MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE COASTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, June 12, 2003
@ 7:00 p.m.
Community Center, Ole Hanson Fireside Room
100 N. Seville
San Clemente, CA 92672

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Committee Member Nielsen led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Ken Nielsen, William Hart, Michael Barnes, Nesa Ortega, Dennis Hannan

Absent: Peggy Vance

Staff present: Bill Cameron, City Engineer
Bill Humphreys, Marine Safety Captain
Mary Colletti, Recording Secretary

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER BARNES, CARRIED (6-0-0) to approve the minutes of May 8, 2003 as amended.

4. PUBLIC INPUT

None.

5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Draft Opportunistic Beach Sand Nourishment Policy

Chairman Hart introduced guest Lawrence Honma to speak about this issue. Mr. Honma works for Anec in, San Diego as a Marine Biologists doing sediment characterization. He worked on the Navy porting project 5-6 years ago where they dredged San Diego bay for beach nourishment sand. He carried the project through to the permit stage. He was involved with the SANDAG project to develop monitoring plans and implement all the biological monitoring during all phases of preconstruction, construction and post-construction, currently.

Chairman Hart asked Mr. Honma to evaluate the success of the SANDAG project. Mr. Honma said they are in the second year of the monitoring program, so there are no conclusive results, but the monitoring is documenting several beach fill areas which may potentially impact natural resources. He said they are checking twice a year on where the sand is going and what the impact is. He said SANDAG hosts shoreline preservation meetings every other month, and suggested the CAC speak to their council members, as they very much favor sand replenishment. He said the project spent $17-$18 million, but the project seems to be increasing tourist revenue.

Chairman Hart asked about the longevity of the sand and Mr. Honma said that the prior year's winter was mild so much of the sand stayed in place, except perhaps for some of the finer sand; the coarser sand stayed over the course of the previous winter. However, this year with higher than average northwest swells, much of the sand was moved offshore. He said that this summer will be more indicative of what will happen over a 2-3 year period. In regard to biological monitoring, they will have shoreline profiles, and it is thought that much of the sand was washed just offshore in the winter and will eventually move onshore this summer.

Chairman Hart asked for anything in particular to watch for, and Mr. Honma said it depends on our goals and our program type. He said the SANDAG project was a very large effort, a long process (1-2 years to get permits and environmental documentation), and they are debating whether or not to do this again. They are studying streamlining the whole process.

Chairman Hart gave a background on the two sand nourishment programs being considered:

1. Multi-year permitting process through the Army Corps of Engineers
2. Opportunistic Beach Fill:
   Construction projects or other sources may contribute sand and we want to be pre-permitted to place relatively small quantities of sand on the beach or in the surf zone.

   Chairman Hart said, and Captain Humphreys concurred, that the permit process was nearly in the stage of being sent to the permitting agencies.

   Chairman Hart described the policy the CAC is drafting for Beach Sand Opportunistic placement to Mr. Honma.

   Committee Member Barnes asked if Mr. Honma was working on any of the San Diego county opportunistic sand projects. Mr. Honma said no, but knew of one in Encinitas utilizing about 50,000 yards of sand. He said Encinitas has been hardest hit by coastal erosion. They are planning to place the sand right on the beach. He cited an example of beach sand placement in Carlsbad several years ago that had mixed results; some of the sand was red (it was from a hotel construction site) and upset a lot of people. He believed the sand met the USACOE criteria, but that the sand color can vary in pockets of

color. Mr. Honma, in response to Committee Member Ortega's questions said that sand from the five borrow sites was different in color and texture, and in some areas the color change was delineated. He said, for example that off Mission Beach, where the coarsest material was used, it was more orange than brown, and very coarse. He said you could see the line of demarcation, even after about a year and a half. He said it changed the bathymetry of the beach as well. Mr. Honma said though, that in general, people were happy to have more sand on the beach.

Committee Member Ortega asked if he had problems with a large percentage of silts and clays in the sand from construction sites. Mr. Honma said, yes, based on water quality and turbidity studies done, there tended to be a higher percentage of silts and clays that would create a lot of turbidity. He said that in the SANDAG project, during dredging of borrow sites, finer material would surface, it would be pumped onto the beach, and the turbidity was dependent upon water motion; if calm, there was turbidity for a few days; if there were waves, there was less turbidity. He said the worst case of turbidity from the borrow sites was a couple of days. The turbidity occurred at the receiver sites, especially in the first few days when the finer material surfaced, not at the borrow sites, where a vacuum dredge was used in 80 feet of water.

