



# CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH WATER QUALITY/COASTAL TIDELANDS COMMITTEE AGENDA

Crystal Cover Conference Room

Thursday, April 3, 2025 - 3:00 PM

## **Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee Members:**

**Councilmember Michelle Barto, Chair**  
**Mayor Joe Stapleton, Vice Chair**  
**Peter Belden, Member**  
**Curtis Black, Member**  
**Charles Fancher, Member**  
**Craig Hudson, Member**  
**George Robertson, Member**  
**John Wadsworth, Member**  
**Vacant, Member**

## **Staff Members:**

**Jim Houlihan, Deputy Public Works Director/City Engineer**  
**John Kappeler, Senior Engineer**  
**Bob Stein, Assistant City Engineer**  
**Karen Gallagher, Administrative Assistant**

---

The Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee meeting is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. Among other things, the Brown Act requires that the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee agenda be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance of each regular meeting and that the public be allowed to comment on agenda items before the Committee and items not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee. The Chair may limit public comments to a reasonable amount of time, generally three (3) minutes per person.

The City of Newport Beach's goal is to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, we will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact John Kappeler, Water Quality Enforcement Manager, at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible at (949) 644-3218 or [jkappeler@newportbeachca.gov](mailto:jkappeler@newportbeachca.gov).

## **NOTICE REGARDING PRESENTATIONS REQUIRING USE OF CITY EQUIPMENT**

Any presentation requiring the use of the City of Newport Beach's equipment must be submitted to the Public Works Department 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

- 1) **CALL MEETING TO ORDER**
- 2) **ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS**
- 3) **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS (10 min)**

*Public comments are invited on agenda items. Speakers must limit comments to five minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.*

- 4) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES (5 min)**

[030625\\_NPB\\_WQCT\\_Draft](#)

- 5) **CURRENT BUSINESS (55 min)**

(a) Peninsula Point Dunes Restoration (Chambers Group) (30 min) Presentation on the Peninsula Point Dunes Restoration project, including an additional update on the mitigation area for the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor.

Recommendation: Committee Discussion

(b) Committee Goals/Objectives Workshop (Bob Stein) (10 min) Review and update of the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee Goals.

Recommendation: Committee Discussion/Approval

(c) Newport Bay Trash Interceptor - Trash Characterization (Ellis Peterson) (15 min) Update on the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor trash characterization project.

Recommendation: Committee Discussion

6) **COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM) (10 min)**

(a) Prado Dam and Stormwater Capture (May - Lisa Haney, MWDOC)

(b) Coastal Resiliency (May 2025 - Charles Fancher)

(c) Total Maximum Daily Load for Copper (Cu) (June 2025 - John Kappeler)

(d) San Gabriel River Trash Interceptor Project (June 2025 - John Wadsworth)

(e) Newport Beach Trash Interceptor Public Outreach Campaign (Spring 2025 - John Pope)

7) **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (5 min)**

*Public comments are invited on non-agenda items generally considered to be within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers must limit comments to three minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on non-agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.*

8) **SET NEXT MEETING DATE (5 min)**

Recommendation: May 1, 2025

9) **ADJOURNMENT**

**Date:** March 6, 2025  
**Time:** 3:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Crystal Cove Conference Room, Newport Beach Civic Center  
**Meeting Minutes prepared by:**

**1. Call meeting to order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call and Introductions**

**Committee Members Present:**

Councilmember/Chair Michelle Barto  
Committee Member George Robertson  
Committee Member Peter Belden  
Committee Member Charles Fancher  
Committee Member Craig Hudson

**Committee Members Absent:**

Mayor/Vice Chair Joe Stapleton  
Committee Member John Wadsworth  
Committee Member Curtis Black

Staff Present: John Kappeler, Senior Engineer  
Karen Gallagher, Administrative Assistant  
Jim Houlihan, Deputy Director of Public Works  
Bob Stein, Assistant City Engineer  
Ellis Petersen, Associate Engineer  
Charles Springer, Senior Management Analyst

Guests Present: Jim Mosher, Resident  
Nancy Skinner, SPON  
Nancy Gardner, Orange Coast River Park  
Nancy Scarbrough, SPON, Resident  
Virginia Anders-Ellmore, Resident  
Mark Ward, Help Your Harbor  
Billy Dutton, Help Your Harbor

**3. Public Comment on Agenda Items**

Nancy Skinner, a Member of Still Protecting Our Newport (SPON), invited everyone to their annual meeting focusing on sea level rise, on April 26<sup>th</sup> at 9:30 a.m.

