios.

Appendix A – SFLC CRSMP Public Meeting Agenda

Public Meeting for SF Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

Wednesday, December 2, 2015

6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Pacifica Community Center – 540 Crespi Drive, Pacifica, CA 94044

Meeting Objectives

- Provide an overview of the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW) and the San Francisco Littoral Cell (SFLC) Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP), including its purpose and key components
- Provide an update on the SFLC CRSMP development process to date
- Discuss next steps, including release and public review of the draft Plan
- Share information about other recent local coastal planning efforts
- Answer questions from meeting attendees

Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter(s)
5:45 p.m.	<i>Arrivals</i>	
6:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Overview of meeting objectives, agenda, ground rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW)• Facilitator
6:10 p.m.	Overview of CSMW and SFLC CRSMP <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is a CRSMP?• Why is the SFLC CRSMP important?• What is in the Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CSMW• All
6:30 p.m.	SFLC CRSMP Development to Date and Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Recap of work accomplished• Incorporation of public input to date• Next steps, including release of Public Draft	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CSMW• All
6:50 p.m.	Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarifying questions and comments• Share information about other recent local coastal planning efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All
7:50 p.m.	Closing Remarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CSMW
8:00 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>	

Appendix B – List of SFLC CRSMP Public Meeting Participants

Last Name	First Name	Organization
Barker	Michael	San Mateo County
Battalio	Bob	Environmental Science Associates (ESA)
Butler	Bill	
Carmichael	Victor	CSFB 2.0
Darnell	Joel	Environmental Science Associates (ESA)
Davenport	Clif	California Geological Survey (CGS)
Digre	Sue	City of Pacifica City Council
Donguines	Raymund	City of Pacifica
Flores	Diana	Pacific Coast Television
Frappier	Jon	
Geneste	Paul	Pacifica
Gentry	Lisa	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Gettleman	Ben	Kearns & West
Golomb	Julia	Kearns & West
Halloran	Bill	Pacific Coast Television
Halloran	Eulalia	Pacifica resident
Harris	Richard	SF Public Golf Alliance
Hirst	Deborah	Supervisor Don Horsley's Office
Hunter	Chris	San Mateo County
Keener	John	Pacifica City Council
Kendall	Tom	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Lancelle	Julia	Pacifica Land Trust
Li	Simon	Pacific Coast Television
Murdock	Christian	City of Pacifica
Northrop	Jane	Pacifica Tribune
O'Brien	Patrick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
O'Brien	Michael	
O'Campo	Van	City of Pacifica
Papendick	Hilary	San Mateo County
Poncelet	Eric	Kearns & West
Potter	Chris	California Natural Resource Agency
Reidenauer	Jeff	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Robison	Rand	Pacifica
Shareghi	Allan	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Ward	Kristen	National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area
White	Louis	Environmental Science Associates (ESA)
Zeavin	Stan	Pacifica