Mr. Honma said there are mechanical and BMP ways to control turbidity and to construct your beach to decrease turbidity. He suggested that if sand was from construction sites, you could place it higher on the beach, or mix it slowly, a little at a time with the native material. Mr. Honma said you should keep the sand close to the surf zone in this case. Mr. Honma did not have any statistics on the "worst case" turbidity that occurred in the first few days, but he felt the percentage of fines, on the surface were between 10% to 20% from the borrow sites. He said the USACOE and the Port of San Diego were dredging a navigation channel from the San Diego bay to the Coronado Bridge and they're looking for sand with 30% silt or less to be suitable for beach nourishment.

Committee Member Nielsen felt the big issue was sand from construction sites and how long the dirt would take to become sand and how it would impact our beach. He felt that dirt could stay no longer than a day before people would become upset. Mr. Honma said, based on what happened at Carlsbad, that inland dirt was not very successful, based on color and feel, and aesthetically, but that there was no problem with mud or long-term turbidity. He said he felt that the Carlsbad project was very unpopular with the public and that the sand had to ultimately be removed. He said SANDAG is exploring getting sand from landfills and other resources and was trying to streamline the permitting process.

Mr. Honma said he had yet to see an opportunistic sand nourishment project work well, but it would be interesting to see the results of the Encinitas project. He said the biggest problem was the end result; color, beach usage, aesthetics, etc., but that environmentally they were successful in mitigating erosion. He said that Encinitas now is happy to take almost any sand in order to prevent further erosion. He said he imagines that if the criteria of grain size, color, contamination, etc., are met, they will place 50,000 yards on the beach.

Committee Member Ortega asked if it was realistic to expect opportunistic sand, not from a borrow site, with less than 10% fines. Mr. Honma said he thought that sounded low, but since he was not a geologist he could not say for sure.

In regard to quantity of placement, Committee Member Ortega asked if small quantities such as 30,000 yards at a time would be a waste of time. Mr. Honma said in his opinion you should place as much as you have; be it 10,000 yards, but the larger the project the better, as the sand buffers itself and is more likely to stay put. He said that in SANDAG, there were a lot of coastal cities involved who had public relations concerns; it was very important to them that the sand be placed directly onto the beach, where people could see it. They placed it beginning from the back beach, based on coastal modeling which helped indicate where on the beach the sand would be placed, at what elevation, etc. He said there were 2 million yards divided among 12 cities. At Imperial Beach, the USACOE were trying to dump 1-2 million yards, every 5-10 years, dump another million to maintain the foundation. Committee Member Ortega asked how close it should be to the mean tide level. Mr. Honma said it varies depending upon your base elevation, the beach slope, length and width, etc. Mr. Honma said to increase a beach's elevation to 12 or 13 feet was a common practice, and this was part of the process which is designed by Coastal Engineers. Captain Humphreys said that Moffatt & Nichols could design it for us.

City Engineer Bill Cameron asked if placing a small quantity such as 1,000 cubic yards worthwhile to put on the beach. Mr. Honma said, if the permitting was an easy process, the yes it was worthwhile. He said any biological impacts would be based on the proximity of resources. If the resources were far away, there would be no biological impact. Chairman Hart suggested that some of the policy guidelines could be relaxed for small quantities of sand, if there was no significant biological impact and it is worth it to place 1,000 yards of sand on the beach. He understands that even with a high percentage of fines, perhaps turbidity would not be a problem Mr. Honma said that turbidity generally does dissipate, but that people in general are usual concerned about it at the outset. He also said that matching the color was extremely important. Committee Member Nielsen said we'd have to notify the public that any dirt-like sand we placed would turn into sand.

In response to Committee Member Ortega's question regarding sand obtained from inland resources, Mr. Honma cited a sand nourishment project at Solana Beach utilizing inland sand; he said the sand disappeared very quickly, and he was not sure of the reasons. He did say that overall, the SANDAG project done in San Diego county was successful, barring some complaints from residents. He said they're not yet sure of the biological impacts, however.