**4. Review and approval of minutes**

**Motion:** A motion was made by Committee Member Robertson to approve the February 6, 2025, minutes as presented, seconded by Committee Member Belden. The motion passed unanimously.

**5. Current Business**

Chair Barto agreed on staff recommendation to sequentially hear Item No. 5-b, followed by Item No. 5-c, and then Item No. 5-a.

- b. Newport Peninsula Dunes Restoration (Bob Stein)  
Update on the Newport Dunes Restoration Project.  
**Recommendation: Committee Discussion**

Assistant City Engineer Bob Stein reported the City has ongoing sand surveys to replenish areas where it has been lost from the City's beaches, noting Newport Beach loses sand on a regular basis.

In response to Committee Member Fancher's inquiry, Mr. Stein confirmed the City is losing width. He noted the City has been importing sand since the 1970s because the sand line was close to the houses at that point in time.

Mr. Stein stated the core of their program is monitoring sand and importing as needed. He reported that they are looking into how to make it last longer as sand is becoming a valued commodity among other neighboring cities.

Committee Member Hudson noted Sunset Beach is gaining width annually.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Stein reported Orange County Supervisor Katrina Foley runs a Regional Sand Replenishment Program. He explained that the concept of offshore borrowing may be an option for Newport Beach. He reported that the groin fields, in operation since the 1960s, need some refurbishment and there is also discussion of adding a new groin at 62nd St. He reported Australia's famed Gold Coast is losing sand, impacting world-renowned surf so they have been pumping sand slurry. He reported a similar project could be accomplished along the Santa Ana River for about \$20 million.

In response to Committee Member Belden's inquiry, Mr. Stein stated this is well down the list of objectives.

In response to Deputy Director of Public Works Jim Houlihan's inquiry, Committee Member Belden reported the City has tried pipes twice with the first one being destroyed by a storm shortly after completion and the second also having problems. He expressed his appreciation for the concept.

Mr. Stein reported on the Peninsula Point Restoration Project where residents had built lawns and gardens into the beach area leading to fines from the California Coastal Commission (CCC). He noted that the City is in its second year of mitigation in an area where large dunes are set 200-300 feet apart. He reported the City's concept was to fill the gaps between the dunes to create a flood barrier while planting evening primrose seeds on the dunes to see if they would take hold. He advised that they should know in a couple of months if the seeds grow but, if they do, the City might continue this work of growing the dune system over the next 10-15 years.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Stein clarified the only plant hardier than primrose is problematic beach bur. He clarified sawgrass is considered a native plant but commented that the City has not had good results when working with it until after primrose has first solidified the dune.

Mr. Stein compared aerial dune surveys from 2006 and 2014 to demonstrate how the dunes have shifted. He reported on an ongoing dunes creation program in the City of Santa Monica which includes stabilization-enhancing fencing. He stated the City of Manhattan Beach is creating an irrigated sand dune system but advised that Newport Beach does not have this irrigation.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Stein confirmed the City builds a berm annually but has to remove it because residents complain they cannot see the water.

Mr. Stein reported on the City's activity building supplemental dunes, adding if successful it could lead to cause for grant funding. He explained that the sand is easy to move and the seed is inexpensive.

In response to Chair Barto's inquiries, Mr. Stein could not confirm how the City of Manhattan Beach received its grant but agreed to inquire for additional information. He clarified there are concerns over non-native plants on Newport Beach's beaches and State funding acceptance may conditionally require their removal.

In response to Committee Member Robertson's inquiry, Mr. Stein reported the dune enhancements would extend just past F St. where the terrain flattens out.

Committee Member Belden expressed concerns on behalf of lifeguards over large rocks that have accumulated at Peninsula Point.

In response to Council member Belden's inquiry, Mr. Houlihan stated removing the larger rocks would have to involve the United States Army Corps of Engineers as they built this area along with the groins and they cannot be removed by City staff alone.

