

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: San Clemente Shoreline Feasibility Study Orange County, CA – Civil Works Review Board

1. The subject meeting was held 12 May 2011 from 1300 until 1600 hours Eastern Time. The agenda (Enclosure 1) and list of attendees (Enclosure 2) are enclosed.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to gain approval by the Civil Works Review Board (CWRB) to release the final Feasibility Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement for State and Agency (S&A) review.
3. The meeting was opened by Mr. Steve Stockton, Director of Civil Works, who offered welcoming remarks and provided an overview of the meeting purpose. This was followed by self-introductions of those attending in person.
4. Colonel R. Mark Toy, SPL District Commander, presented the study overview and the recommended plan for San Clemente Shoreline project– Orange County, CA, including the plan formulation, problems addressed, alternatives considered, the recommended features and their costs, the status of Office of Water Project policy review, Agency Technical Review and Independent External Peer Review. Representatives of the local sponsors, Mr. George Scarborough (City of San Clemente, City Manager) and Mr. Jim Dahl (San Clemente City Council member) presented remarks in support of the recommended plan, and the importance of the project to reduce storm damage risk to the San Clemente Shoreline. Dr. Christine Altendorf, Director of Program, South Pacific Division, presented the SPD perspective and endorsement of the recommended project. This was followed by Ms. Andrea Walker, who provided the HQ Office of Water Project Review summary of issue resolution and a recommendation to release the report for S&A review.
5. Mr. John Winkelman, New England District, ATR lead, provided a summary of the technical review and issue resolution process. He explained how one ATR comment concerning the disparity between historical flooding and computed (modeled) flooding, that had remained open was resolved through discussion and consensus by the vertical team. Ms. Karen Johnson-Young, Project Manager for Battelle, and Mr. Christopher Creed, IEPR lead, summarized the IEPR process, results, and comment resolution. Of the six highly significant comments, concerning plan formulation, project economics, and coastal engineering, all were resolved.

6. The following is a summary of questions and discussions that were held during the meeting:
- a) A general question was raised concerning the need for adaptive management plans. Are they normally required at this stage? It was explained by Mr. Wes Coleman that they were a requirement and needed at this stage of the study.
  - b) Questions and comments from Mr. Mike Ensich included:
    - *Who will do the monitoring?* The monitoring will be performed as part of PED and project construction activities.
    - *Surfgrass is adapted to burial but how much is not clear, appreciate the fact that monitoring over the reef will be difficult.*
    - *Who permits the borrow area and is there enough in the borrow site for the project?* Yes there is 3 million cubic yards in the borrow area, the project only needs 2.3 million cubic yards. The California State Lands Commission permits the borrow area.
  - c) Questions and comments from General DeLuca, NAD Commander, included:
    - *The Feasibility Scoping Meeting was in 2002 and the Alternative Formulation Briefing in 2010, why did it take so long between the two milestones?* Budgetary constraints and extensive review requirements elongated the study schedule.
    - *What was the total cost?* The study cost \$4.3M, which includes \$200,000 for IEPR and \$100,000 for ATR.
    - *Was there concern with cost of the project?* The Sponsor realizes the importance of constructing this project and is fully supportive.
    - *Was Scripps wave data used?* Yes the Coastal Data Information Program (CDIP) information was used for this study.
    - *What is the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) role compared to the State Lands Commission role?* The CCC approves projects in the coastal zone where as State Lands permits use of the near shore areas such as the use of borrow areas.
    - *Did sea level rise analysis drive costs?* The sea level rise analysis did not present a large financial burden to the study. In the end, the analysis showed that the NED plan selection was not influenced by the 3 sea level rise scenarios.
    - *Is there a trigger point for sea level rise scenarios that would change the project?* No, because sea level rise increases slowly for this area until about 2040.
    - *Can you consider total benefits per capita?* It is \$0.33 per visitor.
    - *Have lives been lost?* No
    - *Did the team look at ways to restore the natural flow of sediment?* The analysis did look at the sediment activities within the watershed; however, it was determined that changes to the watershed to increase sediment supply would be beyond the scope of this study because of the amount of development within the watershed.

