4

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
South Coast Area Office
200 Oceangate, Suite 1000
Long Beach, CA 90802-4302
(562) 590-5071

July 16, 2002	
September 3, 2002	
January 12/2003	
ALB-LB	
September 19, 2002	

October 8-11, 2002

RECORD PACKET COPY

Tu 5c

STAFF REPORT: CONSENT CALENDAR

Filed:

Staff:

49th Day:

180th Day:

Staff Report:

Hearing Date:

Commission Action:

APPLICATION NO.: 5-02	2-237
-----------------------	-------

APPLICANT: Lynne Riddle

AGENT: Shellmaker, Inc.

PROJECT LOCATION: 615 36th Street, City of Newport Beach (Orange County)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Removal and replacement of a 30' long concrete bulkhead in the same location. No work is proposed to the existing dock.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed development involves demolition of an existing bulkhead and construction of a new bulkhead in the same location. The subject site is subject to tidal action, but not to direct wave attack because the site is located within a protected channel of the Newport Harbor. The proposed new bulkhead is necessary to protect existing structures from tidal induced erosion and will have no impacts upon shoreline sand supply because the device will be located in the same location as the existing. The major issues before the Commission relate to the effect of the proposed development on marine resources and water quality. No eelgrass is located within the project area at this time.

Staff recommends the Commission <u>APPROVE</u> the proposed development with three (3) special conditions. Special Condition No. 1 requires that the applicant dispose of all demolition and construction debris at an appropriate location. Special Condition No. 2 assures that impacts to eelgrass are avoided and, if necessary, mitigated. Special Condition No. 3 requires that a preconstruction survey for *Caulerpa taxifolia* be done and if its presence is discovered, the applicants shall not proceed with the project until 1) the applicant provides evidence to the Executive Director that all *Caulerpa taxifolia* within the project and/or buffer area has been eliminated or 2) the applicant has revised the project to avoid any contact with *Caulerpa taxifolia*.

LOCAL APPROVALS RECEIVED: Approval in Concept (#636-615) from the City of Newport Beach Harbor Resources Division dated July 2, 2002, Approval from the California Department of Fish & Game dated July 24, 2002, Section 401 Permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Santa Ana Region) dated August 16, 2002.

SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS: Eelgrass and Caulerpa Survey at 615 36th Street, Newport Beach prepared by Coastal Resources Management dated June 16, 2002; *Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Construction of a New Seawall, 615 36th Street, Newport Beach, California* prepared by Petra Geotechnical dated May 13, 2002; Structural Calculations for a New Seawall prepared by William Simpson & Associates, Inc. dated May 20, 2002. 5-02-237 (Riddle) Staff Report-Consent Calendar Page: 2 of 6

LIST OF EXHIBITS:

- 1. Vicinity Map
- 2. Assessor's Parcel Map
- 3. Approval in Concept Plans
- 4. Structural Plans and Details
- 5. Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The staff recommends that the Commission <u>APPROVE</u> the permit application with special conditions.

MOTION:

I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit No. 5-02-237 pursuant to the staff recommendation.

Staff recommends a <u>YES</u> vote. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

RESOLUTION:

I. Approval with Conditions

The Commission hereby approves a coastal development permit for the proposed development and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction over the area to prepare a Local Coastal Program conforming to the provisions of Chapter 3. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

II. Standard Conditions

- 1. <u>Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment.</u> The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
- 2. <u>Expiration.</u> If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date this permit is reported to the Commission. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
- 3. <u>Interpretation.</u> Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director of the Commission.

5-02-237 (Riddle) Staff Report-Consent Calendar Page: 3 of 6

- 4. <u>Assignment.</u> The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
- 5. <u>Terms and Conditions Run with the Land</u> These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

III. Special Conditions

1. Construction Responsibilities and Debris Removal

- (a) No construction materials, equipment, debris, or waste will be placed or stored where it may be subject to wave wind, or rain erosion and dispersion.
- (b) Any and all construction material will be removed from the site within 10 days of completion of construction.
- (c) Machinery or construction materials not essential for project improvements will not be allowed at any time in the intertidal zone.
- (d) If turbid conditions are generated during construction a silt curtain will be utilized to control turbidity.
- (e) Floating booms will be used to contain debris discharged into coastal waters and any debris discharged will be removed as soon as possible but no later than the end of each day.
- (f) Non-buoyant debris discharged into coastal waters will be recovered by divers as soon as possible after loss.

