



Meeting Summary

Governance Meeting for San Francisco Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

Tuesday, January 26, 2016
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

California Coastal Commission, 45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000, San Francisco, CA

Meeting Objectives, Agenda, and Participants

This meeting involved invited staff from relevant local, state, and federal agencies to explore the topic of governance in the context of the Draft San Francisco Littoral Cell (SFLC) Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP). The meeting's stated objectives included:

- Provide an overview of governance and its importance to regional coastal management
- Discuss regional coastal management roles, and needs expressed in initial discussions
- Discuss potential governance structure options (identified in draft governance chapter) and key considerations for identifying the appropriate option
- Identify next steps

Input received during the meeting will be used to inform the revision of the Governance chapter of the Draft SFLC CRSMP.

An agenda showing the flow of the discussion topics is in Appendix A. Meeting attendees are listed below.

First Name	Last Name	Agency/Organization
Clif	Davenport	CSMW/California Geological survey (via phone)
Raymond	Donguines	City of Pacifica
Shannon	Fiala	CA Coastal Commission
Ben	Gettleman	Kearns & West
Joanne	Kerbavaz	CA Department of Parks and Recreation (via phone)
Brenda	Goeden	Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Ben	Grant	SPUR (via phone)
Christopher	Huitt	State Lands Commission (via phone)
John	Keener	Pacifica City Council
Kelly	Malinowski	Coastal Conservancy
Teresa	Mothershead	City of Daly City (via phone)
Mary Ann	Nihart	Pacifica City Council (via phone)
Van	Ocampo	City of Pacifica (Public Works)
Steve	Ortega	National Parks Service (via phone)
Hilary	Papendick	San Mateo County Sea Change
Eric	Poncelet	Kearns & West
Chris	Potter	CA Natural Resources Agency

Spencer	Potter	San Francisco Parks and Recreation Department
Stephanie	Rexing	CA Coastal Commission
Anna	Roche	SFPUC
John	Roddy	City of San Francisco Attorney's Office
Sandy	Wong	CCAG (via phone)
James	Zoulas	USACE

Welcome and Introduction

The meeting was convened by Chris Potter of the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (CSMW)—a collaborative taskforce of state, federal and local/regional entities, concerned about adverse impacts of coastal erosion and excess sedimentation on coastal biota and habitats. The CSMW is co-chaired by the California Natural Resources Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, South Pacific Division. It was facilitated by Ben Gettleman and Eric Poncelet of Kearns & West.

Overview of Governance and its Importance to Regional Coastal Management

Ben Gettleman provided an overview presentation on the role of governance in the context of the SFLC CRSMP. He noted that governance is needed not to implement the SFLC CRSMP itself, since this Plan only provides guidance and does not contain projects for implementation, but rather to inform the implementation of future regional sediment management action among the jurisdictions involved in the SFLC.

Comments (C), Questions (Q), and Responses (R)

- (C): The slide recommending that regional coastal sediment management “not impede local efforts” is not necessarily true, given that the emphasis on the Plan should be at the regional level. Ben Gettleman confirmed that this statement was more of a finding expressed during some of Kearns & West’s assessment interviews and should not be viewed as a recommendation.

Regional Coastal Management Roles and Needs for the San Francisco Littoral Cell

Update on and discussion of current relevant coastal management and coordination efforts

Meeting participants provided updates on some of the local and regional coastal management and coordination efforts, including:

- **San Mateo County Sea Level Rise (SLR) Vulnerability Assessment.** Hilary Papendick described San Mateo County’s sea level rise (SLR) vulnerability assessment. The county is currently working with the technical firm, Arcadis, to conduct the assessment. The assessment is looking at assets (built, community, natural) at risk from SLR and 100-year storms. It is looking at 30 assets and vulnerabilities for the county, both on the open coast and the Bay shore. This assessment will lead into an Adaptation Planning phase, but there is no funding yet. San Mateo County will look to the State Coastal Conservancy for additional for funding. This planning phase will take 12-18 months. The county wants to develop something similar to SFPUC on capital planning guidance.
- **San Mateo County City and County Association of Governments (CCAG) Water Committee.** Mary Ann Nihart, the CCAG Water Committee chair, described CCAG’s effort to pull together elected officials and