- d) Questions and comments from Mr. Steve Stockton included:
- *Were the reviews scaled appropriately for the project?* The reviews such as IEPR and ATR fit the requirement of the study.
  - Mr. Stockton stated that this was an excellent presentation.
  - *Did the study team use information learned from other studies and contacts?* Yes we used information gained from other studies that have gone through this process, including contacts with the Wilmington and Jacksonville Districts as well as ERDC.
- e) Questions and comments from Mr. Stacey Hirata included:
- *What happens to the unprotected areas along the entire 7.5 miles of rail line in the entire study area?* Those areas have enough shoreline width to protect the rail line.
  - *How vulnerable is the rail line?* The rail line does rise above the ocean north and south of the project area.
- f) Questions and comments from Mr. Tab Brown included:
- *Describe the screening criteria for the seawall.* The CCC will allow construction of a seawall in an emergency condition.
  - *Would there be environmental mitigation costs for construction of a seawall?* Yes, a sand mitigation fee from the CCC to compensate for the loss of recreation amenities on the beach as well as the supply of sediment being supplied to the littoral cell.
  - *What is cost of seawall construction?* The city of San Clemente had a consultant develop costs for construction of a seawall, which showed a range of \$22M to \$32M which was updated to \$35M for current costs.
  - *Have the tracks been flooded?* Yes, twice over the last 40 years with stoppage of train traffic.
  - *Does the Southern California Rail Road Authority (SCRRA) support the project?* Yes, we received a letter of support from the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) which is the parent organization to SCRRA.
  - *How many trains/commuters per day?* The city responded that there are 52 trains per day which includes both commuters and freight. The rail road is looking at double tracking in the areas near the project site.
  - *How many cars does the train take the place of?* Will provide that information later.
  - *Can we send the report for final S&A review prior to receiving the final Coordination Act Report (CAR)?* Yes
  - *Do we know what we are going to see in the final CAR?* Yes, the draft CAR was received in January 2011 and will be similar to the final CAR.
  - *Was cost certification included in the ATR?* Yes, the review of the cost engineering appendix was coordinated with the Walla Walla District (NWW) and was completed concurrently with the ATR.
  - *Did HQ participate in FSM?* They did not participate in the milestone conference, but did participate in a conference call later.

- *What were your lessons learned?* Those were discussed later in the presentation.
  - *Is there sufficient Sponsor funding?* The city received funding from the state of California and used monies from their general fund.
  - *Is mitigation success criteria included in the Monitoring and Mitigation Plan?* Success criteria will be developed during Preconstruction, Engineering and Design (PED).
- g) Questions and comments from Mr. Doug Lamont from ASA(CW) included:
- *What is the percent benefit to railroad versus the city's infrastructure?* The benefits are focused on the rail road (90%). Mr. Lamont suggested adding explanations on the rail road's authority versus USACE's role. Show how it meets more than the needs of commuters. Also, add more detail on the loss of the rail road to commuters.
  - *What is the frequency of seismic events? Would this affect the project?* There are a low number of seismic events in the area.
  - *Are tsunamis a concern?* The strike zone plates in this area produce lower energy waves and Catalina dissipates wave energy.
- h) Questions and comments from Ms. Marianne Matheny-Katz from ASA(CW) included:
- *What is the alternative if the rail road is damaged?* There would be a temporary disruption of service. Buses would be used to reroute commuter passengers and impacts to cargo would be quite large.
  - *Should include a line in Table 5-1 of the Main Report and Economics Appendix to show the limited recreation benefits of Storm Damage Reduction (SDR) and Recreation.*

7. The following lessons-learned were offered by Colonel Toy for SPL:

- Early coordination with Division, HQ and review teams is critical to maintaining schedule and communicating expectations.
- Nation-wide USACE collaboration was beneficial.
- Communicating differences in agency procedures & requirements would improve coordination.
- Become quickly familiar with new requirements and develop District expertise (IEPR, Cost Estimating).

8. The following lessons learned were offered by Dr. Altendorf for SPD:

- Use holistic and collaborative Planning.
- Model development required close coordination with engineering, economics and the PCX.
- West coast regional coastal engineering model needed to deal with west coast storm damage dynamics.
- Vertical Teaming works great but not necessarily set-up structurally to accomplish efficiently.

9. Mr. Stockton concluded the discussions with a positive, unanimous vote by the Board members to release the report for S&A review, subject to the minor revisions required by the latest HQ review of the final report package. The intent is to execute a Chief of Engineers report.

10. Mr. Brown thanked SPL for their efforts over the past year to get the study to this stage. Mr. Stockton thanked the entire vertical team and the sponsor for same and thanked everyone for their attendance and participation, and closed the meeting at 1600 hours Eastern Time.

**SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA  
Civil Works Review Board - 12 May 2011**

**AGENDA**

- 1300 Welcome Mr. Steve Stockton  
CWRB Chair and  
Director of Civil Works
- 1305 Introductions Mr. Steve Stockton  
CWRB Chair
- 1310 Project Briefing COL Mark Toy  
District Commander, Los Angeles District
- 1400 Sponsor Support Mr. Jim Dahl  
San Clemente City Councilmember  
Mr. George Scarborough  
San Clemente City Manager
- 1420 Division Commander Briefing Dr. Christine Altendorf  
Director of Programs, South Pacific Division
- 1440 Policy Review Ms. Andrea Walker  
Office of Water Project Review, HQUSACE
- 1455 Agency Technical Review Mr. Larry Cocchieri  
PCX Deputy, Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise
- 1500 Independent External Peer Review Ms. Karen Johnson-Young  
Project Manager, Battelle Memorial Institute
- 1510 Board Discussion Mr. Steve Stockton  
CWRB Chair
- Member Questions
  - Office of ASA(CW), OMB Questions
- 1530 Action Mr. Theodore Brown  
Chief, Planning & Policy Division
- 1535 Lessons Learned / After Action Report: COL Mark Toy  
District Commander, Los Angeles District
- What was supposed to happen?
  - What did happen?
  - Why did it happen that way?
  - How will we improve next time?
- 1540 Lessons Learned SPD, OWPR, Sponsor, Others
- 1545 Summary of Project Briefing COL Mark Toy  
District Commander, Los Angeles District
- 1550 Close Mr. Steve Stockton  
CWRB Chair

# SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, ORANGE COUNTY, CA

## Civil Works Review Board 12 May 2011 – 1:00pm

### Attendees

#### **Civil Works Review Board (CWRB)**

CWRB Chair and Director of Civil Works  
Chief, Planning & Policy Division  
Commander, North Atlantic Division  
Chief, Operations and Regulatory Community of Practice (CoP)  
Chief, Northwestern Division Regional Integration Team (RIT)

#### **Name:**

Mr. Steve Stockton  
Mr. Theodore (Tab) Brown  
BG Peter DeLuca  
Mr. Michael Ensch  
Mr. Stacey Hirata

#### **Office of Management and Budget (OMB)**

OMB Examiner

Ms. Andrea Leung

#### **Department of the Army – Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works**

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Project Planning & Review)  
Senior Economist

Mr. Doug Lamont  
Ms. Marianne Matheny-Katz

#### **Office of Counsel**

Counsel, USACE

Mr. Scott Murphy

#### **Planning & Policy Division**

Deputy, Planning & Policy Division

Mr. Harry Kitch

#### **Office of Water Project Review (OWPR)**

Chief, Office of Water Project Review  
Policy Review Lead  
Policy Review Team  
Policy Review Team  
Policy Review Team  
Policy Review Team  
Civil Works Review Board Team  
Civil Works Review Board Team

Mr. Wesley Coleman  
Ms. Andrea Walker  
Mr. Jeremy LaDart  
Mr. Jeff Trulick (via phone)  
Mr. Michael Haskins  
Mr. Charles Chesnutt  
Ms. Patricia Bee  
Ms. Marilyn Benner

## **SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, ORANGE COUNTY, CA**

### **Civil Works Review Board**

**12 May 2011 – 1:00pm**

#### **Attendees (cont.)**

##### **South Pacific Division Regional Integration Team (SPD RIT)**

Leader, South Pacific Division RIT	Mr. Scott Whiteford
Civil Works Deputy, SPD RIT	Ms. Ada Benavides
Program Manager, SPD RIT	Mr. Joseph Bittner

##### **South Pacific Division (SPD)**

Director of Programs	Dr. Christine Altendorf
Chief, Planning and Policy CoP	Mr. Clark Frentzen
District Support Team Lead	Mr. Paul Bowers

##### **Los Angeles District (SPL)**

District Commander	COL Mark Toy
Chief, Planning Divisions	Dr. Josephine Axt
Chief, Plan Formulation Branch	Mr. Eduardo Demesa
Chief, Economic Section	Mr. Michael Hallisy
Project Manager	Mr. Joseph Johnson
Planning Technical Lead	Ms. Heather Schlosser
Coastal Engineer	Mr. Chuck Mesa

##### **City of San Clemente, CA -- Non-Federal Sponsor**

City Councilmember	Mr. Jim Dahl
City Manager	Mr. George Scarborough
Consultant, Marlowe & Co.	Mr. Michael Willis
Consultant, Marlowe & Co.	Mr. John Harms

##### **Congressional Offices**

Staff, Office of Congressman Ken Calvert (CA, 44 <sup>th</sup> )	Mr. Christopher Marklund
--	--------------------------

**SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, ORANGE COUNTY, CA**

**Civil Works Review Board  
12 May 2011 – 1:00pm**

**Attendees (cont.)**

**Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) – North Atlantic Division**

Deputy, CSDR-PCX	Mr. Lawrence Cocchieri	
Agency Technical Review Lead	Mr. John Winkelman (New England District)	(via phone)

**Independent External Peer Review Team (IEPR)**

IEPR Program Manager (Battelle Memorial Institute)	Ms. Karen Johnson-Young	(via phone)
IEPR Lead Panel Member (Olsen Associates, Inc)	Mr. Christopher Creed (Coastal/Civil Engineer)	(via phone)