



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

**Thursday, January 14, 2016**  
2:00 to 4:00 p.m.  
USACE San Francisco District  
1455 Market St., San Francisco, CA

**I. Introduction – Meeting Overview and Participants**

The Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW) held a Technical Review meeting on January 14, 2016 focused on technical and scientific aspects of the draft San Francisco Littoral Cell (SFLC) Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP or Plan).

The stated objectives of the meeting were to:

- 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 draft SFLC CRMSP and address questions from meeting participants

The agenda for the meeting is found in Appendix A.

Over 25 people attended the meeting, including staff from the cities of San Francisco and Pacifica, San Mateo County, representatives from regional, state and federal agencies, local elected officials and their staff, representatives from local nonprofit organizations, and CSMW members. A full list of meeting participants is included in Appendix B.

This document 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, consultant (facilitator) with Kearns & West, outlined meeting objectives, provided an overview of the workshop agenda, and proposed meeting ground rules. Eric explained that the Technical Review meeting would be supplemented by two public meetings, one in San Francisco and one in Pacifica.

**II. Overview of CSMW and SFLC CRSMP**

Chris Potter, California Natural Resources Agency and CSMW Co-Chair, introduced the CSMW members in the room. Meeting attendees then introduced themselves. Chris explained that the SFLC CRSMP is one of 11 regional sediment management plans that CSMW sponsored as part of development of a Sediment Master Plan for the state.

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](http://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 body of work including 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 erosion and improving and maintaining safety of public access.

John highlighted four ongoing sediment management plan activities and products: California Beach Erosion Assessment Survey (2010) and Beach Erosion Concern Areas (BECAs) to identify beaches of high concern; the CSMW WebMapper Tool and Coastal Sediment References Database; public outreach including multiple workshops; and CRSMPs and associated environmental documents.

John emphasized that the SFLC CRSMP is not a prescriptive or one-size-fits-all document but rather presents scenarios and a suite of scientifically and engineeringly sound options. The purpose of the Plan is to make stakeholders aware of the situation along with some options for remedy.

### **III. Key Content of the SFLC CRSMP**

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

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 then reviewed the contents of the draft Plan, walking through the various chapters. He again highlighted that the Plan is not a list of pre-approved projects; it is a guidance document. The consultant that wrote much of the draft 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 management responses to choose from. Examples of critical erosion locations include the failed parking lot south of Sloat Boulevard; a landslide area in Daly City; Beach Blvd; Manor District; and the south end of Linda Mar. In addition to identifying nine critical erosion locations in the SFLC, the Plan also

summarizes sediment management issues in each reach of SLFC, and includes photographs and economic valuation.

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

- Question (Q): What data were used for projected sea level rise?
  - Answer (A): National Research Council middle and high numbers.

#### **IV. SFLC CRSMP Governance and Next Steps**

Eric Poncelet 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) agreed to be the organization that would lead governance for the SFLC CRSMP as a JPA (Joint Powers Authority). This governance approach changed, which resulted in Kearns & West and the CSMW exploring a number of alternative options for governance structures that might work. The Governance chapter outlines the pros and cons associated with each governance approach, which include:

- No action (no governance structure for the Plan)
- Coordinating network (an informal network across relevant jurisdictions and agencies, with an MOA or MOU to facilitate ongoing discussion and coordination on coastal sediment management)
- Existing jurisdiction(s) serving as lead CRSMP governance agency
- Special District
- Joint Powers Authority

Eric explained that since sediment management transcends jurisdictional boundaries, it is important that governance structures facilitate cross-jurisdictional cooperation. Through a series of governance interviews, Kearns & West did not identify a single agency as the obvious candidate to assume this leadership role, but rather realized that governance would be effective if several agencies committed to improving their coordination. The recommendations section of the Governance chapter suggests that a coordinating network with commitments established through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and with some agencies taking a leadership role, currently might be most appropriate for the SFLC. Eric noted that the CSMW is planning to convene a governance meeting later in January to support a more in-depth governance discussion and initiate a suite of next steps for ongoing governance after the Plan is finalized.

#### **V. Next Steps in the Plan Review Process**

Eric Poncelet described four ways to provide public comment: [online](#) via the CSMW website; via a written comment card at a public meeting; by email to [jgolomb@kearnswest.com](mailto:jgolomb@kearnswest.com); or by postal mail.