Regarding near-shore resources, Committee Member Ortega asked what the impact in the first 2 years was. Mr. Honma said he had no results, but that they are now doing monitoring and the preliminary information suggests that some areas have been "sanded in". The rocky reefs are only a few hundred yards from front edge of beach, so it wouldn't take much for that material to move offshore, and because of our weather recently, it may have been impacted, but there's no way to tell if that sand will move back up this summer. He said some of the reefs are more covered now than in the last 3 years.

In regard to surf resources, Mr. Honma said that with coarse sand, such as a Mission Beach, he feels it "messed up" the surf resources, because of offshore berms. He said that other breaks such as Leucadia, Cardiff and Beacons, the sand seemed to improve the surf resources. He said to this day at low tide there is a fair amount of sand at Cardiff's restaurant row where in past years it used to be very rocky. He said that in other areas, especially with coarser sand, the impact seems to be more negative on surf resources.

Committee Member Nielsen stated that one of the reasons for Mr. Honma's presence tonight was to see what is required to get legal permits and satisfy the agencies. Do we have to do a baseline study and when, what type, and what is the cost of monitoring for opportunistic sand replenishment, etc.? Mr. Honma asked if any surveys had been done. Committee Member Nielsen replied yes, that the USACOE had done a survey and it was accessible to this Committee. Mr. Honma said in that case, it should be fairly easy to get a permit by submitting the USACOE survey results with our permit application.

Committee Member Nielsen said he felt that the spots surveyed were good candidates for sand nourishment, although Linda Lane was tricky, and there was some danger to T-Street, as a surfing resource. He also said that USACOE is gathering coastal profile information for the City of San Clemente. Mr. Honma said this is the type of information we should submit with our application.

Committee Member Nielsen said we're hoping for 300,000 yards over 4 beaches maximum per year. Mr. Honma said that would require a thorough baseline study and that a lot of the expensive work on this study has been done by the USACOE. Therefore, it would be a matter of reviewing the areas to see that what the USACOE saw is actually there. He said it would be a question of documenting what's on the rocky reefs and that one of the permit conditions would be monitoring this. The Committee felt that they

could obtain the USACOE study results. Committee Member Ortega said their maximum placement for North Beach is 125,000 yards/year; Linda Lane is 75,000/year, T-Street and South of T-Street is 100,000 yards/year, maximum. Mr. Honma said that regarding monitoring, we already have a good foundation to work from. He said SANDAG spent $1 million for monitoring out of an $18 million program and said this gives an idea of the rough percentage we should allow for the cost of monitoring.

Committee Member Barnes asked how long a baseline survey is good for. Mr. Honma said that once a baseline is done, if there are no dramatic changes to the areas, there would be no need to redo a baseline study several years later. He said we could use the USACOE results as a template, but before our program is implemented, we would have to check the areas to validate their findings. Committee Member Nielsen said the USACOE study has documented every reef and every rock, and that all we'd have to do is ground-troop it and document it. Mr. Honma said that it could be done in a day or two, depending on the size of the fill sites.

Committee Member Barnes asked about biological monitoring; would sediment transport modeling be required to estimate the eventual locations of the sediment for a project our size. Mr. Honma felt that yes, it would be required especially if the resources were within the city and that Coastal Frontiers currently does shoreline profiles.

Committee Member Barnes asked if post-sand replacement monitoring would be required. Mr. Honma said that is one of the permit requirements of SANDAG and that the biological aspect is only monitored twice a year, in spring and fall. Mr. Honma showed the 12-beach SANDAG monitoring plan to the Committee.

The Committee then reviewed their Draft Opportunistic Beach San Nourishment Policy with Mr. Honma and the pertinent points were as follows:

Mr. Honma agreed with Chairman Hart that we could probably get by with a minimum of doing biotech and grain size samples as testing for small quantities of opportunistic sand.

Committee Member Nielsen asked about matching the color. Mr. Honma said that it would be difficult to match sand color on the beach, that when they were dredging sand offshore the color was different, but that within a year the color should match, depending on the resources. He then cited an example of a beach where 1.5 years later there was still a line of demarcation where the sand color did not match.

In regard to the grain size, Mr. Honma said that the CAC's draft policy language was standard. He said the larger the material, the longer it will stay. He said you'd probably want to dump it in the surf zone to get the sand blended, and "hide it", especially if it had to be done in the summer.

Committee Member Ortega said if we have a choice we'll try to dump it in the fall and winter.