technical staff to talk about water issues in San Mateo County. CCAG started out transportation focused; it now also focuses on energy, stormwater, groundwater, flood control, etc. SLR is but one facet of their purview. The Water Committee is trying to figure out its own governance component, similar to the SFLC CRSMP. They understand how actions in one jurisdiction can affect other jurisdictions. CCAG is still in a process of educating itself regarding other governance possibilities. They have learned from others like Sonoma County Water Agency (re: SLR, coastal erosion, etc.). All of the jurisdictions are on their own but need to be working together.

- ***Ocean Beach Master Plan.*** Ben Grant described how the Ocean Beach Master Plan (OBMP) came out in 2012. Its planning horizon is the year 2050, but it also includes an adaptation plan that looks out until 2100. Coordination is across different levels of government. GGNRA has jurisdiction at the coast, and SFPUC is responsible for waste water treatment along Ocean Beach. The plan is very geographically focused. Most of its governance falls under coordination among the involved entities. It has a Steering Committee that includes agency heads that meet quarterly to discuss issues. The Plan includes ad hoc working groups as well.
- ***SFPUC Pacific coastal adaptation actions.*** Anna Roche noted that SFPUC's current work on the coast is focused south of Sloat Boulevard. There is chronic erosion jeopardizing the Lake Merced Tunnel and the local waste water treatment plant. The SFPUC is taking a two-phased approach which includes adaptive management, sand nourishment, managed retreat, and a bounded sea wall. Construction is anticipated in 2019-2020. The SFPUC has also pursued a multi-year coastal development permit with the California Coastal Commission to do softer measures (e.g., beach nourishment, moving sand from north Ocean Beach to south Ocean Beach). The SFPUC is also working with USACE on an agreement to use sand dredged from San Francisco Bay (e.g., a cost share agreement to bring 300-400,000 cubic yards to South Ocean Beach). They are also currently doing a vulnerability assessment for SFPUC wastewater specific infrastructure and also working on a SLR action plan that will require additional vulnerability assessments (to get everyone on the same page), and will be doing a coastal adaptation plan later this summer. There is also a FEMA open coast study with important information for all. Ocean Beach work is a capital project implementing recommendations from the OBMP. The San Francisco Planning Department is the lead agency.
- ***San Francisco Bay CRSMP.*** Brenda Goeden described the San Francisco Bay-focused CRSMP, which is being led by BCDC. Current efforts include talking to cities and counties to determine beach erosion concern areas. One issue that has come up is that jurisdiction staff often don't view themselves as managing sediment issues. The jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay CRSMP overlaps a bit with the SFLC CRSMP. BCDC recently went through a long-term sand mining permitting process and is currently doing studies on sand transport issues and benthic analyses. 2-3 million cubic yards of sand/mud is dredged per year, and this is a key issue facing sediment management in the Bay. BCDC is trying to reuse all of it, although USACE is required to dispose some outside of Bay rather than reuse. BCDC is also doing marsh restoration that is linked to sediment. BCDC also has an "Adapting to Rising Tides" project focused on SLR and convened a workshop on sediment transport and risks in the Bay in October 2015. Governance-related items affecting the San Francisco Bay CRSMP include the following:
 - The agencies responsible for dredging, sand mining, and sand placement include USACE, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), EPA, and BCDC (these agencies are also on the Long Term Management Strategy Management Committee).

- Additional coordination with the Long Term Management Strategy is also being focused up the Delta. EPA and USACE have jurisdiction in the Delta, so BCDC needs to serve in an advisory capacity in the Delta, since it has no jurisdiction there. Jurisdictional boundaries of the two RWQCBs and USACE are also complicating factors; multiple Boards and regions need to work together effectively.
- BCDC wants to be involved in governance that affects cross-over between San Francisco Bay and the outer coast.
- There will be a BCDC Commission hearing soon to look at current findings (2/4). The Draft San Francisco Bay CRSPM will be presented to Commission at a future meeting.

