



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, October 7, 2010

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

Guiding Principles:

- commitment to unified approach for local decisions on sand replenishment;
- address local needs and maximize positive regional impacts;
- encourage cooperation and coordination;
- contribute equitable fair share from local participants; and
- promote opportunities for beach sand replenishment.

AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- **REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT**
- **DISCUSSION OF REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**
- **OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II MODELING**

*SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit.
 Phone 511 or see www.511sd.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, October 7, 2010

ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION
1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS	COMMENTS
Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) during this time.	
+3. MEETING SUMMARIES FOR THE APRIL 1, AND JUNE 3, 2010, MEETINGS	APPROVE
The Working Group is asked to review and approve the meeting summaries:	
3a. April 1, 2010	
3b. June 3, 2010	
4. REGIONAL SHORELINE MONITORING PROGRAM ANNUAL REPORT	INFORMATION
Greg Hearon from Coastal Frontiers Corporation will provide the Working Group with a presentation on the 2009 Regional Shoreline Monitoring Program Annual Report.	
+5. REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II	INFORMATION / POSSIBLE ACTION
5a. SANDAG staff will provide an update on the draft Memorandum of Agreement among the participating coastal cities and SANDAG.	
5b. Chris Webb from Moffatt & Nichol will provide the Working Group with an update on the status of RBSP II planning efforts, specifically an overview of the modeling efforts that led to the draft monitoring plan.	
5c. SANDAG staff will go over the RBSP II project schedule, specifically the deadlines associated with the environmental document and permits.	
6. STATUS OF PENDING AND FUTURE PROJECTS WITHIN THE REGION	INFORMATION
The Working Group will discuss the status of current Marine Life Protection Act Initiative efforts, the potential for a north county opportunistic sand project, and hear an update on lagoon maintenance projects.	
7. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING	INFORMATION
The next regularly scheduled Working Group meeting is Thursday, December 2, 2010, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.	

+ next to an item indicates an attachment

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

October 7, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **3a**

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF APRIL 1, 2010, MEETING

File Number 3200200

Members in Attendance:

Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, Chair
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, Vice Chair
James Bond, City of Encinitas
Kevin Faulconer, City of San Diego
Mark Filanc, City of Del Mar
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad
Eileen Maher, San Diego Unified Port District
Mike Woiwode, City of Coronado

Advisory Members in Attendance:

August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fishermen's Association (CLTFA)
Marco Gonzalez, Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation
Louis Gussac, Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association (SCTCA)
Robert Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service
Michele Okihiro, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Mark Rauscher, Surfrider Foundation

Staff Subgroup:

Y. Sachiko Kohatsu, County of San Diego
Leslea Meyerhoff, City of Solana Beach
Frank Quan, City of Oceanside
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach

Others in Attendance:

Anthony Andaya
Bud Carroll
Bryan Clark, ARC Capital Planners
Scott Clark
Jon Corn
Walt Crampton, TerraCosta
Teri Fenner, AECOM
Karen Green, SAIC
Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Associates, Inc.
Cindy Kinkade, AECOM
Kyle Lancaster, City of Carlsbad

John Metz
Dan Muslin, TEC Inc.
Natalie Roderick, Hofman Planning
Barry Snyder, AMEC
Richard Stolpe, TEC Inc.
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:

Gary Gallegos, SANDAG
Kim Roeland, SANDAG
Rob Rundle, SANDAG
Shelby Tucker, SANDAG

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, called the meeting to order at 11:38 a.m., and welcomed the group. Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, introduced and welcomed Mark Rauscher as the new advisory member from Surfrider Foundation.

2. Public Comment/Communications

Ms. Tucker presented James Bond, City of Encinitas, with an award from the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association.

3. Summary of the February 4, 2010, Meeting

After making no corrections, the February 4, 2010, meeting summary was unanimously approved.

4. Addition of Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) Advisory Member

Ms. Tucker announced that Marco Gonzalez, Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation (CERF), is requesting CERF to be included as an advisory member of the Working Group. Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach, motioned to include CERF as an advisory member. Ann Kulchin, City of Carlsbad, seconded the motion, which passed with all voting aye.

5. Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSP II)

a. RBSP II Budget

Ms. Tucker announced that a revised attachment (Agenda Item 5a) was available that corrected an error that was made on the table on page 14 of the agenda. The correction, she explained, increased the funding shortfall for the RBSP II from \$3,564,399 to \$4,404,399. She then described the cost increase between the 2001 Regional Beach Sand Project (RBSP I) and RBSP II in 2012. Ms. Tucker explained that one of the main reasons for the cost discrepancy is that the borrow sites that were used for RBSP I are unavailable for RBSP II, and consequently transportation distances from borrow sites to receiver sites are greater, thus increasing the cost. She also pointed out that the revenues received or anticipated total \$22,342,625, which results in a funding short fall of \$4,404,399.35. She added that the portion of the revenues from the Department of Boating and

Waterways (DBW) totaling \$13 million has been received, and invited Gary Gallegos, SANDAG, to speak in regards to the DBW funding.

Mr. Gallegos began by referencing a letter, which was available to all attending the meeting from the DBW, requesting that \$700,000 be deferred from the \$6.5 million currently budgeted for Fiscal Year 2010-2011. The deferral of funds would help sustain four ongoing Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) coastal studies in Encinitas, Solana Beach, Carpinteria, and San Clemente. He noted the DBW has been good partners with SANDAG in the past and acknowledged that most of the funding for the sand projects comes from them. Mr. Gallegos stated that he had received a commitment from the Chief Deputy Director at DBW stating that they would try to restore the funds in next year's budget, but acknowledged the uncertainty that exists in future budgets for the State of California.

Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, clarified that the money that the DBW is asking for is funding coastal studies – two in San Diego – that will occur before the RBSP II. He agreed with Mr. Gallegos that DBW has been a good partner in the past, and expressed confidence in DBW to restore the funds in the following year. He finished by motioning to approve the deferral of the \$700,000 in Fiscal Year 2010-2011; Mr. Janney seconded the motion.

Mark Filanc, City of Del Mar, pointed out that the four ACOE studies would benefit the entire coastal region, particularly benefiting cities like the City of Del Mar that are vulnerable to sea level rise.

James Bond, City of Encinitas, explained that the City of Encinitas has been planning and contributing money for nearly two decades (reconnaissance study conducted in 1991) for this ACOE coastal study, and restated the potential benefits of the studies for all coastal areas in the region.

Mr. Gallegos suggested asking DBW to issue a letter of no prejudice stating that they would help to replenish the \$700,000 in the future. But, he also acknowledged the urgency in replacing sand on the beaches, as well as the sensitive timing and the scale needed for cost effectiveness for beach sand projects. Mr. Gallegos suggested the letter might be a tool to allow the project to continue in the future.

Ms. Kulchin asked about the options that the SPWG had, and specifically wanted to know if it was possible to say no. Mr. Gallegos responded that it was an option to say no because the funding is in the Governor's Budget, so we might keep the \$700,000, but in the long run we might lose a key partner.

Mr. Gonzalez pointed out that one thing the SPWG has not talked about is federal funding opportunities, such as the Navy, which funded the Regional Beach Sand Project I (RBSP I) in 2001. He suggested asking for line item assistance from our congressional delegation since the funding shortfall is tied to a federal agency (i.e., ACOE). Mr. Gallegos agreed, stating that since there could be a \$5.1 million shortfall, federal funding should be explored. Mr. Gonzalez listed three that might be open to discussions about this funding issue: Senators Boxer and Feinstein, and Representative Filner. Ms. Slater Price added Representative Susan Davis.

Mr. Janney spoke about a nourishment project in Imperial Beach that is getting federal funding with matching funds from DBW. From his experience, finding federal money to fund construction projects has been difficult, and he credited DBW and the Port of San Diego for their efforts to support the projects. Mr. Janney concluded that the money for the RBSP I will likely have to come from the state.

