



401 B Street, Suite 800
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231
 (619) 699-1900
 Fax (619) 699-1905
 www.sandag.org

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MEMBER AGENCIES

- Cities of
- Carlsbad
- Chula Vista
- Coronado
- Del Mar
- El Cajon
- Encinitas
- Escondido
- Imperial Beach
- La Mesa
- Lemon Grove
- National City
- Oceanside
- Poway
- San Diego
- San Marcos
- Santee
- Solana Beach
- Vista
- and
- County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS

- Imperial County
- California Department of Transportation
- Metropolitan Transit System
- North County Transit District
- United States Department of Defense
- San Diego Unified Port District
- San Diego County Water Authority
- Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association
- Mexico

SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

The Shoreline Preservation Working Group may take action on any item appearing on this agenda.

Thursday, July 12, 2007

11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

SANDAG, 7th Floor Conference Room
 401 B Street, Suite 800
 San Diego, CA 92101-4231

Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker
 (619) 699-1916
 stu@sandag.org

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT
- REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PLANNING COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
 Phone 1-800-COMMUTE or see www.sdcommute.com for route information.*

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

Thursday, July 12, 2007

ITEM #	ACTION
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	
+2. SUMMARY OF THE MAY 3, 2007, MEETING	APPROVE
The May 3, 2007, meeting summary is attached for Working Group review and approval.	
+3. SANDAG WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES	INFORMATION
John Kirk, Deputy General Counsel, will provide an overview of the Working Group's advisory role. Attached is a memo from SANDAG's General Counsel on Maintaining Advisory Role of Subordinate Committees and Groups, a copy of the SANDAG Committee & Working Group Guidelines, and a copy of the Basic Rules of Order for Working Group Proceedings (Attachments 1-3).	
+4. UPDATE ON ACTIONS TAKEN BY SANDAG POLICY COMMITTEES AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON ITEMS FROM THE SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP	INFORMATION
Staff will provide the Working Group with an update on SANDAG Policy Committee and Board of Director action on recommendations made by the Working Group. A copy of the Board of Directors report from the June 8 meeting is attached.	
5. REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT	INFORMATION
Greg Hearon from Coastal Frontiers will provide the Working Group with a presentation on the results from the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program for 2006. The annual report can be found on SANDAG's Web site at www.sandag.org/shoreline .	
+6. REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PLANNING COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY	INFORMATION/ POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION
SANDAG staff will provide the Working Group with an update on the preparation of the Feasibility Study to be provided to the California Department of Boating and Waterways in mid-July. Additionally, staff would like feedback from the Working Group on recommendations from SANDAG staff and the staff subgroup on planning cost allocation methodologies.	

ITEM #

ACTION

- 7. DESIGNATE SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP MEMBER TO ATTEND REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

DISCUSSION / POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION

At the May 3, 2007, meeting it was recommended that the Working Group consider designating a member to represent the Working Group at Regional Planning Committee meetings. This designee would not be a member of the Regional Planning Committee but a member of the public attending on behalf of the Working Group.

- 8. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

INFORMATION

Steve Aceti from CalCoast will discuss the status of state and federal legislation.

- 9. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS

COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Working Group during this time.

- 10. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

INFORMATION

The next Working Group meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 6, 2007, from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

July 12, 2007

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **2**

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF THE MAY 3, 2007, MEETING

File Number 3000200

Members in Attendance:

James Bond, City of Encinitas
Mike Bixler, San Diego Unified Port District
Carrie Downey, City of Coronado
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach
Esther Sanchez, City of Oceanside
Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego

Advisory Members in Attendance:

Steve Aceti, California Coastal Coalition
August Felando, Lobster Trap Fishermen Association
Bob Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Kim Sterrett, Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW)
Julie Thomas, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Staff Subgroup:

Ray Duncan, City of Oceanside
Don Hadley, City of Oceanside
Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Ed Kleeman, City of Coronado
Y. Sachiko Kohatsu, County of San Diego
Jamie Fox Rice, City of San Diego
Danny Schrotbaron, City of San Diego
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas

Others in Attendance:

Nick Bultbe, AMEC
Bud Carroll, City of Carlsbad
Teri Fenner, EDAW
Marilyn Flaherty, California Department of Fish and Game
Lawrence Honma, Merkle and Associates
Anne-Lise Lindquist, Moffatt & Nichol
Angela Lockhart, City of Carlsbad

David Schug, URS
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol
Matthew Owens, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
Shelby Tucker, SANDAG

1. Introductions and Public Comments

James Bond, City of Encinitas, called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m. and introductions were made.

Kevin Faulkner, City of San Diego, publicly announced that the City is committed to contributing their full portion of funding required for the Beach Sand Replenishment Cost-Benefit Analysis.

2. Agenda Item #2, Summary of the March 1, 2007, Meeting

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, mentioned that in the last meeting and in the minutes, it was noted that the SANDAG Legal Counsel would comment on relevant items in this meeting. This was not possible and will be put on a subsequent agenda.

Upon motion by Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, and seconded by Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach, the Working Group recommended approval of the March 1, 2007, meeting minutes.

3. Agenda Item #3, Lessons Learned from the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP)

Ms. Tucker introduced Ron Noble of Noble Consultants, Inc. (NCI). NCI performed final engineering design, prepared construction contract documents, oversaw the construction bidding and contract award, and performed the construction management, hydrographic surveying and engineering inspection for the 2001 RBSP.

Mr. Noble reviewed the 2001 project and emphasized that although there were multiple project phases and actual construction aspects are often the focus, preliminary studies are extremely important. In particular, identification of appropriate sand source sites compatible in quality, quantity, and proximity with receiver sites, is crucial to the success of the project. He also noted that the permitting process is lengthy and time should be allocated to this.

Mr. Noble reviewed the construction process in some detail. There were 12 receiver sites and 6 source sites in the RBSP. The Imperial Beach and Oceanside source sites were found to be deficient, while the Mission Beach site was optimal. Sequencing of nourishment was decided by the contractor with permitting factors attached. Fill designs and volumes were discussed with supporting cross sectional diagrams and before and after photographs.

In total, there was approximately 2.1 million cubic yards of sand placed on the receiver beaches which was relatively little, thus the project was considered a demonstration to determine the effectiveness of project funding, design, implementation, monitoring, and overall success.