Mr. Stein reported on progress at Surfer's Point in the City of Ventura where the City received grant funding and permission from the CCC to create a dune system. He noted a parking lot was removed and commented that there is a comparable problem in areas of Newport Beach like Balboa Pier.

Mr. Houlihan commented that the City of Solana Beach formulated a similar approach.

In response to Chair Barto's inquiry, Mr. Stein reported the Surfer's Point example is about five years old and features a system where the rock was covered with sand. Mr. Houlihan cited the Junior Lifeguard Administration facility as a philosophical example of whether the point of this exercise is to protect the beach or homes, noting this impacts how the CCC will weigh potential approval.

In response to Orange Coast River Park representative Nancy Gardner's inquiry, Mr. Stein confirmed the Surfer's Point methods have worked to retain sand.

Mr. Stein reported the City of San Clemente received a grant for the planning of an offshore groin serving as an artificial reef exceeding the water level to shield its beaches' sandy areas.

Chair Barto stated this seems like a simple solution, but one surfers will hate.

Mr. Stein stated this likely does not make sense for Newport Beach.

Committee Member Belden reported Director of Public Works Dave Webb has discussed such a plan near Balboa Pier. He stated he understands the application in this area of the City, noting the spot is problematic for lifeguards because of how the shore powerfully breaks waves, regularly endangering surfers. He explained that extending the beach would make it safer and allow for better lifeguard access.

Mr. Houlihan theorized a barrier exceeding the water level may be impractical, but they could consider geotubes to trip the waves earlier so less energy hits the shore.

Ms. Gardner reported on the case where the Chevron Corporation built a pipeline destroying a surf break and, after being sued by the Surfrider Foundation, the court agreed the company had to fix the surf break. She reported that Chevron used geotubes in its repair efforts but designed it poorly.

Chair Barto noted they will change the surf break if they must move anything and cautioned there is a balance in potentially destroying something so wonderful.

Committee Member Belden stated they could ruin the lesser-used Balboa Pier break and use the sand to improve a different area to create a benefit for beachgoers in more popular areas.

Ms. Gardner suggested they could restore Balboa Pier as well.

Mr. Houlihan explained that if the beach got bigger, they could put a break further out from the current shoreline.

Committee Member Belden reported listening to lectures from a professor at the University of North Carolina who runs a coastal erosion and geoen지니어ing consultancy focused on improving surf breaks. He reported that he has corresponded with the professor and recommended discussing the matter with him if they elect to go in a route where surf breaks are modified.

Chair Barto noted North Carolina is one of the few east coast areas known for sand dunes comparable to Newport Beach. She reported that they regularly move, and cities must stay a few steps ahead of the dune migration. She noted that North Carolinians have had to come up with mitigation measures beyond just their trend of building coastal homes on stilts.

Ms. Gardner noted there will be winners and losers throughout this process and not every beach can be saved no matter how much money they spend.

Mr. Stein reported discovering ShoreLock which is put into sand for stability and has seen success in The Bahamas and Europe. He noted that it has never been used in the United States.

In response to Ms. Gardner's inquiry, Mr. Stein reported ShoreLock is a form of concrete.

Mr. Stein reported that Grand Canal beaches continue to disappear into the channel. He explained that there could be an opportunity to experiment with ShoreLock here. He stated property owners should plan on taking protective steps such as building houses on stilts, citing the Hawaiian island of Kauai as an example and theorizing it may be necessary 100 years from now on Balboa Peninsula.

Mr. Houlihan reported there are already Council-approved requirements about minimum heights in portions of the City allowing for water to pass under houses. He concluded that there will likely be more ordinances like this in the City's future.

Mr. Stein explained, that under the proposed Objective One for the Committee to be discussed later in the meeting, they could include dunes creation, hardening vulnerable areas, breakwater and sand nourishment, sand binding, and defining a Coastal Program.

Committee Member Belden noted that the benefit of approving a recent \$50,000 proposal for sand movement monitoring because this proactive research will be needed once they plot their ultimate course of action.

Mr. Houlihan noted that grant applications will also investigate this sand movement monitoring realm.