Ms. Kulchin asked if the City of Oceanside will participate in the RBSP II; Ms. Tucker responded participation from the City of Oceanside is still uncertain. Mr. Gonzalez added that the pier in Oceanside lost a large amount of beach (approximately 50 feet), which might be a big motivator to help secure funding.

Mr. Bond reflected on years of meetings in Washington D.C. and Sacramento to gather support for coastal projects, and stated that one of the biggest criticisms he received was that money frequently went toward studies, but not toward the work of actually putting sand on the beaches. He stated that the ACOE studies are critical in moving toward real ground solutions.

Louis Gussac, SCTCA, spoke of the interests of the tribal nations in preserving submerged archaeological sites offshore. He suggested gathering support from other tribal leaders to collectively ask for funding from the federal government, aiming to benefit the beach replenishment projects while protecting known offshore sites and possibly discovering new important sites. Ms. Slater-Price and Mr. Gallegos both agreed that that was an excellent idea; Mr. Gallegos suggested including it in the upcoming Tribal Summit.

Robert Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service, noted the change in locations for the borrow and receiver sites, but he noted that the quantities are basically the same as the 2001 RBSP I. He questioned why the cost for environmental permitting increased almost 50 percent from RBSP I. Ms. Tucker explained that the environmental review was for all alternatives, including some alternatives that significantly increase quantities for some cities.

Ms. Slater-Price reminded the group that there was a motion and a second on the board to allow DBW to defer payment of \$700,000; the motion passed with all in favor.

b. Funding Match for RBSP II Phase II

Ms. Tucker asked the coastal cities to memorialize their commitment for providing matching funds for the Phase II tasks by the June SPWG meeting. The Phase II tasks include monitoring, construction management, and funds for the planning contingency.

Ms. Slater-Price asked Mr. Filanc to state the City of Del Mar's decision of whether or not to participate. Mr. Filanc answered that the City of Del Mar will not be able to participate due to budget constraints.

Ms. Tucker announced that SANDAG will work with the City of Oceanside to see if they will be able to participate; if not, she stated there will be an \$84,000 hole in the revenues.

Kevin Faulconer, City of San Diego, mentioned that the City of San Diego wanted to be supportive, but that there were some discussions and additional work that needed to be done before any commitment was made. Both Ms. Tucker and Mr. Gallegos offered help and assistance.

Ms. Tucker finished by stating that the MOU was a draft, and that a final version would be sent to the coastal cities after the June meeting.

c. Status of RBSP II Planning Efforts

Teri Fenner and Cindy Kinkade, AECOM, presented a review of the project description and alternatives for the environmental document. She briefly described the three alternatives, listing the quantities of sand proposed to be placed within each alternative. Ms. Fenner described some differences between RBSP I and RBSP II: the first project was based on the Shoreline Preservation Strategy (1993), while RBSP II is based on that, as well as the Regional Sediment Management Plan. RBSP II also has new borrow sites to maximize the quality and quantity of sand to be placed on the beaches; these borrow sites, she informed, have the same name as the borrow sites from RBSP I. Receiver sites have shifted in location and in some cases have changed volumes from RBSP I. Ms. Fenner explained that these changes, along with updated environmental regulations, require a new environmental review. Ms. Kinkade presented the schedule for CEQA/NEPA review, including preparation of the EIR/EA from April to August 2010, public scoping meetings to be held April to June 2010, and a final EIR/EA completed in June 2011. Ms. Tucker added that Chapter 2 (including maps) was not included in the agenda packet, but that anyone wishing to see them should contact her.

Mr. Bond asked about the location of the borrow sites, pointing out that in 2001, some sites were filled with small-grained sand which did not persist on the beach as long as the large-grained sand. Ms. Fenner explained that the location of the borrow sites intended to provide the best quality sand, and that detailed information about the borrow sites would be included in the EIR/EA. Chris Webb, Moffatt and Nichol, added that the borrow sites (specifically SO-5 off Del Mar) was moved toward the shore and closer to the river, providing coarser grain size sand. Mr. Hoffman asked if a grain size distribution chart would be provided in the environmental document; Mr. Webb confirmed that it would. Mr. Filanc asked for the document to also include the minimum and maximum depth for the borrow sites. Mr. Webb assured that a cross section with dimensions would be included, based on the footprint from RBSP I dredging.