2. Pre-Construction Eelgrass Survey

- Α. Pre Construction Eelgrass Survey. A valid pre-construction eelgrass (Zoster marina) survey shall be completed during the period of active growth of eelca (typically March through October). The pre-construction survey shall be completed prior to the beginning of construction and shall be valid until the next period of active growth. The survey shall be prepared in full compliance with th "Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy" Revision 8 (except as modified by this special condition) adopted by the National Marine Fisheries Service shall be prepared in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game. The applicants shall submit the eelgrass survey for the review and approval of the Executive Director within five (5) business days of completion of each eelgrass survey and in any event no later than fifteen (15) business days prior to commencement of any development. If the eelgrass survey identifies any eelgrass within the project area which would be impacted by the proposed project, the development shall require an amendment to this permit from the Coastal Commission or a new coastal development permit.
- B. <u>Post Construction Eelgrass Survey</u>. If any eelgrass is identified in the project area by the survey required in subsection A of this condition above, within one month after the conclusion of construction, the applicants shall survey the project site to determine if any eelgrass was adversely impacted. The survey shall be prepared in full compliance with the "Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy" Revision 8 (except as modified by this special condition) adopted by the National Marine Fisheries Service and shall be prepared in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game. The applicants shall submit the post-construction eelgrass survey for the review and approval of the Executive

5-02-237 (Riddle) Staff Report-Consent Calendar Page: 4 of 6

Director within thirty (30) days after completion of the survey. If any eelgrass has been impacted, the applicants shall replace the impacted eelgrass at a minimum 1.2:1 ratio on-site, or at another location, in accordance with the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy. All impacts to eelgrass habitat shall be mitigated at a minimum ratio of 1.2:1 (mitigation:impact). The exceptions to the required 1.2:1 mitigation ratio found within SCEMP shall not apply. Any off-site mitigation shall require an amendment to this permit or a new coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment or new permit is required.

3. Pre-construction Caulerpa Taxifolia Survey

- A. Not earlier than 90 days nor later than 30 days prior to commencement or re-commencement of any development authorized under this coastal development permit (the "project"), the applicants shall undertake a survey of the project area and a buffer area at least 10 meters beyond the project area to determine the presence of the invasive alga *Caulerpa taxifolia*. The survey shall include a visual examination of the substrate.
- B. The survey protocol shall be prepared in consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the National Marine Fisheries Service.
- C. Within five (5) business days of completion of the survey, the applicants shall submit the survey:
 - i. for the review and approval of the Executive Director; and
 - to the Surveillance Subcommittee of the Southern California Caulerpa Action Team (SCCAT). The SCCAT Surveillance Subcommittee may be contacted through William Paznokas, California Department of Fish & Game (858/467-4218) or Robert Hoffman, National Marine Fisheries Service (562/980-4043).
- D. If Caulerpa taxifolia is found within the project or buffer areas, the applicants shall not proceed with the project until 1) the applicants provide evidence to the Executive Director that all *C. taxifolia* discovered within the project and/or buffer area has been eliminated in a manner that complies with all applicable governmental approval requirements, including but not limited to those of the California Coastal Act, or 2) the applicants have revised the project to avoid any contact with *C. taxifolia*. No revisions to the project shall occur without a Coastal Commission approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

5-02-237 (Riddle) Staff Report-Consent Calendar Page: 5 of 6

IV. Findings and Declarations

The Commission hereby finds and declares as follows:

A. LOCATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The subject site is a waterfront lot located between the first public road and the sea at 615 36th Street (Exhibits 1 & 2). The site is located along The Rialto Waterway, a channel of the Newport Harbor. The site currently contains an existing residence and an existing dock. No work is proposed to the existing residence or dock.