- c. Newport Bay Trash Interceptor (Ellis Peterson)  
Update on the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor trash characterization project.  
**Recommendation: Committee Discussion**

Associate Engineer Ellis Peterson reported that the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor is operational and noted that part of the project is to determine the source of the trash so the City can work with its upstream partners in an effort to reduce the trash ultimately reaching San Diego Creek. He stated part of the task is to use Artificial Intelligence (AI) assistance in this endeavor. He reported Professor Douglas McCauley of the Benioff Ocean Science Laboratory reached out to offer their services of using AI to sort trash, including work with Mr. Trash Wheel in the City of Baltimore, Maryland. He noted that the organization has ample grant money and is working globally to collect data.

Mr. Peterson reported Professor McCauley had recommendations for inexpensive specific camera models to add to the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor to collect additional data. He acknowledged that

it could prove to be a valuable addition to their data collection process. He noted Benioff is categorizing the types of plastic collected which could benefit the City in its goals.

In response to Committee Member Belden's inquiry, Mr. Peterson confirmed Benioff can subcategorize the kind of plastic coming through the system.

Committee Member Belden noted identifying the different types of plastic is one of the biggest challenges for the recycling industry because there are so many types of plastic.

Chair Barto theorized the recycling industry is not thinking scientifically enough in its efforts to identify types of plastic.

Mr. Peterson stated the recycling industry is trying but not doing a great job. He reported reaching out to Waste Management, Inc. which is attempting to notify its customers about how they are putting the wrong materials in their recycling bins but is doing so using notoriously bad enforcement model leading to threatening letters customers often challenge. He commented that Benioff has a fair amount of grant money, a large amount of data, has invested a lot of time, and is adamant about doing a good job. He noted that Benioff is regularly adding more trash categories.

In response to Committee Member Belden's inquiry, Mr. Peterson confirmed the trash interceptor is collecting a lot of organic material such as reeds. He explained that it can be hard for AI to identify because organic material like reeds do not form specific shapes like plastic bottles. He noted that other Benioff-monitored trash wheels are collecting less organic material than Newport Beach but expressed hopes some of their data can still be applicable.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiries, Mr. Peterson stated the ability to link the trash to its source is science more complex than what lies within his personal understanding but noted that AI has this ability through very small pieces of data.

Chair Barto noted bottles are more generic than fast food waste or mattresses.

Mr. Peterson agreed with Chair Barto and stated they could collect data based on cups from McDonald's, In-N-Out Burger, and other restaurants to find trends for upstream partners to consider. He explained that part of the project is to change habits, citing Benioff's websites for each trash wheel with a live counter for how much trash has been collected. He noted that, if there is interest, a live counter would be an option for Newport Beach allowing for a direct public connection and engagement.

Committee Member Belden spoke on behalf of Committee Member Wadsworth in stating his interest due to his participation with the Surfrider Foundation.

Senior Engineer John Kappeler reported the State has issued a trash mandate to all cities whereas by December 2030 a trash characterization study is required.

Mr. Peterson stated the public does not realize just how much trash is coming through the City's waterways and this project helps visualize the scale of the problem.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Peterson stated having the information is a great conversation starting point for upstream partners. Mr. Stein reported meeting with the City of Costa Mesa and envisioned walking San Diego Creek during the fall to assess debris. He recommended meeting with other upstream areas encouraging the removal of items before they wash downstream.

Ms. Skinner suggested teaching children in the hope it reaches their parents.

Chair Barto recommended including non-profit partners such as the Surfrider Foundation.

Help Your Harbor Co-Founder Billy Dutton reported they have presented a field trip for schools for students to view and learn about trash. He offered to revisit their presentation. He echoed Ms. Skinner's comments about this educational experience's benefits of bestowing knowledge on future generations living inland. He agreed that the children see the impacts their community is having on the downstream environment.

Mr. Peterson reported Benioff is funding-rich and will only expect the City to pay a discretionary 10% of the costs. He noted that Benioff offered to provide the live collection data but the City would have to host its own website. He speculated even a robust marketing effort associated with such a website would only cost the City about \$30,000. He confirmed Benioff would pay for the equipment and data processing.