It was emphasized that flexibility was allowed in the contracting, and should be in potential future projects, because of construction changes in terms of equipment use and general implementation.

In this case, a split hull Hooper dredge was used that would dredge at the source site then transfer the sand in the hull to a mobile, mono buoy with sub-lines which then pumps the sand from ship to shore. Two of these near-shore sub-line piping setups were used so that one was moored to the sea floor and in service while the second was in transit to, or being installed at, the next site.

Mr. Noble considered the project a success and noted the limited number of change orders in construction contracts, adherence to timelines, and the relatively efficient cost allocation.

Issues to address were identified as intensive borrower site investigations as this is one of the primary cost determinants. It was noted that there is some flexibility on dredge types to use and payment arrangements will vary depending on billing either by load or by volume pumped. Twenty-four hour, seven day a week operations are required for economic and overall efficiency. Finding an alternative for each borrower site and creating cost estimates for those is also of high importance.

August Felando, California Lobster Trap Fishermen's Association, inquired about the monitoring of the project during and after implementation and requested this be consistently addressed. This aspect will be included in future agendas as project development moves forward.

Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, asked about the amount of sand lost into La Jolla Canyon. This was not known by Mr. Noble.

4. Agenda Item #4, Update on Actions Taken By SANDAG Policy Committees and Board of Directors on Items from the Working Group

Ms. Tucker reviewed actions taken by the Regional Planning Committee (RPC), SANDAG Executive Committee, and SANDAG Board of Directors regarding issues recommended by the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG).

On April 6, 2007, the RPC discussed the acceptance of funding for the preparation of the Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (Management Plan), the preparation of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between SANDAG and the California Coastal Commission, and planning for the preparation of a Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA). The RPC took action by making a recommendation to the Executive Committee to continue with required moves on the Management Plan and MOA.

On April 13, 2007, the Executive Committee took action on the Management Plan, amending the Overall Work Program and Budget to include the project and authorize SANDAG's Executive Director to enter into the revenue agreement with Boating and Waterways and procure a consultant for plan development. The Board of Directors took action authorizing the SANDAG Executive Director to enter into the MOA in substantially the same form on April 27, 2007.

Ms. Tucker recognized Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, Ms. Slater-Price, and Mr. Aceti for their participation in the RPC meeting on behalf of the SPWG.

Next steps include preparing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Management Plan, hopefully, in early May depending on final approval from Boating and Waterways.

SANDAG has been moving forward with the CBA. Bids were requested from three qualified firms, and Dr. Phillip King from San Francisco State University was selected to complete the study. Written commitments have been received from all coastal cities, the contract has been signed, and work began two weeks ago with completion expected in mid-July. SANDAG plans to bill the coastal cities within the next month.

Ms. Tucker reiterated that the CBA is only one part of the overall Feasibility Study and other aspects will be discussed in Item 5. She also thanked everyone for their efforts in moving the process forward including financial commitments.

Mr. Aceti recommended that the SPWG have a representative at each RPC meeting to maintain a presence in that forum. Ms. Slater-Price mentioned her support of this, that she sits on that committee but can not always attend and that anyone available should attend. Mr. Bond recommended that designating a SPWG representative to the RPC be made an item at a subsequent meeting.

5. Agenda Item #5, Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Feasibility Study

Ms. Tucker reviewed the requirements of the overall Regional Beach Sand Replenishment Feasibility Study and referenced the attachment regarding requirements for state funds from the Department of Boating and Waterways.

SANDAG is working with Chris Webb to complete the remaining components including statement of the problem, analysis of project alternatives, defined scope of project, proposed preliminary design, and favorable benefit-to-cost analysis.

SANDAG staff was requesting SPWG input and feedback on strategies to complete the Feasibility Study.

Ms. Tucker noted that the Feasibility Study requires a resolution of fiscal support from the local agencies' governing body. This is SANDAG's responsibility and since they do not have funds available, they require formal commitment from the coastal cities to pursue the project. In order to facilitate this, a list of options of estimated costs per city based off the 2001 project was provided as an attachment.

There are two main options for contributions by jurisdiction with sub-options under each. The overarching approaches are either making a cost breakdown based on the miles of coastline per city, or cubic yards of sand placed on receiver beaches per city. The match that will come from cities will exclude any state-owned beaches as denoted in parenthesis on the draft. Planning costs of approximately \$500,000 will need to be covered by this contribution allocation. The final column on the right indicates the total approximate amount each city would pay for the entire project.

SANDAG staff recommends option 2D, which allocates funding contributions based on the amount of sand placed on receiver beaches while planning costs are distributed evenly among cities.

Mr. Bond mentioned the City of Encinitas' support of state contributions toward their beaches in terms of their ability to contribute funds and continue to render services (lifeguards, clean-up, maintenance, etc.).

Kim Sterrett noted that the state cost-sharing estimates are maximum amounts contingent on state approval and it is, therefore, possible that cities with state beaches would have to pick up greater amounts of the costs involved than those on the estimate.

It was asked what form the support should come in and whether a formal City Council resolution was required or an e-mail would suffice. Ms. Tucker stated that a City Council resolution is requested.

The two state funding programs, the Beach Erosion Control Program and the Public Beach Restoration Fund, have different matching requirements. It was recommended that cities should cite the 85/15 state-to-local ratio of the Beach Erosion Control Program as the target in their resolutions.

Ms. Sanchez noted that the budget more than doubles between the option of paying by mile of coastline and paying per cubic yard of sand. It was confirmed that the estimates were based off the 2001 project and costs will increase or decrease based upon changes to the project. If Oceanside determined their cubic yards need to be less than that of the previous project, the cost of option 2 also would be less. Oceanside would, therefore, like to analyze the options further with their team before settling on an option. This position was reinforced by Solana Beach on similar grounds.

Ms. Slater-Price noted that Mr. Bond was influential in the City of Encinitas implementing an increase of tax on tourists (TOT) hotel room tariff. The additional TOT revenues from the increase are then allocated to an investment fund for future spending on sand-only projects. Currently, the tax generates about \$200,000 a year, and it was recommended that other coastal cities utilize a similar self-driven approach to funding.

Esther Sanchez, City of Oceanside, asked about the \$1 per room fee in Carlsbad and how much revenue that is generating. The figure was unknown.