The Committee and Mr. Honma continued to review the bacteriological monitoring sections of the draft policy. Committee Member Nielsen said we are trying to identify the least requirements we need to do for the least amount of money and asked what is not necessary for us to do in order to get the permit. Mr. Honma said we could tell the agencies up front what we want to do. Chairman Hart said it is Moffat & Nichols' judgment as to what must be done to get the permit through. Mr. Honma thought the methodology for biological monitoring depends on what the agencies require. Mr. Honma said he wrote much of the verbiage in the biological section of the draft policy and he felt that the committee was pretty "right on" with their requirements. However, some of the agencies may or may not impose all of the conditions, but that it depended on "who you talk to" at the agencies.

Mr. Honma said that SANDAG has to mitigate any significant impacts made to vegetative rocky reefs. Committee Member Hannan asked if one could tell which reefs may be more sensitive to being covered with sand. Mr. Honma said you can tell which reefs get heavily scoured by looking at them; they are usually closer to the beach. He said there is a list of "indicator" species which are perennial, require hard substrate, and you can tell from these how a reef will be affected biologically. The indicators are plants, as animals tend not to stay on near-shore reefs. Committee Member Hannan asked if very silty sand would cloud the water and kill certain species. Mr. Honma said further offshore, yes, but not near-shore. He said one of SANDAG's permit issues deals directly with this. He said 30 feet of water is the "marker" for monitoring and most of the monitoring focuses on 10-15 foot waters near the shore and closer to the receiver sites; if there are biological impacts there, you must then focus the monitoring on deeper waters.

Committee Member Nielsen said that sensitive lobster areas are 15 feet at high tide in the Linda Lane area. Chairman Hart asked in what depth of water does surf grass live. Mr. Nielsen responded that it was less than 15 feet. Mr. Honma said the agencies were concerned with protecting surf grass, as lobsters and other species thrive on it.

Mr. Honma said you can't get your 404 permit until all other permitting is in place and the 404 permit addresses turbidity monitoring issues. Mr. Honma said near-shore turbidity is tough to monitor—sometimes you must send samples to a lab, but sometimes you can simply use a plastic disk called a SECCHI disk to measure turbidity. He said depending on who is writing the permit, they may allow a 20% increase in turbidity in the first 250 feet and maybe after 500 meters, it's back to ambient turbidity. Typically the permit language specifies a preconstruction survey to document what ambient is, then sets monitoring times depending on the length of the program. Mr. Honma said you can often negotiate on these items. He said the Regional Water Quality Board is most concerned with turbidity. To give an example, Mr. Honma cited Oceanside, where they dredged the harbor and the

monitoring was done once a day during a 2 week sand nourishment program. Mr. Honma said the monitoring requirement would probably be satisfied by a person on the beach taking notes for documentation.

Mr. Honma concluded by saying there would always be members of the public for and against aspects of sand nourishment.

The CAC members all agreed that Mr. Honma's comments were very helpful and illuminating. Chairman Hart said he would reread the draft policy in a new light and possibly have new ideas for it at the next meeting. Mr. Honma said he would review the CAC's Draft Policy and send his comments with Committee Member Nielsen to the next meeting. Chairman Hart thanked Mr. Honma for his presence tonight.

6. NEW BUSINESS

None.

7. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Parks and Recreation Commission Minutes, April 8, 2003

Received and filed.

B. Bacteriological Monitoring Report

Received and filed.

8. ITEMS FROM STAFF

Captain Humphreys distributed copies of a letter sent from City Planning to resident Michael Metcalfe in regard to Mr. Metcalfe's proposed public kiosk/signboard. Please refer to this email copy for details.

Captain Humphreys mentioned an email of complaint dated May 12, 2003, from Mark Babski, a member of Surfrider, to Mark Cousineau, Surfrider President in regard to the City's Marine Safety Division's use of the donated Waverunner. Chairman Hart said this email had been forwarded to him, and that Mr. Babski stated that he was offended by the lifeguard department's use of the Waverunner while he was surfing one day. Chairman Hart said he asked Captain Humphreys to prepare a response to Mr. Babski's email. Chairman Hart distributed this memo of response to the committee. The response to Mr. Babski also included the Personal Watercraft Operations Manual for the City's Marine Safety Department. Captain Humphrey's letter explained that the lifeguards in question were testing the Waverunner and were operating safely and within the guidelines of the Personal Watercraft Operations Manual, as well as within the safety standards and training program set by the Marine Safety Division. Captain Humphreys said there are simply things our lifeguards must do that may not always be agreeable to everyone, but are necessary for their safety. He stated that the Waverunner is used as a lower costing and lower maintenance alternative to a boat. He stated that within the last

3-5 years, Waverunners have been greatly improved to reduce noise and emissions and that the members of the public may not realize how improved the Lifeguards' Waverunner is as compared to Jet Skis or Waverunners manufactured even 5 years ago.