Mr. Peterson reported the first load of trash collected included a mattress. He commented that the most common things collected are usually plastic bottles, plastic bags, polystyrene, and food wrappers, but noted the City thus far has collected remarkably few plastic bags. He reported on how easily the trash wheel collected and removed the mattress.

In response to Chair Barto's inquiry, Mr. Peterson reported Benioff is particularly excited about potentially working with Newport Beach because they can drive there from their headquarters at the University of California at Santa Barbara as opposed to harder travel to their distant projects globally.

Committee Member Fancher expressed his excitement at the project's potential but cautioned he wants to ensure they reach their potential. He stated Mr. Peterson's work in better identifying the captured items is important for work with upstream municipalities. He explained there is a marketing aspect allowing the City to inform the public of this good work on their behalf. He stated this project should be portrayed as an unfortunate one the City must perform at a cost of \$5-8 million because people upstream are not really friendly partners trying to stop their trash before it goes downstream to Newport Beach. He encouraged focusing the burden to stop the trash on upstream neighbors. He noted this project was originally sold as a short-term stopgap to a long-term solution.

Committee Member Hudson stated this is solely blaming people upstream when Newport Beach also contributes trash. He encouraged not establishing a "us vs. them" mentality, noting there can be problems as it relates to places like the City of Santa Ana.

Committee Member Fancher stated they must address the full intention and purpose of the trash collector.

Mr. Dutton stated the data is how the City can bring it to the attention of upstream neighbors. He advised that the Help Your Harbor cleanup events put the trash into clear plastic bags to show off what is in the bag along with weight information. He explained that this basic data alone was enough for people to realize there is a large problem requiring attention. He noted the trash collector will build on this data, noting continuing to feed the AI data over time will create more detailed information the City can act upon.

Chair Barto stated, if she has this type of data, she can take it to the Orange County Watersheds meeting and be better prepared to achieve County-level buy-in through the presentation of numbers worth paying attention to.

Mr. Peterson reported the AI will improve over time but it will help by taking video with the cameras recommended by Benioff.

Mr. Dutton stated the proposed website should not be perceived as marketing but rather as education. He noted that the collections could be tracked in school classrooms. He recommended that this should be done early in the project with Benioff.

In response to Committee Member Robertson's inquiry, Mr. Peterson confirmed he would need formal approval from the Committee to proceed with the 90/10 split agreement with Benioff.



**Motion:** A motion was made by Committee Member Robertson to authorize City staff to enter into an agreement with Benioff Ocean Science Laboratory for Newport Bay Trash Collector data analysis expertise with an approximate 90/10 cost split, seconded by Committee Member Fancher. The motion passed unanimously.

- a. Committee Goals/Objectives Workshop (Bob Stein)  
Review and update of the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee Goals.

**Recommendation: Committee Discussion/Approval**

Mr. Stein reported the Committee currently has three draft objectives. He explained that the difference between an objective and a goal is an objective has a target date and some metrics. He stated the first objective, with a tentative March 2026 completion date, is to prepare recommendations on how to protect ocean beaches, houses, businesses, and infrastructure along the Balboa Peninsula from increasing flood and ocean threats associated with sea level rise and more intense storms.

In response to Committee Member Belden's inquiry, Mr. Stein clarified the list he is displaying is the list of topics the Committee would use to come up with its recommendations. Chair Barto noted that, during the last meeting, they organized about 18 suggested objectives on poster boards and whittled it down to the three being presented tonight.

Committee Member Belden recommended having Zeus Geotechnic come back along with the University of North Carolina professor mentioned in Item No. 5-b.

Committee Member Fancher stated the first objective should be expanded to all of the City's oceanfront and not just the Balboa Peninsula. He stated they need to study it all for a better understanding of problems and opportunities. He recommended that they focus on oceanfront replenishment, and vitality, noting the discussion for Item No. 5-b made him realize the need for a larger program with an organized full analysis approach. He stated the City should invest \$2 million into such a Study, noting it spends \$6 million to promote its hotels which have their sales generated by beachgoers. He stated the Committee could set the groundwork for this Study. He stated they must invest in the beaches because they are the City's economic driver. He called for a Beach Vitality Commission dedicated specifically to the beaches like the Harbor Commission. He noted the City needs a million cubic yards of sand annually which is far more than the federal government provides.