Mr. Gonzalez pointed out the inherent difficulty in establishing a baseline because of seasonal shifts in erosion and beach profiles. With the most recent episodic event this winter, he asked if additional surveying would be needed and wondered how budgeting accounted for these complications. Ms. Fenner replied that no additional baseline biological surveys are planned beyond those completed in 2009/2010. She acknowledged the challenges associated with establishing a baseline with seasonal shifts. She stated that site photos from 2009 and 2010 will be included in the documents. Mr. Gonzalez discussed emergency procedures needed to protect structures during extreme El Niño conditions, such as placing rip-rap on the beaches. He added that discussions with homeowners would need to address short-term and long-term solutions, and clarification should be made in how RBSP II might fit in with protection of private property.

Mr. Guassac asked how the offshore activities would operate around submerged archaeological sites. Ms. Fenner replied that there would be coastal resources surveys and monitoring done, and asked if Mr. Guassac would like to be involved. Mr. Guassac replied that he would.

A member of the public asked if spring monitoring data from Coastal Frontiers was used for the baseline. Karen Green, SAIC, answered that a survey will be done in May 2010, which will be added to the current baseline information.

6. Legislative Update

Mr. Kellejian asked if anyone has an update on state-level discussions about making state parks and state beaches smoke-free. Ms. Slater-Price mentioned that she had heard there was some support from various communities, but that it had not advanced. Mr. Bond suggested that establishing a smoke-free area was relatively easy on a beach, where boundaries are clear and space is limited, compared with a large expansive state park. Ms. Slater-Price added that a ban on smoking was achieved in the County of San Diego due in part to the vote being timed just after major fires, and suggested fire hazard reduction to be added to the benefits for anti-smoking legislation. Mr. Bond added that the state parks have a shortage in personnel as is it without the extra responsibility of enforcing a smoking ban.

Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach, announced that the Energy and Water Appropriations Cycle for ACOE projects began at the beginning of February. Requests for funding have been published, and those included the City of Imperial Beach's projects.

Mark Rauscher, Sierra Club, described a ballot measure that is being proposed to secure a permanent funding source for State Parks. Funding would be from an \$18 fee added to the vehicle registration; in return for that fee, any vehicle with California registration would receive free day use of state parks. Ms. Slater-Price asked if there would be language to avoid backfilling. Mr. Rauscher clarified that there currently is no money going toward state parks, so there is no threat of backfilling.

Mr. Gonzalez reported some feedback on opportunistic sand projects. For the Encinitas Pacific Station Project in 2009, the feedback that was received was the individuals were uninformed about the opportunistic sand project, and there was concern over the discoloration and composition of sand being placed on the beach (e.g., rocks and glass mixed in with the sand). The more recent Scripps Memorial Hospital Encinitas project occurred during a period of high surf and strong wind and current conditions, which resulted in discolored material being spread from Moonlight Beach, a couple of miles to the south to Swami's surf area. Mr. Gonzalez suggested (1) revisiting the model for predicting the movement of the material along the coast, and (2) preparing a more thorough public response plan. Ms. Slater-Price suggested a good source of information was the lifeguards. Mr. Gonzalez disagreed, and described his interactions with the lifeguards during the project. Mr. Bond detailed some of the efforts made at the City of Encinitas to inform the public about the project. These included a Web site and several notices in the newspaper. Mr. Gonzalez argued that for the RBSP II, it needs to be anticipated that there will be lots of interest, particularly regarding the color and grain size of the material being placed, and suggested placing information at the construction site to proactively mitigate public outcry. Ms. Tucker replied that she is working on the communications component of RBSP II, anticipating similar reactions from the public. Mr. Gonzalez suggested that organizations, such as Surfrider and CERF, might help in informing the public about these projects.

7. Adjournment and Next Meeting

Chair Slater-Price adjourned the meeting at 12:47 p.m. The next meeting will be held on June 3, 2010.

