# Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup
# San Francisco Littoral Cell
# Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

# Public Meeting Summary

| **Thursday, January 14, 2016**<br>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.<br>United Irish Cultural Center<br>2700 45th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94116 | **Thursday, January 21, 2016**<br>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.<br>Little Brown Church<br>1850 Francisco Blvd, Pacifica, CA 94044 |
|---|---|

## I. Introduction – Meeting Overview and Participants

The Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW) held public meetings on January 14, 2016 in San Francisco and January 21, 2016 in Pacifica focused on the development of the draft San Francisco Littoral Cell (SFLC) Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP or Plan). The objectives of the public meetings were to:

- Provide an overview of the SFLC CRSMP, including its development process
- Review key contents of draft SFLC CRMSP
- Receive comments on the draft SFLC CRMSP and answer questions from meeting participants
- Describe next steps to revise the Plan

The agendas for both meetings were identical and can be found in Appendix A.

In total, over 35 people attended the two public meetings. Participants included 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. The meetings were facilitated by Kearns & West. A full list of meeting participants is included in Appendix B.

This document was prepared by Kearns & West and summarizes the presentations made during the meetings, as well as questions and comments received and responses provided. It is not intended to serve as a detailed transcript of all comments made.

To begin, Eric Poncelet, facilitator, outlined meeting objectives, provided an overview of the workshop agenda, and proposed meeting ground rules. Chris Potter then made introductory comments.

## II. Overview of CSMW and SFLC CRSMP

John Dingler, Assistant Project Manager with the U.S Army Corps of Engineers' (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 and local jurisdictions. 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 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 highlighted four ongoing Sediment Management Plan (SMP) activities and products: California Beach Erosion Assessment Survey (2010); the CSMW WebMapper Tool and Coastal Sediment References Database; Public Outreach including multiple workshops; and Coastal RSM Plans and environmental documents.

John noted that CRSMPs are not a prescriptive or one-size-fits-all documents but rather present scenarios and a suite of scientifically and engineeringly sound options. The purpose of the Plan is to make stakeholders aware of the situation.

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

*San Francisco Meeting*

- Question (Q): How have CRSMPs worked in regions with completed Plans?
    - Response (R): There's been a lot of success in the Southern Monterey Bay Littoral Cell, in part because of the (National) Marine Sanctuary. Santa Barbara has many sand projects on the beach.
    - R: In San Diego and Santa Barbara, plans have enjoyed strong local support. Each region has an organization, in this case a Joint Powers Authority (or JPA) that has gone to great lengths to implement: SANDAG in San Diego, and BEACON in Santa Barbara.
- Q: Is San Francisco a Beach Erosion Concern Area (BECA)?
    - R: Individual areas, such as Ocean Beach, have been defined as BECAs. CSMW is seeking feedback on the current BECA sites.

*Pacifica Meeting*

- Q: Is GGNRA part of the CSMW?
    - R: Yes.
- Q: Is the CSMW funded to conduct projects?
    - R: On the federal side, CSMW planning and tools represent a project. The State of California and USACE have a 50/50 cost-share agreement for development of the Sediment Master Plan.

## III. Key Content of the SFLC CRSMP

John Dingler explained the San Francisco Littoral Cell is a stretch of coast from Golden Gate in San Francisco to Point San Pedro in Pacifica that is bounded by features that contain the sand in that area, such as Headlands and Submarine Canyons.

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 Dingler reviewed the contents of the draft Plan. He then described the CSMW's public engagement efforts in 2012 that informed the development of the draft SFLC CRSMP. These 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. The draft Plan was released on January 4, 2016, and will undergo a 30-day public comment period. [Note: this review period was expanded to 45 days with a comment due date of February 17, 2016.]

John again highlighted that the Plan is <u>not</u> a list of pre-approved projects; it is a guidance document. The consultant that wrote the Plan, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), modeled the coastline in 2050 according to projected sea level rise, in various management scenarios, such as do nothing and with beach nourishment. One of the outcomes of the draft Plan is a summary of types of responses that local jurisdictions may choose from. Examples of critical erosion locations include the failed parking lot south of Sloat Blvd.; a landslide area in Daly City; Beach Blvd.; Manor District; and the south end of Linda Mar.

*Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses regarding key content of the SFLC CRSMP*

*San Francisco Meeting*

- Q: Even though the inshore sand at South Ocean Beach has moved elsewhere, at low tide the waves continue to break on the same offshore sandbars as 50 years ago. Thus, why install a reef in that location?
    - R: Recommendations in that area would be more along the lines of beach nourishment or managed retreat.
- C: It seems that beach nourishment should be the first step at South Ocean Beach. There's a large volume of sand available for beach nourishment, and there are stable sand bars already present.
    - R: There are many factors to consider. We would like to see serious beach nourishment, but it hasn't yet been done. It's a difficult though not impossible endeavor to move sand onto the beach with large waves present.
- Q: Is there an estimate of the cost to do this kind of beach nourishment? Sand would remain in place on South Ocean Beach in between El Niño winters.