It was clarified that in the case of Encinitas, the City Council was able to get the TOT tax increase initiative on the ballot with a super-majority vote, and the voters passed it with 70 percent plus approval.

Solana Beach also increased their TOT from 10 percent to 13 percent for room rates, using 2 percent for a beach sand replenishment fund and 1 percent for tourism promotion initiatives. Part-time residents also were included in this TOT. Solana Beach has additional funds available due to seawall mitigation and the Public Beach Recreation Fund.

Carrie Downey, City of Coronado, inquired as to whether a more tentative City Council resolution on the overall costs would suffice to move the project forward.

Kim Sterrett, California Department of Waterways, reiterated that SANDAG is facilitating, not funding the project and a resolution is required to demonstrate commitment to funding the project by the coastal cities. However, he noted that the resolution is not a contractual commitment to funding, but rather a Statement of Intent to move forward.

It was determined that the resolution should be a "Resolution of Support," but Mr. Sterrett mentioned that "fiscal support" should be included. Mr. Sterrett noted that language such as "we want to pay our fair share," whatever that may be determined to be, is allowable versus an exact figure.

Rob Rundle, SANDAG, mentioned that the miles of coastline option in cost contribution was based off the familiar model used in what coastal cities currently pay for coastal monitoring. In the 2001 project, the Department of Boating and Waterways and the U.S. Navy paid the significant costs of replenishment while the coastal cities continued to pay for more nominal costs of monitoring while not making contributions to construction. Therefore, now that there will be local contributions to the overall project including construction, the most equitable scenario is being investigated with the SANDAG recommendation of option 2D being based on a receiver per cubic yard estimate. However, it is up to the Working Group to decide what it feels is best.

Ms. Tucker reinforced the need for timely resolutions from the cities to complete the packet that must be submitted to Mr. Sterrett in July if the project is to be included in the next budget. Adherence to a strict timeline also is required so necessary presentations to the SANDAG Planning Committee and Board of Directors can be made. Ms. Tucker will provide assistance with a draft resolution for cities to use to facilitate the process.

6. Agenda Item #6, Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP)

Ms. Tucker mentioned that draft SCOUP 2 will be out in summer and the final in the fall. The SPWG will receive an update from Chris Webb of Moffatt & Nichol on the status of this document at a later meeting.

7. SANDAG Board of Directors Policy Meeting on Beach Sand Replenishment

The Board of Directors (Board) will be holding a Policy Meeting on June 8 where beach sand replenishment will be discussed. As part of the RCP's Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS), long-term infrastructure funding needs in three areas were identified: Stormwater Management, Beach Sand Replenishment, and Habitat Preservation. In January, estimates of long-term funding costs were provided to the Board and they requested further information. Three policy meeting informational briefs on each of the three areas will be provided as a result. The Board will discuss Shoreline Management and Beach Sand Replenishment on June 8, 2007.

SANDAG requests feedback on the attached outline of presentation participants and material in order to provide the Board with a full picture of the SPWG's efforts and beach sand replenishment issues including past, present, and future strategies. Stakeholders, elected officials, and area experts are the primary presenters in this forum, not SANDAG staff, and there is need to assure that all perspectives are represented. Currently, Steve Aceti and Kim Sterrett are on the agenda but there is need for others to be included.

Ms. Slater-Price recommended that someone who clearly understands and represents fiscal impacts, such as the Economic Development Committee, Convention and Visitor's Bureau, and/or Chamber of Commerce present the argument for the economic benefit of beaches for area incomes.

Mr. Aceti recommended that an elected official from the SPWG attend. Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, volunteered to attend and also recommended that Cami Mattson from San Diego County North Convention and Visitor's Bureau be contacted as an economic voice.

Ms. Downey also offered to attend and recommended that a representative from the hotel industry attend, especially someone from an area with beach sand oriented TOT.

8. Agenda Item #7, Legislative Update

Mr. Aceti provided a legislative update for the Working Group and thanked those members who attended the annual CalCoast Sacramento event.

At the event, water quality issues were discussed, mostly in the form of five marine debris bills. Wetlands and beach restoration also were discussed.

The most pressing legislative issue last week was the budget for the Public Beach Restoration Program (Program). This came before an Assembly Subcommittee where funding from the Harbors and Water Craft Revolving Fund for the Program came into competition with Recreational Boaters' interests. The Assembly moved to continue Program funding. CalCoast is pushing to move the provision of these funds from the Harbors and Water Craft Revolving Fund to the State Coastal Conservancy.

9. Public Comment/Communications

Public comments and communications were invited but none were made.

10. Adjournment and Next Meeting

The next scheduled meeting for July 5, 2007, will be moved because of problematic timing adjacent to the July 4 holiday. Proposed dates of July 12, August 2, and September 6 were suggested alternatives, with July 12 being the most favored.

The meeting was adjourned by Jim Bond.

San Diego
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
MEMO

December 22, 2006

TO: SANDAG Staff, Committees, and Working Groups
FROM: Julie Wiley, General Counsel
SUBJECT: Maintaining Advisory Role of Subordinate Committees and Groups

Prior to a new committee or working group being formed at SANDAG the Office of General Counsel needs to be informed so that decisions can be made regarding what laws will apply to it. Generally, the Brown Act will apply to committees officially created or approved by the Board or a PAC and the conflict of interest laws will apply to committees with decision-making authority.

Many of the committees and working groups (committees) that report to a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) or Board at SANDAG are formed as purely advisory bodies that provide input to the decision-makers at the PAC and/or Board level. State conflict of interest laws do not apply to people who serve on advisory bodies and the members do not have to fill out financial disclosure forms (Form 700s). After a committee is formed, its responsibilities and level of influence may change and trigger the applicability of additional legal requirements. Staff should inform the Office of General Counsel and reevaluate the committee's charter when such changes occur.

In order for an advisory committee at SANDAG to maintain maximum flexibility and broad participation from members, measures can be taken to prevent it from accidentally slipping into the category of committee that would require application of the conflict of interest laws. Measures that help assure a committee has advisory rather than decision-making status are:

- Generally, other than approval of its minutes, the committee's agenda should never show any proposed action other than a recommendation. Advisory committees cannot give final approval for actions.
- Committee members cannot directly send letters, sign petitions, or speak to legislators, reporters, or government agencies as representatives of SANDAG. Any such activities should be carried out by SANDAG staff or a Board member after PAC or Board approval of the action and any policy statements made should come from the Board not a committee.
- The Board should give any assignments or delegation of authority to the PAC a committee reports to – assignments and authority should not be given directly by the Board to a committee.