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

October 7, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **3b**

Action Requested: APPROVE

SUMMARY OF JUNE 3, 2010, MEETING

File Number 3200200

Members in Attendance:

Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, Chair
Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, Vice Chair
Jim Janney, City of Imperial Beach
Eileen Maher, San Diego Unified Port District
Mitchel Perdue, U.S. Navy

Advisory Members in Attendance:

Loni Adams, California Department of Fish and Game
August Felando, California Lobster and Trap Fishermen's Association (CLTFA)
Ron Flick, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Marco Gonzalez, Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation
Robert Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service
Michele Okihiro, Scripps Institution of Oceanography
Mark Rauscher, Surfrider Foundation
Julie Thomas, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Staff Subgroup:

Steven Jantz, City of Carlsbad
Y. Sachiko Kohatsu, County of San Diego
Leslea Meyerhoff, City of Solana Beach
Frank Quan, City of Oceanside
Danny Schrotberger, City of San Diego
Greg Wade, City of Imperial Beach
Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas

Others in Attendance:

Bud Carroll
Tim Dillingham, California Department of Fish and Game
Teri Fenner, AECOM
Kristen Goodrich, Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve
Karen Green, SAIC
Lawrence Honma, Merkel & Associates, Inc
Cindy Kinkade, AECOM
Anne-Lise Lindquist, Moffatt & Nichol
Barry Snyder, AMEC
Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol

SANDAG Staff in Attendance:

Kim Roeland, SANDAG

Rob Rundle, SANDAG

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Pam Slater-Price, County of San Diego, called the meeting to order at 11:39 a.m., and welcomed the group.

2. Public Comment/Communications

Kristen Goodrich, Tijuana River National Estuarine Research Reserve, TRNERR, announced that the second training entitled "Planning for Climate Change" will be held on June 17, 2010, at the TRNERR headquarters from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

3. Summary of the April 1, 2010, Meeting

Without quorum, review and approval of the minutes was postponed to a later meeting.

4. Encinitas Opportunistic Sand Project Update

Kathy Weldon, City of Encinitas, provided a comparison of two opportunistic sand projects – Pacific Station (January 2009) and Scripps Memorial Hospital (March 2010) – and presented the lessons learned from each. Some of the differences between the two projects include:

- 1) The Pacific Station project occurred during a La Niña event, while the Scripps Hospital project occurred during an El Niño event;
- 2) The Pacific Station project dug 35 feet and reached Torrey sandstone which is pale yellow in color, and the Scripps Hospital project was shallower (13 feet), didn't reach the Torrey sandstone, and, as a result, provided material that was darker red in color; and
- 3) The Pacific Station project had a 5-day turbidity requirement, and the Scripps Hospital project had a 3-day turbidity requirement.

Ms. Weldon also discussed the differences in construction and costs for each project, recommending establishing a clear work plan with contractors before construction work starts.

Marco Gonzalez, Coastal Environmental Rights Foundation, CERF, noted that from his office location at Swami's, there were discrete plumes of turbidity in the water during the Scripps Hospital project, which caused some concern for people in the area. Mr. Gonzalez described the turbidity as "startling," and noted the importance of response plans for the public concern.

5. Regional Beach Sand Project II (RBSP II) Memorandum of Understanding

Shelby Tucker, SANDAG, provided an update on the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among participating coastal cities and SANDAG. She listed the coastal cities that are currently on the MOU, including the Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Imperial Beach.

Ms. Tucker stressed the importance of moving the project forwarding and getting commitments from all cities that wished to continue participation in the project.

Joe Kellejian, City of Solana Beach, noted the importance of setting a deadline and added that participation from the City of Oceanside (Oceanside), which is currently uncertain, is critical. There was discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the two options for the MOU: 1) include Oceanside into the MOU and proceed as planned, or 2) proceed without Oceanside in the MOU. It was determined that the MOU would be tabled until the October Working Group meeting, giving Oceanside additional time to determine their level of involvement in the project.