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.
- **Public meetings:** In January, during the 30-day review period, the CSMW will host two public meetings (of which this meeting is the first) 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.

## VI. Comments and Discussion

Eric Poncelet invited comment and questions from the meeting participants. He also shared several discussion questions of interest to the CSMW:

- Does the draft Plan achieve its intended purpose?
- Is the information in the draft Plan still current and useful?
- Is the information in the draft Plan consistent with other related plans and efforts? Should any information be changed to make the Plan more consistent? Here, Eric noted the importance of dovetailing effectively with other local and regional efforts.

### *Summary of Comments, Clarifying Questions and Responses regarding SFLC CRSMP*

- Q: Would you consider extending the comment period? 30 days is not enough time for the City of Pacifica.
  - R: How much time is reasonable?
  - R (Van): 60 days would be more reasonable.
- Q: What can cities and agencies do to help people in the near term? Can an interim plan be developed? What is the role of regulatory agencies?
  - R: The need for an interim process has not come up much in the past; CSMW may be able to address this through the governance structure.
  - R: The objective of the Plan is to make people and jurisdictions more *aware* of the issues so that they can make informed responses, consider issues earlier, and respond earlier.
- C: Will the Plan make it harder for homeowners to obtain permits to do what they want on their property?
  - R: CRSMPs will not be adopted by a regulatory body. Nonetheless, this comment highlights a scenario in which a planning proposal deviates from the Plan, which could add complications for the community.
  - R: The purpose of the Plan is to provide a regional perspective, and not look at individual parcels.
  - C: These types of issues could be addressed by relevant agencies via the governance structure.
- C: San Francisco Bay and the San Francisco Open Coast are two adjacent CRSMPs that lack strong linkages in the Plan, particularly around sand mining in Bay and sediment movement across Golden Gate. The connections between the Bay and the Open Coast could be strengthened.
- C: The Plan would benefit by more clearly addressing the question of dredging the shipping channel in the ebb-tidal delta (i.e., the San Francisco Bar) and what can be done with that sediment.
- C: The geology section in the draft Plan currently does not reference an important study on local sediment sources to the Bay, and by inference to the Open Coast. The article is by Will Elder in Marine Geology:

*Elder, W.P., 2013, Bedrock geology of the San Francisco Bay Area: A local sediment source for bay and coastal systems; Marine Geology, p. 18-30.*

- C: Regarding the discussion of sand mining in San Francisco Bay, including the graphic on page 70 and language on pages 71-74: graphic figure 22 depicts a potential borrow site adjacent to the Golden Gate Bridge by Crissy Field. Since people use beaches there, taking sand from the adjacent beach would not be a good idea.
- C: 15% of the sand mined from San Francisco Bay is replenished. Mining sand near the harbor may exacerbate a difficult problem that has not yet been resolved. Recommending the harbor as a borrow site is not sound from a geological or regulatory perspective. She echoes the comment regarding Bay/Open Coast integration.
- C: Some of the beach visitor numbers cited in the Plan are outdated. The Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) can provide reports with updated numbers that are much higher. These include:
  - Baseline Shoreline Use Estimates for the Cosco Busan Oil Spill Damage Assessment, December 30, 2010; Prepared by Chris Leggett, Mark Curry, Nora Scherer, Industrial Economics, Incorporated
  - Assessment of Visitor Activities at Six Sites Within Golden Gate National Recreation Area, December 20, 2011; Prepared by Chris Leggett and Mark Curry, Industrial Economics, Incorporated
- C: It's Important to specify GGNRA's jurisdiction, which is ¼ mi offshore via State Lands Commission lease and jurisdiction inside the Bay. It would be helpful to describe this in more detail in the Plan.
- C: The Plan contains a statement about sediment behind dams in GGNRA. However there are no dams on GGNRA lands.
- C: On page 30, there is a statement that sea level rise has been minimal in Northern CA for various reasons; yet the sea level rise projections used in this report are in the medium to high range. Is there evidence that the factors that have kept sea level rise to a minimal level to date are changing?
  - R: Several recent reports indicate that these factors are changing. Because of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, sea level has been suppressed on the North American side of the Pacific, but this operates on a multi-decadal cycle and is currently changing; thus, faster-than-normal sea level rise is projected in next decade. John will send the citation.
- C: The selection of sensitive species in the Natural Resources section of the draft Plan is confusing. Does this collection of species fit the entire stretch of coast?
- C: The economic analysis in the draft Plan appears to be very limited. There are also concerns around the economic values, where some appeared to be very one-sided. For instance, providing recreation is expensive; as such, providing increased recreation would have increased costs.
- C: The Governance section is very good. It's not prescriptive, but lays out the possibilities very well.
- C: What authority will individual jurisdictions have? Will the Plan be implemented through the governance structure?
  - R: The Plan provides information that can inform decision-making, but jurisdictions make their own decisions. In some instances, it may make sense to look at a more regional level. The governance structure will create opportunities for different agencies to come together and find synergies in their work; this is consistent with the non-prescriptive nature of the Plan.