- Approval of letters, position statements, reports, or other documents originating from the committee should be given only after review and modification by staff and approvals via a PAC and/or the Board and should always be signed by staff or a Board member, not a committee member.
- Action items originating from a committee should not be put on the consent calendar of a PAC or the Board. The items must be fully reported and discussed at either the PAC or the Board with an opportunity for public comment. Reports accompanying the agenda items should state the position of the Committee and the staff separately even if the positions are consistent. Staff reports should be documents independent from anything generated by the committee, and staff conclusions may or may not be consistent with the recommendations of the committee.
- Items passing through a PAC to the Board should show the recommendation as coming from the PAC, not the committee. Additionally, any new or contrasting points of view or modifications to the recommended action that were discussed at the PAC should be documented.
- The primary goal of staff, the PACs and the Board should not be to come to a consensus with the committee, but rather to take the committee's ideas into consideration along with other factors in coming to a decision.
- Committees should be treated as a group of persons interested in the decisions of the PACs and the Board with regard to their subject area whose opinions the PACs and Board take into consideration rather than being treated as a group of experts that the Board relies on to make those decisions.



SANDAG COMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES

I. PURPOSE

SANDAG thanks you for your willingness to serve on one of its committees, stakeholder groups, task forces, or working groups. SANDAG's committees and working groups are created by SANDAG's Board of Directors, Policy Advisory Committees (Transportation Committee, Executive Committee, Borders Committee, Regional Planning Committee or Public Safety Committee), or staff to allow stakeholders in the region to reach consensus and provide input to the Board and Policy Advisory Committees. These guidelines are intended to provide you with information regarding your responsibilities as a member of one of SANDAG's committees, task forces, or working groups ("committees").

II. ROLE AS A REPRESENTATIVE

You were most likely asked to serve on a SANDAG committee due to your experience and/or position as an elected official or as a representative of a public agency, regional interest group, or community stakeholder. SANDAG assumes that persons sent to represent a group of people on a SANDAG committee have the appropriate level of authority and understanding to serve in a representative capacity for their organization. If you were selected as the representative of a public agency, regional interest group, or other community stakeholder, SANDAG encourages you to provide input regarding the interests of the organization you represent and assumes that you will communicate information obtained at SANDAG meetings to the appropriate persons in your organization. If you are unable to continue as a SANDAG committee or working group member, please notify SANDAG's project manager and the organization that you represent. SANDAG will work with you and your organization to ensure that a new representative is selected. If desired, the organization you represent may select one or two alternates to serve in your stead if you are unable to attend a meeting or vote.

Sometimes persons are asked to serve on a SANDAG committee because of their individual qualifications rather than because of the entity or special interest that person represents. In that event, the individual member's vote does not have to be consistent with the opinion of any organization of which he/she may be an employee or member. Additionally, persons who are selected for their individual qualifications instead of in a representative capacity may not have an alternate.

III. ADVISORY CAPACITY

As a member of one of SANDAG's committees or working groups it is important to work toward consensus with other members on particular issues and then provide recommendations to SANDAG's Board, Policy Advisory Committees and/or staff regarding those issues. The advice and recommendations provided by committee members will be taken into account by the Board, Policy Advisory Committee or staff in the decision-making process. Staff will place items on committee agendas, after discussion with the Chair and/or members that need to be addressed by the committee to meet SANDAG's needs. These items will have first priority. Other items may be added to the agenda by a Chair or other member if time and other resources permit and the items are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the committee. Please remember that SANDAG's Board has sole authority to take action on behalf of SANDAG, make a final determination on behalf of SANDAG, and/or take a position on behalf of SANDAG, unless it has specifically delegated that authority in writing.

IV. CONDUCT

As an official member of a SANDAG committee, you should either sit at the conference room table located in the room being used for the meeting or a nameplate or some other device should be used to delineate your status. Attendees who are not members of the committee should request permission to speak from the Chair of the committee or working group. The Chair should recognize requests from non-members to speak and ask them to identify themselves if they have not already been introduced.

SANDAG has implemented policies that apply to all persons at SANDAG including committee members. These policies include prohibitions against harassment, discrimination, and violence. A copy of these policies can be obtained upon request to the Office of General Counsel or on SANDAG's Web site. Persons who violate the policies will receive at least a warning and may be asked to leave SANDAG's premises.

A committee member is prohibited from using his/her title as a member of any of SANDAG's committees when stating his/her position on an issue if: a) he/she is making the statement outside of a committee meeting, and b) his/her position conflicts with official Board policy. Persons who violate this prohibition may be removed from office by the Chair of the Board.

V. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Potential conflicts of interest are a consequence of the many and varied roles that SANDAG committee members play in our community. One of the goals of these Guidelines is to manage real or perceived conflicts of interest. SANDAG has determined that a system of self-disclosure will be the most effective since conflicts of interest must be dealt with on a case by case basis. Discussion and disclosure generally can resolve issues related to conflict of interest.

A conflict of interest occurs when there is a divergence between an individual's professional, private, or personal relationships or interests and his/her obligations to SANDAG as a committee member such that an independent observer might reasonably question whether the individual's actions or decisions are determined by considerations of personal benefit, gain or advantage. A conflict of interest or the appearance of it depends on the situation, and not necessarily on the character or actions of the individual. The appearance of a conflict of interest can be as damaging or detrimental as an actual conflict. Thus, individuals are asked to report potential conflicts to the SANDAG Office of General Counsel so that appearances can be separated from reality.

Potential conflicts of interest are not unusual and must be addressed. For example, conflicts of interest can arise out of the fact that some SANDAG committees assist SANDAG in shaping requests for proposals and specification documents that are in turn used as criteria for competitive selection of consultants. Representatives from private sector organizations may be selected to serve as a member of one of SANDAG's committee or working groups by virtue of their experience in a particular industry. Therefore, it is expected that situations may arise where a committee or working group member is asked for input on the scoping of a project for which their organization may later want to submit a bid or proposal. This situation presents a potential conflict of interest if the committee member will be rewarded for their participation in SANDAG activities because the member or his/her organization eventually receives consulting fees or an unfair advantage during the competitive procurement process.