Chris Webb, Moffatt and Nichol, provided an update on the status of RBSP II planning efforts. Finalization of the project description resulted in the Notice of Preparation released on May 21, 2010. He announced that the public scoping period will run from May 21, 2010 – June 21, 2010; during that time there will be three public scoping meetings. The first of the meetings will be held at SANDAG after the SPWG meeting on June 3, 2010, the second later in the evening in Encinitas on the same day, and the final meeting on June 8, 2010, in the evening in Imperial Beach.

6. Legislative Update

Ms. Tucker provided a brief update on the status of state and federal legislation related to the shoreline management program. She discussed AB 2598, a climate adaptation bill which includes an assessment of impacts from sea level rise. She also described a sea level rise study by the National Research Council for California, Oregon, and Washington. Ms. Slater-Price and Mr. Gonzalez, announced that AB 1998, the statewide ban on plastic bags, passed the assembly.

7. Adjournment and Next Meeting

Chair Slater-Price adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 7, 2010. After a short break, the Regional Beach Sand Project Public Scoping meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

October 7, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5a**

Action Requested: INFORMATION/POSSIBLE ACTION

REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II

File Number 3200200

Introduction

SANDAG applied for and received funds from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) for the planning and construction of the second Regional Beach Sand Project (Project). These funds were provided for Fiscal Years (FY) 2009 and 2010, funds are anticipated for FY 2011. The DBW requires a 15 percent match for funds received. To date, the coastal cities have provided matching funds for FY 2009 and have been asked to determine whether they will continue to participate in the Project by providing the required 15 percent in matching funds for the second three Project tasks. This commitment will then be memorialized in Amendment 1 to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SANDAG and the participating coastal cities.

Recommendation

In an effort to move forward on implementing the Project, SANDAG staff is recommending that the coastal cities who have taken action on providing the required local match to state funding, move forward with finalizing the MOU (Attachment 1).

Background

SANDAG has been working with the coastal cities to secure matching funds. The Cities of Oceanside, Carlsbad, Encinitas, Solana Beach, and Imperial Beach have provided funds that serve as the 15 percent match to FY 2009 DBW funds. These funds are being used toward the first three Project tasks (phase one), which include environmental review, permitting, and final engineering plans and specifications.

Phase two of the Project will include monitoring, construction management, and funds for the planning contingency. Contingency funds have been included in anticipation of permitting requirements set forth by the resource agencies. The amount each participating coastal city would be expected to pay for phase two is listed below. This amount reflects the 15 percent match to FY 2010 DBW funds broken down based on the approved funding methodology and Project tasks.

Those cities that continue to participate in the Project will be asked to again memorialize their commitment. This will be done through an amendment to the MOU entered into in June 2009. The draft Amendment 1 to the MOU is included as Attachment 1.

At this time, the City of Oceanside will not sign Amendment 1 of the MOU. Funds to be paid by the City of Oceanside for year two will be carried over into year three and prior to any work being done on year two tasks for the City of Oceanside, they will be required to pay their proportional share.

Realizing the many benefits that come from placing sand in the region's northern most city, SANDAG staff will continue to work with the City of Oceanside with the expectation that whatever agreement can be reached and approved also will be memorialized through an MOU between SANDAG and the City of Oceanside.

In the event that the City of Oceanside is unable to provide any funds toward the Project, this Working group will discuss amendments to the Project's scope.

Jurisdictions	60% Sand	10 % Miles (01)	30% Population	Total
Oceanside	\$42,517	\$5,440	\$36,154	\$84,111
Carlsbad	\$38,978	\$6,006	\$20,166	\$65,150
Encinitas	\$46,072	\$7,461	\$12,187	\$65,719
Solana Beach	\$14,172	\$3,675	\$2,747	\$20,594
Del Mar	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
San Diego	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Imperial Beach	\$12,141	\$3,065	\$5,686	\$20,892
Total	\$153,880	\$25,647	\$76,940	\$256,466
	\$111,363	\$20,207	\$40,786	\$172,355