Q: Are these various plans and studies guidance docs or requirements? Responses included:

- R: The San Mateo County SLR vulnerability assessment is just an assessment. It will include some high level recommendations. An Adaptation Plan will also eventually be produced which will likely include implementable strategies, but it is not a General Plan or Local Coastal Plan (LCP). We will need to tie it in to other plans.
- R: CCAG's Water Committee is currently in the information gathering stage. The goal is to come up with recommendations on what changes San Mateo County could make regarding various water-related functions. The four water-related focal areas include: SLR, flood control, groundwater, stormwater. CCAG does have binding relationships regarding utilization of funds. It will eventually be looking for binding relationships among its members.
- R: The Ocean Beach Master Plan is just a guidance document. It has not been formally adopted by the City/County of San Francisco. The SLR portion is the only portion of the Ocean Beach Master Plan being incorporated into San Francisco's LCP.
- R: San Francisco's LCP update is meant to deal with SLR. San Francisco has adopted SLR guidance for city projects (adopted 2014).
- R: The San Francisco Bay CRSPM is not regulatory. Only limited participation from Bay cities and counties has occurred to date.

Discussion of Governance Structure Options and Key Considerations

Eric Poncelet provided an overview of the governance options currently included in the Draft SFLC CRSPM. These options include: 1) status quo (i.e., no increased coordination), 2) creating a Coordinating Network, 3) identifying a lead agency, 4) using an existing or new Special District, and 5) using an existing or new Joint Powers Authority (JPA).

Meeting participants shared their views on the proposed governance options. Comments included:

- C: A Coordinating Network is attractive because it does not require that much effort. For San Mateo County, the agency that will address sea level rise has not been determined. Once it is determined, it would be a good fit to participate in and perhaps lead the Coordinating Network.
- Q: Do San Mateo County and San Francisco County coordinate?
 - R: San Francisco and San Mateo Counties have been participating in vulnerability assessment meetings, and around Sharp Park and airport issues. The counties are on the cusp of having more coordination. Higher level meetings are taking place too. Both counties will also be coordinating on a design competition.

- C: The region needs to improve on the status quo with respect to coordination. He likes the Coordinating Network as a good first step. He recognized that increased communication around sediment management is vital to success.
- Q: How educated are people in the room about shoreline erosion issues (e.g., bluff erosion, sediment transport)? Many local officials are currently not that knowledgeable about these types of issues.
- C: A potential drawback of a Coordinating Network is could be limited to reactive, near-term action. It is important to have a group similar to the CSMW that meets regularly and talks about longer term planning.
- C: CCAG will be thinking about the same governance options in its own process. But in the interim, it is important that all cities in San Mateo County are on same page around SLR.
- C: A Coordinating Network is at risk without a lead agency.

Discussion - Moving Forward on Governance

Participants shared their views on appropriate components of a governance structure to support the SFLC CRSMP. Most of the discussion focused on the formation of a Coordinating Network. Comments included:

Participation

- Who needs to participate depends on the topics that will be discussed at any particular meeting.
- Each jurisdiction should be represented by a single contact person who would help determine appropriate participation at meetings.

Frequency of meetings

- There was broad support in the group for quarterly meetings. These would need to be planned well in advance so people save the dates on their calendars. Public agendas would also need to be distributed far enough in advance so people can determine participation.
- Chris Potter noted that the CSMW could help launch the first few meetings.

Activities/Topics for Discussion

Participants recommended the following focus topics for a Coordinating Network:

- Discuss upcoming projects.
- Provide educational presentations – e.g., on physical processes around sediment transport issues, shoreline erosion issues. The point would be for Coordinating Network participants to then share this information with other staff. Chris Potter noted that the CSMW is a natural repository for this type of information.
- Provide presentations on how other CRSMP governance structures s in other parts of the state have worked on implementation of regional sediment management actions.
- Discuss longer term planning.