Mr. Stein noted this could be the core of a recommendation, adding they do not have a program like this one with funding for consultants. He advised that, if the City Council thinks it is a good idea, they could create the program.

Chair Barto explained that this would be similar to how the City regularly conducts traffic studies.

Committee Member Fancher recommended for the first objective they focus on what such a program would look like and cost, including consultants. He noted this could take up to six months to draft a proposal about getting into the business of beaches to bring to the City Council. He recommended discovering what type of analysis needs to be done by what type of entity and at what cost.

Mr. Stein stated this is a recommendation where the other Committee Members need to agree it is a good one. He acknowledged that they could be headed in this direction.

Committee Member Fancher encouraged to focus on this concept of identifying what they want to change followed by a plan of how to get there.

Chair Barto stated they need to wordsmith what they are discussing as a recommendation for a plan.

Committee Member Hudson clarified they want a comprehensive plan for not only the Balboa Peninsula but for all the City's oceanfront.

Committee Member Robertson stated he does not disagree with going in the direction of looking at all beaches and not just Balboa Peninsula, but cautioned they are putting the cart before the horse. He commended Mr. Stein's presentation's organization but advised that more data is needed. He noted there are regional programs where they can learn about best practices based on their levels of success. He pondered what specific things Newport Beach can do immediately, noting an analysis may call for the City to have a sand czar with the ability to obtain all the sand needed. He agreed, that by March 2026, Balboa Peninsula is achievable.

Chair Barto acknowledged it is achievable by March 2026, but noted it is good to overachieve as well.

Committee Member Fancher stated he and Committee Member Robertson are presenting differing views but agreed that they are both healthy for consideration. He suggested they consider spot working at smaller aspects of a larger equation. He stated their objective should be by March 2026 to have led to the City Council's adoption of a program leading to the correct consultancy to create a beach protection program for all of Newport Beach.

Chair Barto stated it comes down to wordsmithing because if the recommendation is the City needs a comprehensive plan they will know by March 2026. She agreed they will likely come to a comprehensive plan but remarked that what Committee Member Fancher is discussing could be more of a five-year project. She noted that she likes pushing as much as they can.

Ms. Gardner cautioned the Committee's plan must coordinate with the City's General Plan.

Mr. Stein reported the second objective is by August to prepare recommendations for capturing trash in the Santa Ana River before it is released to the Pacific Ocean. He explained that this recommendation could potentially identify projects, funding sources, and a schedule. He noted there are several regulatory agencies involved with the river, and it would likely behoove the Committee to have them present and include their expertise. He presented a map of the Santa Ana River and its many tributaries where trash can enter.

Mr. Kappeler reported he wrote a Prop 13 grant about 20 years ago for a rubber boom in the City of Costa Mesa which worked but is no longer there.

Mr. Stein reported there are water quality issues in northern Orange County's Carbon Creek.

In response to Committee Member Robertson's inquiry, Mr. Stein stated the Orange County Water District's infiltration work is done from its station in the City of Anaheim near Angel Stadium.

Committee Member Robertson requested Mr. Stein add the Water District to his list of resources.

Chair Barto requested AI usage and the assistance Benioff should be written into this objective.

Committee Member Fancher expressed strong support for the second objective. He recommended it be expanded to include identifying projects to help capture trash, funding sources, and a schedule. He noted Mr. Peterson's comments in Item No. 5-c and inquired about where upstream partners fit into this objective and efforts to curb their pollution. He recommended studying how the trash got into Newport Beach's waters and how can it be prevented. He called for stronger language identifying the bad guys upstream and recommending methods of working with them.

Mr. Stein recommended working with upstream neighbors diplomatically through regional agencies.

Mr. Kappeler noted the Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (SAWPA) exists.

Ms. Gardner reported that SAWPA's focus is more upstream and could have a good impact.

Chair Barto stated a Benioff partnership could excite SAWPA.

Committee Member Fancher stated this objective needs to mention identifying upstream partners and how they could participate in a solution.

Mr. Kappeler reported that SAWPA gets ample grant funds for things like pump stations.

Committee Member Hudson inquired where all the trash is going after collection but did not receive a response.