It is wrong for an individual's actions or decisions made in the course of his or her SANDAG activities to be determined by considerations of personal financial gain. Such behavior calls into question the professional objectivity and ethics of the individual, and it also reflects negatively on SANDAG. As a SANDAG committee member you must respect SANDAG's status as a recipient of public funds and conduct your affairs in ways that will not compromise SANDAG's integrity.

All SANDAG committee members have an affirmative duty to disclose any potential financial interest to the SANDAG project manager assigned to the committee. Notification of the actual or potential conflict should be given to the project manager or the Office of General Counsel. Members with an actual or potential conflict of interest should be asked to leave all meetings or portions of meetings where the conflict may arise. If a member must leave their office due to a conflict of interest he/she may continue to attend the meeting(s) as a member of the public.

VI. SANDAG's RESOURCES

Except in a purely incidental way, SANDAG's resources, including but not limited to, facilities, materials, personnel, or equipment may not be used in external activities by a committee member unless written approval has been received in advance from the Executive Director or his/her designee. Such permission shall be granted only when the use of SANDAG's resources is determined to further SANDAG's mission.

VII. CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

Proprietary or other confidential information that a SANDAG committee member may be exposed to at SANDAG may never be used in external activities unless written approval is given in advance by SANDAG's Executive Director or his/her designee.

VIII. RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR MEETINGS

Those SANDAG committees that qualify as "legislative bodies" are required to comply with California's open meeting laws, which are known as the Brown Act. The staff liaison to each SANDAG committee is required to know whether his/her committee is subject to the Brown Act and can answer questions regarding how this affects the procedures used during meetings. Generally, the Brown Act requires that meetings be open to the public, that meetings be noticed in accordance with statutory deadlines, that the decision-making process of the members be carried out in a public meeting venue, and that the public be allowed to comment at the meeting. Questions regarding the applicability and implementation of Brown Act requirements should be referred to the SANDAG project manager or the Office of General Counsel.

SANDAG committees are also required to comply with Robert's Rules of Order. This publication provides procedures for matters such as making motions, amending and substituting motions, adjourning meetings, selecting a Chair, and voting. A summary of the most used aspects of Robert's Rules is attached to these Guidelines in a document entitled "Basic Rules of Order." Business cannot be conducted at a committee without the presence of at least a quorum of voting members. A quorum is a majority of the voting members. For example, a seven member committee would require at least four voting members for a quorum. In order to take action, at least a majority of the quorum must vote in favor of the action in question. So, if four members of a seven member committee attend a meeting, it would take at least three votes to pass a motion. Questions regarding Robert's Rules or other matters of procedure can be directed to the staff project manager or the Office of General Counsel.

IX. CHANGES TO MEMBERSHIP OR RESPONSIBILITIES

Once the SANDAG Board or a SANDAG Policy Advisory Committee has approved the membership roster of a committee, the committee cannot change its membership without going back to the Board or Policy Advisory Committee for approval of the recommended change. If, however, the Board or Policy Advisory Committee in question has delegated authority regarding membership changes to the committee, the committee may make changes without additional approvals. The responsibilities of SANDAG committees are set forth in

committee charters, which are available from the SANDAG project manager. Any changes to responsibilities will require a change to the charter and approval by the responsible Policy Advisory Committee or the Board.

X. AD HOC GROUPS

Committees may form ad hoc groups to provide advice to the entire membership of the committee. Committees may not form standing groups without permission from the Board or a Policy Advisory Committee. If a committee is subject to the Brown Act, any ad hoc group the committee forms will be subject to the Brown Act unless the following requirements are met: 1) the group is composed of less than a majority of voting members, 2) only voting members serve on the group, and 3) the group solely provides advice and does not make decisions. Ad Hoc groups should use the words "Ad Hoc" when naming the group.

XI. FORMATION OF NEW COMMITTEES

New committees that will meet for more than six months may only be formed with approval from the SANDAG Board or a Policy Advisory Committee. New committees of this type may be proposed by a Board member, Policy Advisory Committee Member, or staff. Each new committee must have a charter that is approved by the Board or a Policy Advisory Committee at the time formation of the committee is approved. The charter must contain the information in the SANDAG Charter Outline.



BASIC RULES OF ORDER FOR COMMITTEE PROCEEDINGS

ALL SANDAG committee, committee, task force, stakeholders or working group (hereinafter collectively referred to as "committee") members should use the following guidelines regarding rules of order during a SANDAG procedure.

1) The Presiding Officer or Chair of the committee shall call the meeting into order and dismiss the meeting when all prescribed business is concluded. The **order of business** should be as follows:

1. Reading and approval of minutes
2. Public and committee member comments
3. Consent items on agenda
4. Items on the agenda for discussion
5. Adjournment

2) All SANDAG committee, committee or working groups must have a **quorum** (majority) of members who must be present at the meetings in order to legally transact business.

3) All **motion procedures** should be as follows:

1. Person making motion must be a member of the committee (other than Chair)
2. Person requests recognition by the Chair (or Chair calls for a motion)
3. The Chair recognizes the member by name or title; member then has the floor
4. Member makes the motion in words member wishes the committee's final official statement of action to be
5. Member passes the motion to the Chair as soon as motion is made
6. Another member seconds the motion
7. The Chair restates the motion
8. The motion is then open for debate and discussion
 - All discussion and debate must relate to the motion, if no debate is necessary than the Chair may call for a direct vote
9. When all debates and discussions have been heard, the Chair will call for the motion to be voted upon or a member may "call for the question" if they feel sufficient discussion has occurred.

4) Members **vote** on the motion by a show of hands or by stating "aye" or "no." The result should be stated by the Chair.

5) **Adding an issue** not on the agenda is done as follows:

1. After a motion is seconded, the Chair may call for a vote on the motion to add the issue if:
 - (1) The issue requires immediate action
 - (2) The need for action on the issue came to the attention of the committee subsequent to the posting of the agenda

2. In order for the issue to be heard before the committee, two-thirds of the voting members must be present and two-thirds of those voting members present must vote in favor of adding the issue to the agenda.