Leadership

Participants discussed the importance of having a lead agency in any future Coordinating Network. Comments included:

- Having a lead agency is critical to success.
- The future San Mateo County SLR agency (still to be identified) could help lead in the next 1.5 years.
- Chris Potter noted that the CSMW could provide staffing support through one of its members, at least at the beginning of the process.
- The lead agency would need to have its roles and responsibilities clearly defined.
- Reiteration that in 1.5 years, San Mateo County will have a SLC organization that could take on the leadership role. John Keener would be willing to take on a lead coordinating role in the meantime.

Other Comments

Participants shared other views on how to ensure the success of a future governance structure. Comments included:

- Several participants agreed that for jurisdictions and agencies to commit to participate in a Coordinating Network, there needs to be a clearly defined “objective” – i.e., that clarifies *why* participation is important. They called for better articulation of the “*drivers*” to participate, and there needs to be a recognition of how the different drivers fit together. Participants offered the following possible comments on drivers within the SFLC:
 - SLR is becoming a driver in San Mateo County.
 - Sediment management is becoming a driver within the Bay. Sediment is needed to fill wetlands!
 - SFLC does not have an explicit driver yet. Perhaps we all need to look at sea floor mapping to recognize the risk of erosion along the SFLC coast.
 - Recognition that sediment management in the SFLC requires a regional approach.
 - A key driver is to avoid being perpetually in crisis mode.
 - A possible driver involves the benefits of streamlining projects. Several participants noted that the Dredge Material Management Office (DMMO) could serve as a good model. They noted that the DMMO—which is a partnership between federal and state agencies and is part of the Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS)—has been effective in reducing bureaucracy and creating a forum where interested parties and discuss and come to agreement. Having such a structure would incentivize organizations like the State Lands Commission and State Parks and Recreation to participate. Additional comments on the DMMO model included:
 - It meets regularly, every two weeks.
 - It makes decisions on sediment management quality issues. Applicants come in and make presentations. People at the table hearing the permit applicant presentations are also the permitting staff for the relevant agencies.
 - A key to its success is that the DMMO has very limited scope. It has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that describes the projects that can be addressed.
 - There are lots of topics (e.g., flood protection, restoration, etc.) that could benefit from a DMMO structure. But this takes resources. Lots of paid staff are involved. The

agencies are committed and have signed an MOU. It has been operating for 15 years now.

- For Pacifica, key drivers include beaches for recreation and SLR mitigation (e.g., Linda Mar Beach).
- If needed, the CSMW could reach out more to elected officials to make the case for the importance of participating in a governance structure.

Action items

Key action items identified during the meeting include:

- CSMW to present at a future CCAG Water Committee meeting
- Meeting participants to review and provide comments on the Governance Chapter and other chapters in the Draft SFLC CRSMP.



Appendix A – Agenda

Governance Meeting for San Francisco Littoral Cell Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan

Tuesday, January 26, 2016
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000, San Francisco, CA
Large Conference Room

Meeting Objectives and Agenda

- Provide an overview of governance and its importance to regional coastal management
- Discuss regional coastal management roles, and needs expressed in initial discussions
- Discuss potential governance structure options (identified in draft governance chapter) and key considerations for identifying the appropriate option
- Identify next steps

Time	Topic	Presenter(s)
3:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of meeting objectives and agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kearns & West
3:10 p.m.	Overview of Governance and its Importance to Regional Coastal Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSMW
3:25 p.m.	Regional Coastal Management Roles and Needs for the San Francisco Littoral Cell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interests and needs expressed in initial discussions • Current relevant coastal management and coordination efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kearns & West • All
4:00 p.m.	Discussion of Governance Structure Options and Key Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kearns & West • All
4:40 p.m.	Next Steps and Recommendations for Moving Forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future governance discussions • Action items and assignments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kearns & West • All
5:00 p.m.	Adjourn	

Materials

- Governance Chapter (Chapter 7) from Draft San Francisco Littoral Cell CRSMP