Committee Member Robertson stated the inlet at Prado Dam near the City of Corona can serve as a dividing point because it retains stormwater and, with it, trash. He stated trash from as far away as the City of San Bernadino likely does not reach them because of the dam but requested having this notion confirmed.

Committee Member Hudson stated they should follow the Christian ethic of all being in this together as they approach upstream neighbors.

Mr. Stein reported the third objective is to prepare a list of recommended Upper Newport Bay restoration projects by November. He responded to Mr. Dutton's earlier call for a viewing platform for the trash interceptor by recommending a location on a map with a potential additional walkway. He noted that another potential project, proposed by Committee Member Wadsworth, is an infiltration project in the Newport Dunes, moving wet flow to either the beach area or parking lot to eliminate a diversion to the sewer. He cited the eroding Santa Isabel Ave. area of the nature preserve as another potential project. He explained that an estuary at the mouth of Upper Newport Bay could be a mitigation area for a Balboa Island sea wall. He reported the City has failed in some previous grant applications for this area but they continue to reapply. He explained that some finer cleaning along with Help Your Harbor along San Diego Creek after the trash interceptor had done its work could be a model for other cleanup efforts. He reported Cherry Lake has become a cesspool of bacteria but lamented there may be nothing the City can do, noting it is also on the radar of regional groups.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Stein confirmed the area around Cherry Lake is entirely private land but advised that a former Committee Member has a house there so they could arrange for a tour through them.

Mr. Stein reported they are generally in good shape for this third objective, adding the Big Canyon Project's Phase III will kick off in September.

Ms. Gardner stated all these items are generally cosmetic in nature and they have yet to discuss sea level rise impacting the estuary. She inquired if the City will allow the estuary to rise with the sea level or if they will attempt to contain it. She explained that it will not be an issue in five years but should be included in an overall long-term plan.

Mr. Stein reported the Big Canyon Project's Phase III includes a plan for sea level rise allowing vegetation and animals to migrate inland over time as the sea level rises.

In response to Ms. Gardner's inquiry, Mr. Stein clarified areas with cliffs do not have a place for plants and wildlife to retreat to. He acknowledged they do not know what the situation will be up to 300 years from now.

Ms. Gardner cautioned they should not invest too heavily in a plan which will be worthless 15 years down the road.

Mr. Stein theorized these projects should hold through at least 75 years of projected sea level rise.

Committee Member Fancher agreed with Ms. Gardner.

Ms. Gardner recommended the Committee should focus on short-term issues and leave the long-term planning to the City's General Plan.

Chair Barto agreed anything they suggest should tie into the General Plan. She noted long-term sea level rise concerns are included in the General Plan.

In response to Ms. Skinner's inquiry, Mr. Kappeler clarified the Water District wants to dredge the sand at Prado Dam, but the Corps of Engineers' policy is not to dredge. He explained that it is a lengthy discussion over the Water District's desires for more storage against concerns over flooding in areas like Chino Airport. He commented that it is an interesting but extremely complicated ongoing discussion.

Committee Member Robertson requested an update on the Santa Ana-Delhi Channel Improvement Project.

**6. COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION, OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

- a. Coastal Resiliency (April 2025 – Charles Fancher)
- b. Total Maximum Daily Load for Copper (Cu) (April 2025 – TBD)
- c. San Gabriel River Trash Interceptor Project (May 2025 – John Wadsworth)
- d. Newport Beach Trash Interceptor Public Outreach Campaign (Spring 2025 – John Pope)

Chair Barto added sand replenishment to the list.

Committee Member Fancher reported Oceanside is lined up for the April meeting.

It was reported Dr. Brett Sanders of the University of California at Irvine can also present about sand movement trends at the next meeting.

Chair Barto encouraged all to attend the Newport Bay Trash Interceptor's ribbon cutting.

**7. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Ms. Gardner reported there was a recent United States Supreme Court ruling in City and County of San Francisco v. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recognizing the amount of inland input impacting San Francisco. She noted that it is something to keep in mind if regulators are being too stringent on Newport Beach.

**8. SET NEXT MEETING DATE**

Recommendation: April 3, 2025

The next meeting was set for April 3, 2025.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

---

**Chair / Michelle Barto**