6) Ways to **amend a motion**:

1. **After** a motion has been made and **before** the question has been stated by the chair, any member can suggest **modifications**
 - o The motion maker can accept or reject these modifications as they wish
 - o This method should be limited to minor changes where it is unlikely that members will disagree
2. **After** a motion has been made and **after** the question has been stated by the chair, the **maker** of the motion can request **unanimous** consent to modify the motion
 - o If any member objects the modification must be introduced in the form of a **motion to amend**
3. If the above options do not apply, then members other than the maker can make a motion to amend the proposed motion
 - o Proposed changes to the **wording** (inserting, striking, and substituting words) and limited changes to the **meaning** of the motion can be made
 - o If someone wants to substantially modify the wording, he/she can make a **substitute** motion
 - o Amended and substitute motions must be **voted on before** the original motion
 - o Amended and substitute motions must be:
 - **seconded**,
 - are **debatable**, and
 - require a **majority** vote for adoption
 - o If the amended or substitute motion **passes** the original motion is dropped, however, if the amended or substitute motion **fails** a vote can then be taken on the original motion

7) When the normal **Chair is not present**, ways to appoint a temporary Chair:

1. The Chair can appoint a temporary Chair if there is not one already approved of in advance
2. A temporary Chair is elected by the committee
 - (1) Can be nominated by: the Chair or by a committee member
 - (2) A vote takes place immediately and terminates upon the arrival of the pre-elected Chair or vice-chair

8) Filling **vacancies** with **alternates**:

1. If the Chair is not present, the vice-chair takes his/her place
2. If members were not selected for their individual qualifications then a certain number of alternates equal to the number of members can be selected by the members or the groups they represent if the committee so desires



BOARD OF DIRECTORS
JUNE 8, 2007

AGENDA ITEM NO. 07-06-2
ACTION REQUESTED - DISCUSSION

**WORKSHOP ON REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT
AND BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT**

File Number 3002800

Introduction

Last month, the Board of Directors began discussing in detail three infrastructure areas identified in the Integrated Regional Infrastructure Strategy (IRIS) of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP). These infrastructure areas (stormwater management, beach sand replenishment, and habitat preservation) do not have systems in place to address their funding needs. The IRIS recommended that SANDAG work with our member agencies and other lead agencies throughout the region to develop strategies to address funding for each of these areas of infrastructure needs.

Today's Board Policy meeting is the second of three forums that have been scheduled to discuss these issues in more detail, and it will focus on regional shoreline management and beach sand replenishment. The Board will be provided an overview of existing shoreline management plans and beach replenishment activities that have occurred in the region. Stakeholders will provide insight as to their role in regional replenishment efforts, and a members of the Shoreline Preservation Working Group will offer information on current efforts and why the region should work together to meet future needs.

Discussion

The SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Strategy (Strategy), adopted in 1993, proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region. It provides guidance on methods available to reach the goal of protecting and restoring beaches in the San Diego region. The preferred shoreline management method is beach sand replenishment, as evidenced by the implementation of the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project and development of other efforts that place compatible sandy material from various sources on regional beaches. More information on the SANDAG beach building and maintenance program can be found in Attachment 1.

Additionally, the Strategy contains a comprehensive set of recommendations on financing and implementation of the beach building program. However, it does not identify a long-term funding source for ongoing beach replenishment efforts. Because of lack of available resources at the federal and state level to help finance these types of regional and local infrastructure needs on an ongoing basis, local and regional governments are increasingly being asked to leverage or match state and federal funds with local money or programs that help fill the infrastructure gaps.

The IRIS identifies ways of addressing this trend of greater regional responsibility for planning and funding its infrastructure needs. It outlines a strategy for working with regional infrastructure providers to develop a forward-looking planning, investment, and financing strategy that will help the San Diego region meet its collective regional infrastructure needs.

As discussed above, three policy forums are being held with the goal of ensuring all Board members are informed of the status of planning and implementation efforts for these three infrastructure areas, and to provide direction on whether SANDAG should be involved with future planning and implementation activities in these areas. The specific discussions on each of the three infrastructure areas will address:

- What is currently being done to address the issue?
- What should the region be doing?
- What should be SANDAG's future involvement, if any?

An outline of today's speakers is included in Attachment 2.

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Attachments: 1. Regional Beach Replenishment White Paper
2. List of Speakers/Discussion Topics

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916, stu@sandag.org

No Budget Impact

**REGIONAL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT AND BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT
WHITE PAPER**

Prepared by SANDAG Staff
June 8, 2007

Introduction

In July 1993, SANDAG adopted a long-term vision, known as the "Shoreline Preservation Strategy for the San Diego Region" (Strategy), for restoring the region's beaches. The Strategy proposes an extensive beach building and maintenance program for the critical shoreline erosion areas in the region that includes sand nourishment, sand retention structures, protective structures, and policies and regulations regarding the use of the shoreline and its development.

The Strategy sets out regional objectives, policies, and recommendations for implementing a coordinated list of solutions for each of the region's shoreline problem areas. The Strategy has four main objectives:

1. Manage the region's shoreline to provide environmental quality, recreation, and property protection.
2. Develop and carry out a cost-effective combination of shoreline management tactics that will have a positive impact on the region's economy.
3. Develop a program to fund the shoreline management strategy, which equitably allocates costs throughout the region and among local, state, and federal sources.
4. Obtain commitments to implement and finance the Shoreline Management Strategy.

To realize these objectives, coordination among the region's jurisdictions is necessary. This cooperation is particularly important given that events on one part of the coast or inland can affect beaches and coastal bluffs. The coastal cities and other regional stakeholders have been working through the SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group), providing guidance on regional solutions to coastal erosion problems. The Working Group reports to the Regional Planning Committee. Collaboration has resulted in a preferred approach to a regionwide problem, regional beach replenishment, and has led to more efficient implementation.

Another important issue guiding the Strategy is the long-term and ongoing commitment required to accomplish the objectives. Stewardship of the shoreline will involve a number of coordinated actions taking place over years, if not decades. In the summer of 2004, SANDAG adopted the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), which is the strategic overall planning framework for the San Diego region through 2030. The RCP supports the continued implementation of the Strategy, outlining the preservation and enhancement of the region's beaches and nearshore areas as environmental and recreational resources that must be protected.