The proposed project consists of demolition of an existing bulkhead and construction of a new bulkhead in the same location (Exhibits 3 & 4). The existing bulkhead is located along the western portion of the property and is 30 feet in length. The existing bulkhead is necessary to protect the existing residence. The new bulkhead will be placed in the same location and will not extend seaward of the original location. The new bulkhead will be of conventional construction with tongue and groove precast panels held together with a concrete coping tied back to a deadman system. Closures will be formed and poured at either end of the property to form a tight seal with the neighbors' bulkheads. The new bulkhead height will be at +9 above Mean Low Lower Water to meet present City of Newport Beach engineering standards.

A biological survey conducted on June 3, 2002 determined that no eelgrass or *Caulerpa taxifolia* was present in the project area. If construction is initiated before the next period of active eelgrass growth (typically March through October), no further eelgrass survey is required. To confirm that no *Caulerpa* is present at the time of construction, a subsequent survey must be conducted not earlier than 90 days nor later than 30 days prior to commencement of the proposed project.

B. WATER QUALITY

The proposed bulkhead work will be occurring adjacent to and within coastal waters. The storage or placement of construction material, debris, or waste in a location where it could be discharged into coastal waters would result in an adverse effect on the marine environment. To reduce the potential for construction related impacts on water quality, the Commission imposes special conditions requiring, but not limited to, the appropriate storage and handling of construction equipment and materials to minimize the potential of pollutants to enter coastal waters and for the use of on-going best management practices following construction. As conditioned, the Commission finds that the development conforms with Sections 30230 and 32031 of the Coastal Act.

C. MARINE RESOURCES

The proposed development is the replacement of an existing bulkhead in the same location or landward of the existing bulkhead that is necessary to protect an existing structure. The proposed development will not result in the additional fill of coastal waters as the new bulkhead will be located either in the same location or landward of the existing bulkhead. In the event that the bulkhead is being reconstructed in the same location, it is infeasible to relocate the new bulkhead further landward. The proposed development has been conditioned to minimize adverse effects on the marine environment by avoiding or mitigating impacts upon sensitive marine resources, such as eelgrass, and to avoid contributing to the dispersal of the invasive aquatic algae, *Caulerpa taxifolia*. As conditioned, the project will not significantly adversely impact eelgrass beds and will not contribute to the dispersal of the invasive aquatic algae,

5-02-237 (Riddle) Staff Report-Consent Calendar Page: 6 of 6

Caulerpa taxifolia. Further, as proposed and conditioned, the project conforms with Sections 30233 and 30235 of the Coastal Act.

D. PUBLIC ACCESS

The proposed development will not affect the public's ability to gain access to, and/or to use the coast and nearby recreational facilities. Therefore, as proposed the development conforms with Sections 30210 through 30214, Sections 30220 through 30224, and 30252 of the Coastal Act.

E. LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

The LUP for the City of Newport Beach was effectively certified on May 19, 1982. The certified LUP was updated on January 9, 1990. As conditioned, the proposed development is consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and with the certified Land Use Plan for the area. Approval of the project, as conditioned, will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a Local Coastal Program that is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3.

F. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

As conditioned, there are no feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned to mitigate the identified impacts, is the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative and can be found consistent with the requirements of the Coastal Act to conform to CEQA.

H:\Staff Reports\Oct02\5-02-237(Riddle).doc











National Marine Fisheries Service

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EELGRASS MITIGATION POLICY

(Adopted July 31, 1991)

Eelgrass (Zostera marina) vegetated areas function as important habitat for a variety of fish and other wildlife. In order to standardize and maintain a consistent policy regarding mitigating adverse impacts to eelgrass resources, the following policy has been developed by the Federal and State resource agencies (National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game). This policy should be cited as the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (revision 8).

For clarity, the following definitions apply. "Project" refers to work performed on-site to accomplish the applicant's purpose. "Mitigation" refers to work performed to compensate for any adverse impacts caused by the "project". "Resource agencies" refers to National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game.

1. Mitigation Need. Eelgrass transplants shall be considered only after the normal provisions and policies regarding avoidance and minimization, as addressed in the Section 404 Mitigation Memorandum of Agreement between the Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Age: have been pursued to the fullest extent possible prior to the development of any mitigation program.

2. Mitigation Map. The project applicant shall map thoroughly the area, distribution, density and relationship to depth contours of any eelgrass beds likely to be impacted by project construction. includes areas immediately adjacent to the project site which have the potential to be indirectly of inadvertently impacted as well as areas having the proper depth and substrate requirements for but which currently lack vegetation.