Chairman Hart said that he reviewed Captain Humphreys' response, including the Operations and Procedures Manual and he was extremely impressed with the depth of detail and care in which the Lifeguard department operates the Waverunner. He compared this to your average waverunner operator who is untrained and felt our program was like a "graduate course" in waverunner operation and he is convinced that the City's Marine Safety Division is operating this craft in a safe and considerate manner. The CAC members agreed and Committee Member Nielsen stated for the record that the CAC fully supports the Waverunner Lifeguard Training Program implemented by the City's Marine Safety Division. He also said we should have a boat, but the waverunner is very valuable and the operators must be given the time and opportunities to feel completely confident and fully trained on it.

Committee Member Nielsen asked what the minimum hours were necessary to be a certified operator, as he felt that the operators must have time during work hours to train so they can be very confident and competent to operate it under any condition. Captain Humphreys said there are a minimum number of hours set for training.

City Engineer Bill Cameron said we had a 3 day audit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and their consultant on the new permit for the URMP. He stated that the audit went well, but that we're just beginning and there are many areas we still need to work on. He said the Board was impressed that the City was able to get the fee from its residents and that we did not complain of lack of funds. They also liked the water conservation program we've implemented.

Mr. Cameron said he had checked with Tom Bonigut about the 303(d) list and Mr. Bonigut said that San Clemente has not had any significant changes in the 303(d) list. Chairman Hart proposed that the City again ask the Regional Water Board why we're on the 303(d) list. Committee Member Barnes asked for a copy of the Regional Water Board's audit of San Clemente and Mr. Cameron said he'd see that the CAC received a copy.

Committee Member Hannan asked if the CAC was familiar with the Coastal Trail and the committee conveyed to him that they had discussed it for two years and felt it was a very good program.

9. ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chairman Hart mentioned a letter from resident Arlene Ross, stating her thanks to the CAC for their support on the street sweeping issue.

Chairman Hart also stated that a concerned citizen (his wife) reported an extension to the fence south of T-Street and that she'd heard someone complain about the inconvenience. Several days later, she reported that sections of this fence had been removed, presumable by citizens. Chairman Hart said the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has to review beach level crossings and they always give an emphatic "no". In fact, at a recent

meeting the PUC recommended that the railroad erect a fence preventing all beach access. Mr. Hart said this was in advance of us requesting a permit to build the beach trail as designed. He said he sent a letter to the PUC Chairman to strongly consider the CAC's request for this coastal trail as it is designed to improve safety and strikes a balance between the aesthetic and recreational qualities of the beach and makes a currently bad situation on the beach much better. He said the PUC hearing will be in the next few months and if we're going to avoid having the PUC "hermetically seal" our beach with a fence it will require a community effort and we are currently soliciting support from the Coastal Commission and other agencies and that the railroad is already on board with us. Chairman Hart warned that it would be a difficult fight.

Committee Member Ortega asked about the reappointment of CAC members. Committee Member Nielsen and Chairman Hart responded that it would be discussed in the special joint meeting on June 16, 2003 that this meeting would be adjourned to.

Committee Member Barnes asked about the Coastal Frontier survey report and Captain Humphreys said that he had the electronic version and would bring one set of each graph to the next meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER BARNES, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER ORTEGA, CARRIED (6-0-0) to adjourn at 9:30 p.m. to the joint special meeting of the City Council and the Coastal Advisory Committee to review the CAC's roles and responsibilities, to be held on Monday, June 16, 2003 at 6:30 p.m., in the Community Development Center, Conference Room A, 910 Calle Negocio, Suite 100, San Clemente, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Barnes

~~William Hart,~~ Chair
Michael Barnes

Attest:

Bill Humphreys

Bill Humphreys, Marine Safety Captain