Discussion

Regional Beach Sand Project

In September 2001, SANDAG completed construction of the Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP), which placed 2.1 million cubic yards of clean, beach-quality sand at 12 eroded beaches from Imperial Beach to Oceanside. The RBSP was a first-of-its-kind regional pilot sand restoration project for the West Coast of the United States. The \$17.5 million project was funded by the U.S. Navy and California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW). The region's coastal cities provided funds for the regional monitoring program as well as invaluable support and coordination in obtaining funding for the project.

The main objective of the RBSP was to place sand on the region's eroding beaches to start the process of restoring this priceless centerpiece of our environment and economy. An equally important objective for the project was to demonstrate that cost-effective beach restoration technology could be successfully implemented in the San Diego region. While many of the objectives outlined in the Strategy were met, the RBSP did not include a specific determination as to how these activities would be funded in the future.

Monitoring Program

Through the financial support of the region's coastal cities, SANDAG has been monitoring the coastline through the Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program since 1996. The monitoring results were utilized to plan and implement the RBSP. To meet RBSP permitting requirements, a biological monitoring component was added to the program. The shoreline and biological monitoring data were required to determine how long the sand would benefit the coastline and what impacts it would have on nearshore resources.

Shoreline Monitoring

The shoreline monitoring program includes surveying the beach and lagoon entrances twice annually to document changes in the region's coastline. These efforts will continue to measure changes in the shore zone, monitor how sand moves along the shoreline, and how nourishment activities affect the environment. The monitoring program is important to implement the Strategy and to provide consistent and reliable data that can be used to design and implement future replenishment efforts.

Biological Monitoring

The biological monitoring program was initiated to determine the eventual impact of the RBSP sand nourishment to marine resources. A guiding principle of the RBSP was to build a project that would not result in significant negative impacts to the environment. Most of the monitoring sites were in the vicinity of where beach sand was placed. These monitoring locations were sampled in the spring and fall of each year. During the four-year monitoring period, it was determined that there were no long-term biological impacts associated with the RBSP.

Mitigation funds were set aside in the project budget to address any significant environmental impacts that might be identified by project monitoring. Mitigation included paying the costs of keeping lagoon mouths open, dredging sediment from lagoons, and restoring reef habitat if long-term significant impacts on nearshore reef habitat occurred. In 2006, SANDAG made its final

payment for lagoon mitigation and was not required to expend funds to create offshore reef habitat.

Other Replenishment Efforts

The Strategy places an emphasis on beach replenishment to preserve and enhance the environmental quality, recreational capacity, economic prosperity, and property and infrastructure protection benefits of the region's shoreline. While the RBSP was implemented to meet these objectives, continued maintenance of the region's shoreline will be required.

Since long-term funding sources are not currently available for ongoing replenishment efforts, SANDAG is working with local cities to develop opportunistic sand programs that place compatible excess sandy material from sources such as development projects and detention basins on regional beaches. SANDAG has been working through a grant from DBW on a pilot program called the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP), which is a mechanism for coastal jurisdictions to place small quantities of suitable sand material on beaches when it becomes available.

Recently, SANDAG received another grant from DBW to develop a pilot Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (Regional Management Plan) for the San Diego region. Building upon what was developed for the California Coastal Sediment Management Master Plan, the Regional Management Plan is a guidance and policy document that will discuss how management of sediment targeted at coastal erosion can be implemented in an expeditious, cost-effective, and resource-protective manner throughout the San Diego region.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The 2001 RBSP was a pilot project that has demonstrated the feasibility of beach replenishment in the San Diego region. The monitoring results for the RBSP confirmed the project's objectives of replenishing the region's beaches without negatively impacting the environment. An added benefit to the project was realized through the findings of a habitat study commissioned by the City of Encinitas. The study found that the RBSP actually had a positive impact on biological resources by providing additional beach habitat for nesting and foraging shorebirds.

There have been efforts undertaken by local jurisdictions, such as the City of Encinitas and most recently the City of Solana Beach, to dedicate funding for beach nourishment. As mentioned above, the RBSP was funded by federal and state funds. Since funding for additional beach nourishment has not been identified, the SPWG is working with the local jurisdictions to identify local sources of funds that could be leveraged with potential state and federal funding.

The Working Group has begun work on a feasibility study that will meet the requirements of State Department of Boating and Waterways to allow SANDAG to compete for state Beach Erosion and Public Beach Restoration Program funds; this study should be completed in summer 2007. A component of this feasibility study is the development of a regional cost-benefit analysis (CBA), which will quantify the economic benefit of a nourishment project similar in scope to the RBSP. Specifically, the CBA will estimate the increase in recreational value from widening specific beach sites by looking at the increase in recreational value per visitor and the increase in visitors. Finally, the CBA will estimate the increase in direct economic and tax revenue impact for the San Diego region.

Understanding the results of the first RBSP and getting a better understanding of the economic value of the region's coastline will provide information needed to determine the region's commitment to long-term and ongoing beach replenishment activities and the importance of healthy beaches in the region.

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

July 12, 2007

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **6**

Action Requested: INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION

REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PLANNING
COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY

File Number 3002800

Introduction

At the May 3, 2007, Shoreline Preservation Working Group (Working Group) meeting, SANDAG staff prepared draft cost estimates to depict cost allocation methodologies that were to be used for planning purposes. These estimates were based on the total cost to replicate the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project as identified by Moffatt & Nichol (Attachment 1), approximately \$24.8 million. The Working Group briefly discussed funding, but the discussion needed to continue at a future meeting.

Discussion

On May 31, 2007, the Working Group staff subgroup met to discuss the cost allocation methodologies. After discussions on the existing methodologies provided by SANDAG staff, the subgroup realized that additional work would be necessary in order to determine a cost allocation for the entire project. However, the subgroup agreed that it is important to continue to make progress toward project implementation and decided to discuss only the planning cost allocations.

The subgroup reached a consensus on a cost allocation for the \$500,000 in planning costs, which includes an investigation of offshore sand sources and preliminary design. It should be noted that the City of Del Mar had concerns over the allocation and thought that funding should be based on population. And, the City of Coronado wanted to make it clear that they are willing to participate, but their participation will be limited to the planning phase because they are not directly receiving any of the sand. However, it was recommended by the subgroup that the \$500,000 in planning costs be allocated based on miles of coastline, which is the allocation currently used for the Shoreline Monitoring Program and Cost-Benefit Analysis.