    - R: Specifically in the Sloat Blvd area, there's a divergence, and sediment never enters the area. Sand that is placed there will wash away and never be naturally replaced. One theory is that the sand bar is shrinking and retreating, which is only revealed through very accurate, long-term surveys.
- C: It seems as though the water is shallower than is used to be.
- C: How much would it cost to pump sand onto the beach near Sloat Blvd?
    - R: The USACE dredges 320,000 cubic yards on average. The location where we place it must be authorized. We have looked into the cost of pump it onto the beach. Including the piping and the work on the beach to move the sand around, the estimated cost is approximately $5 million for 300,000 cubic yards.
- Q: Due to economies of scale, if you have a greater volume of sand, would the cost decrease?
    - R: The USACE has access to the dredge for two weeks per year, and get 300,000 cubic yards of sand working 24-hours per day during that two-week period. If we were to pump sand onto the beach, we would spread it out over two or three years, so the beach might receive 100,000 cubic yards per year. Additionally, the dredge master/captain must decide whether he is comfortable with leaving the dredge hooked up to the pipe.

*Pacifica Meeting*

- Q: The Old Martin's Beach south of the tunnel has poor access. Is this an issue for which the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) could reference the CSMW's work to get better access?
    - R: No. The SFLC CRSMP is intended to help decision makers understand current conditions and what projects others could implement in the future to improve conditions.
- Q: Will the next round of congressional spending tie San Mateo County's Sea Change program and the CRSMP effort together?
    - R: We don't know when that will happen or what it will look like. The State Master Plan will make recommendations, but there's no certainty about the outcome. The State of California and other agencies have been pursuing funding for the next phase, for project implementation.
- Q: Were sand reefs created at Ocean Beach?
    - R: The USACE has placed material near the beach for nourishment at Ocean Beach, but hasn't created any actual reefs.

## IV. <u>SFLC CRSMP Governance and Next Steps in the Plan Development Process</u>

Eric Poncelet, Kearns & West, presented on the Governance chapter of the draft Plan, which looks at ways in which jurisdictions could work together to support the Plan. Eric 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 as a JPA. This governance approach changed, so Kearns & West and the CSMW explored a number of different options for governance structures that might work, including: status quo, creating a coordinating network, identification of a lead agency, creating a new or modifying an existing Special District, and creating a new or modifying an existing JPA. The Governance chapter outlines the pros and cons associated with each governance approach. Eric noted that the SFLC CRSMP is intended to support informed and coordinated decision making for regional and local agencies, and bring communities together to discuss funding; this is crucial and has worked in Southern California.

Eric explained that given that sediment management transcends jurisdictional boundaries, it is important that governance facilitates cross-jurisdictional cooperation. Through a series of governance interviews, Kearns & West did not see the appetite for leadership by any single agency, but rather saw that governance would be effective if several agencies step up to work together and coordinate well. The Governance chapter recommends increased coordination and some level of commitment through establishment of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Understanding (MOU). Eric noted that the CSMW would convene a governance meeting later in January to explore possible next steps for ongoing governance after the Plan is finalized.

Next steps in the Plan development process include:

- **Public review:** The draft SFLC CRSMP will undergo a 30-day public review period, which began on January 4, 2016. [Note: the CSMW extended this to a 45-day review period]
- **Governance meeting:** During the 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 public review period, the CSMW will incorporate public comments into the Plan as appropriate, and will then release the final version of the Plan. The SFLC CRSMP will ultimately be incorporated into the California Coastal Sediment Master Plan.

Eric described four ways to provide public comment: Online or via a written comment card at a public meeting, email, or postal mail.

*Summary of Clarifying Questions and Responses regarding SFLC CRSMP governance and next steps*

*San Francisco Meeting*

- Q: To what degree are relevant jurisdictions concerned with this topic?
    - R: In the past, jurisdictions weren't very concerned with prioritizing sediment management, but that is changing.
    - R: The CSMW is comprised of state and federal agencies, including the California Coastal Commission, GGNRA, USACE, and Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). Agencies participate in the CSMW because they are concerned with regional sediment management. This concern doesn't mean that agencies have the money for coastal sediment management or that they are in full agreement. Each agency must uphold its legal charges.
- C: San Francisco Bay is a large river mouth. Humans have interfered with the natural flow of sand from the Bay to outer coastal areas. If any kind of coordinating network is formed, should it coordinate all the way from the Sierras, and look at the whole picture?
    - R: The Plan needs to have a strong linkage to other regions.
- Q: The State of California has no interest in leading this? It seems clear that the state needs to take the lead on this.
    - R: The CSMW is the State of California's primary avenue for coastal sediment management. The state will provide funding for coastal sediment management projects through one of its departments.
    - R: Collaboration will grow more effectively from the ground up than from a lead agency down.