Jurisdictions	Biological and Shoreline Monitoring Match	Planning Contingency Match	Construction Management Match	Total
Oceanside	\$29,350	\$16,574	\$38,186	\$84,111
Carlsbad	\$22,734	\$12,838	\$29,578	\$65,150
Encinitas	\$22,933	\$12,950	\$29,836	\$65,719
Solana Beach	\$7,186	\$4,058	\$9,350	\$20,594
Del Mar	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
San Diego	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Imperial Beach	\$7,290	\$4,117	\$9,485	\$20,892
Total	\$89,493	\$50,538	\$116,435	\$256,466
	\$60,143	\$33,963	\$78,249	\$172,355

Attachment: 1. Memorandum of Understanding

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

**AMENDMENT 1 TO MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING # 5001253
BETWEEN SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AND SAN DIEGO REGION'S PARTICIPATING COASTAL JURISDICTIONS
REGARDING REGIONAL BEACH SAND REPLENISHMENT PROJECT II**

This Amendment 1 to Memorandum of Understanding ("Amendment") is made and entered into effective as of this ___ day of _____, 2010, by and between the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG") and the City of Carlsbad, City of Encinitas, City of Imperial Beach, and City of Solana Beach ("Coastal Cities").

RECITALS

The following recitals are a substantive part of this Amendment:

WHEREAS, in _June 2009_, the parties entered into Memorandum of Understanding # 5001253 to implement the Regional Beach Sand Project II (the "Project") on a regional basis; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG received funds for fiscal year 2010 in the amount of \$6.5 million for the second year of the Project implementation in the San Diego region from the Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW); and

WHEREAS, SANDAG expects to receive additional funds for fiscal year 2011 in the amount of \$6.5 million for the third year of Project implementation from DBW; and

WHEREAS, the DBW funding requires a 15 percent local match to be paid by the San Diego region for all DBW funds expended on the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Coastal Cities anticipated execution of an amendment to the MOU to reflect their ongoing commitment to provide the 15 percent match for the additional Project funds; and

WHEREAS, the Project methodology to allocate the 15 percent match required by DBW among the Coastal Cities is based on the formula of 60 percent amount of sand received, 10 percent miles of coastline restored, and 30 percent population; and

WHEREAS, SANDAG requires a funding commitment from each Coastal City prior to work commencing on each of the second phase of the Project tasks using the additional funding; and

WHEREAS, the proportional share of the Project for the first three Project tasks (Phase 1) has been paid by the Coastal Cities; and

WHEREAS, the Coastal Cities agree to pay their proportional share of the Project for the second phase of the Project, which includes biological and shoreline monitoring, planning contingency as needed to fulfill permitting requirements, and construction management (Phase 2); and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to memorialize additions and modifications to the MOU with this Amendment in order to carry out the purposes set forth above;

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein, the parties agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

SANDAG AGREES:

1. To manage Phase 2 of the Project in coordination with the Coastal Cities through the Shoreline Preservation Working Group; and involve the Coastal Cities in the implementation of all phases of the Project.
2. The SANDAG Project Manager will invoice the Coastal Cities a minimum of 30 days prior to the start date of Phase 2 of the Project to ensure prompt payment by all parties.

COASTAL CITIES AGREE:

1. Each Coastal City has approved its appropriation as set forth in the chart below, being its proportional share of the required DBW 15 percent match for Phase 2 of the Project, which includes biological and shoreline monitoring, planning contingency as needed to fulfill permitting requirements, and construction management. Funds will be paid to SANDAG prior to the start date of Phase 2 of the Project.

Jurisdictions	60% Sand	10% Miles (01)	30% Population	Total
Oceanside	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Carlsbad	\$38,978	\$6,006	\$20,166	\$65,150
Encinitas	\$46,072	\$7,461	\$12,187	\$65,719
Solana Beach	\$14,172	\$3,675	\$2,747	\$20,594
Del Mar	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
San Diego	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Imperial Beach	\$12,141	\$3,065	\$5,686	\$20,892
Total	\$111,363	\$20,207	\$40,786	\$172,355

2. The Coastal Cities understand that SANDAG will not proceed with Phase 2 of the Project without the assurances set forth in this Amendment, reflecting the Coastal Cities' approvals of their respective appropriations, the aggregate of which will fund the Project.