SANDAG staff recommends that all planning costs be allocated evenly among the coastal cities. Since all cities are benefiting equally from the planning activities, staff believes all should pay equally. A breakdown of costs under each recommended method can be seen below. SANDAG staff is requesting the Working Group's input and feedback.

Cost Breakdown Scenarios				
			Estimated Contribution Toward Planning Costs	
City	Coastline Miles	% of Coastline	Cost Based on Miles of Coastline	Cost Based on Even Distribution
Carlsbad	6.5	15%	\$74,500	\$62,500
Coronado	3.1	7%	\$35,500	\$62,500
Del Mar	3	7%	\$34,500	\$62,500
Encinitas	5.8	13%	\$66,500	\$62,500
Imperial Beach	2.7	6%	\$31,000	\$62,500
Oceanside	3.6	8%	\$41,500	\$62,500
San Diego	17.3	40%	\$199,000	\$62,500
Solana Beach	1.5	4%	\$17,500	\$62,500
Total	43.5	100%	\$500,000	\$500,000

Prior to work beginning on the planning activities, each coastal city would need to provide a written commitment to fund this work. The Working Group may want to consider the determination of a deadline for the attainment of financial commitments. Additionally, the Working Group may want to consider a contingency plan for the reallocation of planning funds if one or more of the coastal jurisdictions is unable to, or chooses not to, participate.

The Working Group may make a recommendation to staff regarding the preferred allocation of planning funds. If the Working Group makes a recommendation, this item could be presented to the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on August 3, 2007. If action is taken by the RPC, these recommendations could be taken to the Board of Directors on September 28, 2007.

SANDAG staff will continue to work with the subgroup to determine potential allocation methodologies for the remaining project costs. A recommendation from the subgroup will be presented at an upcoming Working Group meeting.

Attachment: Regional Beach Sand Project Preliminary Cost Estimate

Key Staff Contact: Shelby Tucker, (619) 699-1916; stu@sandag.org

**Agenda Item #6, Attachment 1
Shoreline Preservation Working Group
July 12, 2007**

**TABLE 1
PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE
SANDAG SECOND REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT
ASSUMING MATERIAL IS DREDGED AND PUMPED TO BEACH BY HOPPER DREDGE**

ITEM NO.	ITEM DESCRIPTION	Assumed	RSBP#1		UNIT COST	SUBTOTAL
		Borrow Site	Final	QUANTITY		
(RSBP #1)						
Planning/Soft Costs - Assumed for Now to Be Similar to Previous Project With Escalation						
1	Additional Investigation of Offshore Sand Sources			1	LS	\$300,000 \$ 300,000
2	Preliminary Design (likely on the high end)			1	LS	\$200,000 \$ 200,000
3	Environmental Review (CEQA/NEPA)			1	LS	\$500,000 \$ 500,000
4	Resource Agency Permits			1	LS	\$350,000 \$ 350,000
5	Final Plans, Specs, & Engineering			1	LS	\$1,000,000 \$ 1,000,000
6	Pre and Post Project Monitoring (Biological, reduced for <u>same project</u>)			1	LS	\$250,000 \$ 250,000
7	Pre and Post Project Monitoring (Shoreline)			1	LS	\$600,000 \$ 600,000
8	Cost-Benefit Analysis (new task)			1	LS	\$40,000 \$ 40,000
9	Environmental Permit Contingency for Possible Unknowns (20%)			1	LS	20% of Prelim. \$ 588,000
Total Prelim/Soft Construction Items (likely on the high end and may be able to be reduced)						\$ 3,528,000
Construction Costs						
1	Mobilization & Demobilization			1	LS.	\$2,500,000 \$ 2,500,000
2	Oceanside Beach	SO7	420,000		CY	\$7.01 \$ 2,943,365
3	N. Carlsbad	SO5	225,000		CY	\$9.01 \$ 2,026,713
4	S. Carlsbad	SO7	160,000		CY	\$5.54 \$ 886,943
5	Batiquitos	SO7	118,000		CY	\$5.04 \$ 595,107
6	Leucadia Beach	SO7	130,000		CY	\$5.33 \$ 692,777
7	Moonlight Beach	SO7	103,000		CY	\$5.58 \$ 574,649
8	Cardiff Beach	SO6	104,000		CY	\$4.72 \$ 491,206
9	Fletcher Cove	SO5	140,000		CY	\$5.96 \$ 833,968
10	Del Mar	SO5	180,000		CY	\$5.29 \$ 952,218
11	Torrey Pines	SO5	240,000		CY	\$5.79 \$ 1,389,651
12	Mission Beach	MB1	150,000		CY	\$5.26 \$ 788,642
13	Imperial Beach	MB1	120,000		CY	\$9.36 \$ 1,123,026
14	Construction Contingency		1		LS.	25% of constr. \$ 3,949,566
15	Construction Management		1		LS.	7% of constr. \$ 1,105,878
16	Construction Survey or Inspection		1		LS.	3% of constr. \$ 473,948
Total Construction Costs						\$ 21,327,657
GRAND TOTAL ALL ITEMS				2,090,000		\$ 24,855,657

ASSUMPTIONS:

- 1 This cost estimate is for a duplicate project to the 2001 RBSP using the same borrow site and receiver site arrangements. However, it is unknown if all of the borrow sites (e.g., SO-7) can provide the volume of sand needed, and therefore, further offshore explorations are required. These exploration costs are included as Item 1.
- 2 Pre- and post-project biological monitoring costs are assumed to decrease significantly from the 2001 RBSP. The level of monitoring will be less if the project is identical to the 2001 RBSP, but requirements need to be further defined. Monitoring includes that for beach profiles and limited marine biology before construction, turbidity monitoring during construction, and beach profiles and limited biology for approximately 5 years after construction
- 3 Dredging and Pumping includes land equipment for building the beach profile.
- 4 Costs for permits and environmental review assume an Environmental Impact Report (CEQA) and Environmental Assessment (NEPA) are required, as were required for the 2001 RBSP project with similar costs escalated for 2008 dollars.
- 5 The cost of final engineering is a rough estimate from the 2001 RBSP and needs verification, but the level of effort should be similar or less for an identical project.