*Pacifica Meeting*

- C: I'm chair of San Mateo County's City and County Association of Governments (CCAG), an

existing JPA that has been working on governance with Supervisors Pine and Horsely. We're looking at options to form a governance structure for unified management of the bay side and the coast side. We're presently assembling information. Sea level rise threatens the economy, recreation, and coast, and needs a coordinated approach. I would like CSMW to present its work to CCAG. I'm pleased that CSMW has incorporated input from the community. CCAG is also very interested in unification across districts, beyond emergency responses.

- Q: Is there a list of responses that cities should or should not take that will impact the cities next to them? This would help provide guidance while jurisdictions are addressing governance and inter-jurisdictional collaboration. If there's something that a city shouldn't do, the city should know that as soon as possible.
    - R: CSMW will address this subject through the Master Plan. As a rule, cities shouldn't proceed with projects without consulting nearby cities.
- C: Regional awareness is an important aspect of governance.

## V. General Comments and Clarifying Questions

*San Francisco Meeting*

- Q: Does a large volume of sand leave the Bay?
    - R: There are varied perspectives on this question.
- C: The Plan refers to annual erosion and accretion. I don't think this happens annually; rather, large El Niño storms, with winds blowing south to north, are the mechanism that moves sand from south to north.
- C: Managed retreat causes concern for some members of the public.
- C: There are many more visitors to the beach than what is recorded in the draft Plan. The Plan's visitor numbers are outdated.
    - R: GGNRA shared the same comment and provided the CSMW with updated visitor information.

*Pacifica Meeting*

- C: I live on the coast. Pacifica is in danger of losing its beaches due to sea level rise. Sharp Park has its own lagoon. Why hasn't this been included in the CRSMP? We have at least one useful wetland here in Pacifica. Why wasn't the wetland included in the choices in the plan?
    - R: CRSMPs look at the sand beaches and not the natural areas set back from the coast. However, this is evolving. Perhaps the state plan will address that.
    - R: There is a difference between the Sharp Park wetland and the bayside wetlands. The wetland near Sharp Park is smaller and would be more sight-specific than the focus of this Plan.
    - R: The economic analysis includes the backshore land values. The plan authors didn't know how to assign a dollar value the ecology of the wetlands.
- Q: What is the best way for Pacifica to save the beaches that it can save, and sustain them for as long as possible?
    - R: There are at least three hotspots of erosion: Pacifica, Mirada Road, and Highway 1 at Surfers' Beach. The California Coastal Commission allows the repair of these hotspots, which are emergencies. The promenade sea wall is being undermined and turning into a sinkhole. Mirada Road is beginning to erode, and the County and State government is seeking permission to repair the road. The California Coastal Commission, which doesn't allow preemptive actions, seems to be the most important agency for the implementation of actions in these plans.

    - R: ESA is involved in a number of LCPs across the state. Many are at the level of vulnerability assessment, like San Mateo County. The LCPs are a way to develop a long-term plan that the California Coastal Commission will support. This regional sediment management is intended to be synergistic with the LCPs. For projects, agencies are beginning with vulnerability assessments and then following with adaptation planning. San Francisco is incorporating its adaptation strategy into its LCP. Until regional sediment management plans are assembled, together, agencies will operate on an emergency basis.
- C: It seems prudent to have an interim plan, which the California Coastal Commission could reference. This could help move us towards a more coordinated approach.
    - R: The CRSMP doesn't recommend specific actions. Any solution will take time to plan and implement. At Ocean Beach, there is an interim management plan for placing sand and monitoring erosion. The interim plan came about after the long-term plan. Hopefully the San Mateo County Sea Change initiative will help move towards a long-term plan.
- C: Pacifica residents are asking for an extension on the SFLC CRSMP public review period. This will help encourage the public to submit comments and ideas on the Plan.
    - R: The CSMW has received other requests as well and is able to grant an additional two weeks of review. The new comment deadline will be February 17, 2016.
- C: My concern is the California Coastal Commission. How would the Coastal Commission issue a permit without a plan for doing so?
    - R: The California Coastal Commission doesn't adopt the CRSMPs. No agencies on the CSMW are committed to any plans; their role is to provide information. The CRSMPs are intended to inform the LCPs, which the Coastal Commission will eventually adopt.
- Q: San Francisco has been replenishing its beaches for a long time. Where does the sand go?
    - R: There has not actually been much re-nourishment at Ocean Beach. USACE is putting sand in the near shore (less than 35 feet of water) but can't determine whether that sand moves onto the beach. Sand moves up and down the coast.
    - R: A lot of sand has ended up at North Ocean Beach. A lot of sand has moved away from the Crissy Field area.
- Q: At three different points in the draft Plan, Sharp Park and Lindamar Beach are shown to have a positive net benefit for taking action. It looks like there is no other place in the SFLC where there is any net positive economic benefit from any of these measures. It seems like we should emphasize this for Pacifica.
    - R: Sea level rise will cause negative economic benefits.
- Q: Is it common practice for agencies upstream to prevent sediment from traveling downstream?
    - R: Yes, this is a trend and a problem that creates erosion.
- Q: Will it be possible to overlay CSMW's GIS tool with Arcadis for San Mateo County's Sea Change initiative? I'd like to see them compared.
    - R: Yes, those layers can be downloaded from the CSMW website.