- R: The premise of the Plan is that regional problems are the source of coastal sediment management issues, and thus they can only be addressed through a regional approach. Economies of scale can be achieved in certain projects such as beach nourishment. There are a variety of advantages to a regional approach.
- C: The system is connected, and sediment moves from one site to another. Removing the project-by-project approach will help to address unintended consequences of activities that jurisdictions have historically conducted. One benefit of a regional approach is that if a community's activities are harming another community, they can come together to work on resolving it.
  - Q: Can you provide an example of this?
  - R: There are areas in which rip-rap at the bottom of a cliff starves beaches directly south of it.
- C: The indicator species for sensitive habitat that are listed in the Plan are not resident (i.e., present at all times). However, the area is critical habitat for black abalone. Kelp is also a good indicator species.

# Appendix A – SFLC CRSMP Technical Review Meeting Agenda



## Agenda

### Technical Review Meeting for San Francisco Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

Thursday, January 14, 2016

2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

USACE San Francisco District – 1455 Market St., San Francisco, CA  
Lobby Conference Room

#### 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 draft SFLC CRMSP
- Receive comments on draft SFLC CRMSP and answer questions from meeting participants

#### Agenda

Time	Topic	Presenter(s)
1:45 p.m.	<i>Arrivals</i>	
2:00 p.m.	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of meeting objectives, agenda, ground rules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW)</li> <li>• Facilitator</li> </ul>
2:10 p.m.	<b>Overview of SFLC CRSMP</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan development process</li> <li>• Why is the SFLC CRSMP important?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSMW</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
2:25 p.m.	<b>Key Contents of SFLC CRSMP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSMW</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
2:50 p.m.	<b>Comments and Clarifying Questions</b>  <i>Discussion Questions</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the draft SFLC CRSMP achieve its intended purpose?</li> <li>• Is the information in the draft SFLC CRSMP still current and useful?</li> <li>• 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?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All</li> </ul>
3:50 p.m.	<b>Next Steps and Closing Remarks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSMW</li> </ul>
4:00 p.m.	<i>Adjourn</i>	

## Appendix B – List of SFLC CRSMP Technical Review Meeting Participants

Last Name	First Name	Organization
<i>In Person</i>		
Aareberg	Arn	CDFW
Dingler	John	USACE/CSMW
Donguines	Raymund	City of Pacifica
Fiala	Shannon	California Coastal Commission
Göeden	Brenda	BCDC
Golomb	Julia	Kearns & West
Grant	Ben	SPUR
Harris	Richard	San Francisco Public Golf Alliance
Johnsson	Mark	California Coastal Commission
Mull	Peter	USACE
Ocampo	Van	City of Pacifica
Patton	Pamela	USACE
Poncelet	Eric	Kearns & West
Potter	Spencer	S.F. Park & Recreation Dept.
Potter	Chris	CSMW
Roche	Anna	SFPUC
Ward	Kristen	GGNRA
Wilkins	Eric	CDFW
Zogg	Maureen	SF Public Works
<i>By Phone</i>		
Barber	Michael	San Mateo County
Hines	Lorenzo	City of Pacifica
Huitt	Chris	State Lands Commission
Keener	John	Pacifica City Council
Kerbavaz	Joanne	California Department of Parks and Recreation
Ming	Susy	USACE, LA District
Mothershead	Tatum	City of Daly City
Papendick	Hilary	San Mateo County
Sokolove	Diana	City and County of San Francisco