THE PARTIES MUTUALLY AGREE:

1. That all obligations of SANDAG under the terms of this Amendment are subject to the appropriation of the required resources by SANDAG and the Coastal Cities, and the approval of the SANDAG Board of Directors.
2. That unless it is amended by the parties in writing, the MOU shall terminate on December 31, 2012, or on such earlier or later date as the parties may agree to in writing. Any party wishing to withdraw from this MOU shall provide 60 (sixty) days written notice of its desire to withdraw. If such notice is given, the MOU shall continue to be binding on those parties who have not formally withdrawn, and the withdrawing party shall be responsible for its portion of the costs that SANDAG incurred prior to receiving the notice.
3. This Amendment may be executed in any number of identical counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original, and all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument when each party has signed one such counterpart.
4. That all terms of the MOU remain unchanged and binding except to the extent they are modified by this Amendment.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Amendment effective on the day and year first above written.

SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GARY L. GALLEGOS
Executive Director

Office of General Counsel

City of Carlsbad

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Claude A. Lewis
Mayor

Ron Ball
City Attorney

City of Encinitas

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

PHILLIP COTTON
City Manager

Glenn Sabine
City Attorney

City of Imperial Beach

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

GARY BROWN
City Manager

Jim Lough
City Attorney

City of Solana Beach

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DAVID OTT
City Manager

Johanna Canlas
City Attorney

San Diego Association of Governments
SHORELINE PRESERVATION WORKING GROUP

October 7, 2010

AGENDA ITEM NO.: **5b**

Action Requested: INFORMATION

REGIONAL BEACH SAND PROJECT II: OVERVIEW OF MODELING EFFORTS

File Number 3200200

Introduction

Numerical modeling of sand dispersion was completed for beach fills associated with Regional Beach Sand Project II alternatives. The numerical model GENESIS predicts the change in position of the shoreline from a pre-project initial condition to a series of post-project scenarios. The modeling results are used to assess the potential for environmental impacts to habitat, and to determine the longevity of the beach fill material in the North County coastal littoral cell system. Analyses identify areas that will experience sand deposition, and areas that will either not change or that will actually erode in the future.

Discussion

Model results are analyzed for changes in shoreline position (beach widening, narrowing, or no change). Analyses are extrapolated to quantify changes in dry recreational beach area from the project, potential sedimentation at lagoons, and potential impacts to biology. Finally, the impact analysis leads to monitoring plan recommendations to verify post-project conditions for assessing mitigation needs.

Shoreline Position

Model results show that the shorelines widened from implementation of all project alternatives. All alternatives experienced fairly rapid dispersion of the beach fill material with noticeable beach narrowing at placement sites after one season. However, replenished beaches remained wider for a longer period of time than that predicted for Regional Beach Sand Project I, primarily due to the larger-grained sand proposed for Regional Beach Sand Project II. Beaches remain discernibly wider after five years from all alternatives.

Recreational Beach Area

Dry recreational beach area (the upper level beach otherwise referred to as "towel area") will increase for all project alternatives. Compared to existing conditions, the region will experience increases in recreational beach area by between 10 percent and 20 percent for alternative 1, between 15 percent and 30 percent for alternative 2, and between 20 percent and 44 percent for alternative 3 (alternative 3 will drop out of consideration due to significant impacts requiring mitigation).

Lagoon Sedimentation

Modeling results show that the lagoons will experience some degree of sedimentation from the project. Estimates of lagoon sedimentation vary from site to site, but are relatively moderate and should not result in lagoon closure, nor significantly increased dredging frequencies. Lagoon habitats should not be significantly affected by the project.

Effects to Biology

Effects on marine biology are still being determined as of the time of preparation of this staff report. A presentation will be made to the Shoreline Preservation Working Group (SPWG) showing any biological impacts and ramifications. Monitoring recommendations also will be determined from the results and presented to the SPWG for consideration.

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

RBSP II Project Schedule
USACE and Permitting Milestones
Spring/Summer 2012 Construction
Updated 8/27/10