Protocol for mapping shall consist of the following format:

1) Coordinates

Horizontal datum - Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), NAD 83, Zone 11

Vertical datum - Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW), depth in feet.

2) Units

Transects and grids in meters.

Area measurements in square meters/hectares.

All mapping efforts must be completed during the active growth phase for the vegetation (typically March through October) and shall be valid for a period of 120 days with the exception of surveys completed in August - October.

COASTAL COMMISSION 5-02-237 EXHIBIT #

5

1

A survey completed in August - October shall be valid until the resumption of active growth (i.e., March 1). After project construction, a post-project survey shall be completed within 30 days. The actual area of impact shall be determined from this survey.

3. Mitigation Site. The location of eelgrass transplant mitigation shall be n areas similar to those where the initial impact occurs. Factors such as, distance from project, depth, sediment type, distance from ocean connection, water quality, and currents are among those that should be considered in evaluating potential sites.

4. Mitigation Size. In the case of transplant mitigation activities that occur concurrent to the project that results in damage to the existing eelgrass resource, a ratio of 1.2 to 1 shall apply. That is, for each square meter adversely impacted, 1.2 square meters of new suitable habitat, vegetated with eelgrass, must be created. The rationale for this ratio is based on, 1) the time (i.e., generally three years) necessary for a mitigation site to reach full fishery utilization and 2) the need to offset any productivity losses during this recovery period within five years. An exception to the 1.2 to 1 requirement shall be allowed when the impact is temporary and the total area of impact is less than 100 square meters. Mitigation on a one-for-one basis shall be acceptable for projects that meet these requirements (see section 11 for projects impacting less than 10 square meters).

Transplant mitigation completed three years in advance of the impact (i.e., mitigation banks) will not incur the additional 20% requirement and, therefore, can be constructed on a one-for-one basis. However, all other annual monitoring requirements (see sections 8-9) remain the same irrespective of when the transplant is completed.

Project applicants should consider increasing the size of the required mitigation area by 20-30% to provide greater assurance that the success criteria, as specified in Section 9, will be met. In addition, alternative contingent mitigation must be specified, and included in any required permits, to address situation where performance standards (see section 9) are not met.

5. **Mitigation Technique.** Techniques for the construction and planting of the eelgrass mitigation site shall be consistent with the best available technology at the time of the project. Donor material shall be taken from the area of direct impact whenever possible, but also should include a minimum of two additional distinct sites to better ensure genetic diversity of the donor plants. No more than 10% of an existing bed shall be harvested for transplanting purposes. Plants harvested shall be taken in a manner to thin an existing bed without leaving any noticeable bare areas. Written permission to harvest donor plants must be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game.

Plantings should consist of bare-root bundles consisting of 8-12 individual turions. Specific spacing of transplant units shall be at the discretion of the project applicant. However, it is understood that whatever techniques are employed, they must comply with the stated requirements and criteria.

6. **Mitigation Timing.** For off-site mitigation, transplanting should be started prior to or concurrent with the initiation of in-water construction resulting in the impact to the eelgrass bed. Any off-site mitigation project which fails to initiate transplanting work within 135 days following the initiation of the in-water construction resulting in impact to the eelgrass bed will be subject to additional mitigation requirements as specified in section 7. For on-site mitigation, transplanting should be postponed when construction work is likely to impact the mitigation. However, transplanting of on-site mitigation should be started no later than 135 days after initiation of in-water construction activities. A construction schedule which includes specific starting and ending dates for all work including mitigation activities shall be provided to the resource agencies for approval at least 30 days prior to initiating in-water construction.

2/4

7. Mitigation Delay. If, according to the construction schedule or because of any delays, mitigation cannot be started within 135 days of initiating in-water construction, the eelgrass replacement mitigation obligation shall increase at a rate of seven percent for each month of delay. This increase is necessary to ensure that all productivity losses incurred during this period are sufficiently offset within five years.