# Appendix A – SFLC CRSMP Public Meeting Agenda

Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup

## Agenda

### Public Meetings for
### San Francisco Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

| **Thursday, January 14, 2016**<br>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.<br>United Irish Cultural Center<br>2700 45th Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94116 | **Thursday, January 21, 2016**<br>6:00 to 8:00 p.m.<br>Little Brown Church<br>1850 Francisco Blvd, Pacifica, CA 94044 |
|---|---|

**Meeting Objectives**

- Provide an overview of the San Francisco Littoral Cell (SFLC) Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP), including its development process
- Review key contents of the draft SFLC CRMSP
- Receive comments on the draft SFLC CRMSP and answer questions from meeting participants

**Agenda**

| Time | Topic | Presenter(s) |
|---|---|---|
| *5:45 p.m.* | *Arrivals* | |
| 6:00 p.m. | **Welcome and Introductions**<br>• Overview of meeting objectives, agenda, ground rules | • Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW)<br>• Facilitator |
| 6:10 p.m. | **Overview of SFLC CRSMP**<br>• Plan development process<br>• Why is the SFLC CRSMP important? | • CSMW<br>• All |
| 6:25 p.m. | **Key Contents of SFLC CRSMP** | • CSMW<br>• All |
| 6:50 p.m. | **Comments and Clarifying Questions**<br>*Discussion Questions*<br>• Does the draft SFLC CRSMP achieve its intended purpose?<br>• Is the information in the draft SFLC CRSMP still current and useful?<br>• Is the information in the draft SFLC CRSMP consistent with other related plans and efforts? Should any information be changed to make it more consistent? | • All |
| 7:50 p.m. | **Next Steps and Closing Remarks** | • CSMW |
| *8:00 p.m.* | *Adjourn* | |

# Appendix B – List of SFLC CRSMP Public Meeting Participants

| Last Name | First Name | Organization |
|---|---|---|
| *San Francisco* | | |
| Dingler | John | USACE/CSMW |
| Golomb | Julia | Kearns & West |
| Holl | Dennis | Resident/Surfer |
| Loy | Charlie | Loy Landscapes |
| Orbelian | George | Surfer/Author |
| Poncelet | Eric | Kearns & West |
| Potter | Chris | California Natural Resource Agency/CSMW |
| Reed | George | Supervisor Jane Kim |
| Skain | Pat | Pine Lake Park Neighborhood |
| Stark | James | Country Club Acres |
| Zaga | Maureen | Local resident |
| *Pacifica* | | |
| Anda | Gilbert | Pacifica property owner |
| Adams | Lynn | Pacifica Beach Coalition |
| Battalio | Bob | Environmental Science Associates (ESA) |
| Davenport | Clif | CSMW |
| Dingler | John | USACE/CSMW |
| Donguines | Raymund | City of Pacifica |
| Ellis | Bill | Pacifica Resident |
| Flores | Vicki | Pacifica Chamber of Commerce |
| Gettleman | Ben | Kearns & West |
| Goodall | M | PSA |
| Gost | Chuck | Nick's Restaurant |
| Hunter | Chris | San Mateo County, Supervisor Don Horsley's Office |
| Keener | John | Pacifica City Council |
| LaClair | Joe | San Mateo County Planning |
| Meyerhoff | Bill | Seaview / Pacifica Chamber of Commerce |
| Mothershead | Tatum | City of Daly City |
| Nihart | Mary Ann | Pacifica City Council |
| Northrop | Jane | Pacifica Tribune |
| O'Campo | Van | City of Pacifica |
| O'Connor | Dave | Pacifica resident |
| Petersen | Barbara | SPBWGC |
| Peterson | Gus | San Mateo County SCR VARWG |
| Poncelet | Eric | Kearns & West |
| Renlis | Claudia | Pacifica Beach Coalition |
| Smolicerg | Mark | Bradford Park HOA |
| Smolicerg | Sharon | Bradford Park HOA |
| Zeavin | Stan | Pacifica |