8. Mitigation Monitoring. Monitoring the success of eelgrass mitigation shall be required for a period of five years for most projects. Monitoring activities shall determine the area of eelgrass and density of plants at the transplant site and shall be conducted at 3, 6, 12, 24, 36, 48, and 60 months after completion of the transplant. All monitoring work must be conducted during the active vegetative growth period and shall avoid the winter months of November through February. Sufficient flexibility in the scheduling of the 3 and 6 month surveys shall be allowed in order to ensure the work is completed during this active growth period. Additional monitoring beyond the 60 month period may be required in those instances where stability of the proposed transplant site is questionable or where other factors may influence the long-term success of transplant.

The monitoring of an adjacent or other acceptable control area (subject to the approval of the resource agencies) to account for any natural changes or fluctuations in bed width or density must be included as an element of the overall program.

A monitoring schedule that indicates when each of the required monitoring events will be completed shall be provided to the resource agencies prior to or concurrent with the initiation of the mitigation.

Monitoring reports shall be provided to the resource agencies within 30 days after the completion of each required monitoring period.

9. Mitigation Success. Criteria for determination of transplant success shall be based upon a comparison of vegetation coverage (area) and density (turions per square meter) between the project and mitigation sites. Extent of vegetated cover is defined as that area where eelgrass is present and where gaps in coverage are less than one meter between individual turion clusters. Density of shoots is defined by the number of turions per area present in representative samples within the control or transplant bed. Specific criteria are as follows:

a. a minimum of 70 percent area of eelgrass bed and 30 percent density after the first year.

b. a minimum of 85 percent area of eelgrass bed and 70 percent density after the second year.

c. a sustained 100 percent area of eelgrass bed and at least 85 percent density for the third, fourth and fifth years.

Should the required eelgrass transplant fail to meet the established criteria, then a Supplementary Transplant Area (STA) shall be constructed, if necessary, and planted. The size of this STA shall be determined by the following formula:

 $STA = MTA x (|A_t + D_t| - |A_c + D_c|)$

MTA = mitigation transplant area.

 A_t = transplant deficiency or excess in area of coverage criterion (%).



 D_t = transplant deficiency in density criterion (%).

 A_c = natural decline in area of control (%).

 D_c = natural decline in density of control (%).

Four conditions apply:

1) For years 2-5, an excess of only up to 30% in area of coverage over the stated criterion with a density of at least 60% as compared to the project area may be used to offset any deficiencies in the density criterion.

2) Only excesses in area criterion equal to or less than the deficiencies in density shall be entered into the STA formula.

3) Densities which exceed any of the stated criteria shall not be used to offset any deficiencies in area of coverage.

4) Any required STA must be initiated within 120 days following the monitoring event that identifies a deficiency in meeting the success criteria. Any delays beyond 120 days in the implementation of the STA shall be subject to the penalties as described in Section 7.

10. Mitigation Bank. Any mitigation transplant success that, after five years, exceeds the mitigation requirements, as defined in section 9, may be considered as credit in a "mitigation bank". Establishment of any "mitigation bank" and use of any credits accrued from such a bank must be with the approval of the resource agencies and be consistent with the provisions stated in this policy. Monitoring of any approved mitigation bank shall be conducted on an annual basis until all credits are exhausted.

11. Exclusions.

1) Placement of a single pipeline, cable, or other similar utility line across an existing eelgrass bed with an impact corridor of no more than $\frac{1}{2}$ meter wide may be excluded from the provisions of this policy with concurrence of the resource agencies. After project construction, a post-project survey shall be completed within 30 days and the results shall be sent to the resource agencies. The actual area of impact shall be determined from this survey. An additional survey shall be completed after 12 months to insure that the project or impacts attributable to the project have not exceeded the allowed $\frac{1}{2}$ meter corridor width. Should the post-project or 12 month survey demonstrate a loss of eelgrass greater than the $\frac{1}{2}$ meter wide corridor, then mitigation pursuant to sections 1-11 of this policy shall be required.

2) Projects impacting less than 10 square meters. For these projects, an exemption may be requested by a project applicant from the mitigation requirements as stated in this policy, provided suitable out-of-kind mitigation is proposed. A case-by-case evaluation and determination regarding the applicability of the requested exemption shall be made by the resource agencies.

(last revised 2/2/99)

• Policies

Habitat Conservation

7'16'2002