Alameda South Shore Beach Restoration Project

Applicant Information

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 706852

Applicant Information

a.	Applicant Name	City of Alameda				
b.	Organizational Unit	Planning, Building and Transportation Department				
c.	Address	City Hall, 2263 Santa Clara Ave				
d.	Address 2	#190				
e.	City	Alameda	State	CA	Zip	94501
f.	Federal ID Number	94-6000288	Unique Entity Id.			KUYHVCR5A8M8

g. Agency Type

- (●) City
- ( ) County
- ( ) Federal Agency
- ( ) State Agency
- ( ) District
- ( ) Other Public Agency

Project Information

a.	Project Name	Alameda South Shore Beach Restoration Project				
b.	Is implementing agency same as Applicant	( ) Yes (●) No				
c.	Implementing Agency Name	East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD)				
	Address	2950 Peralta Oaks Court P.O. Box 5381				
	City	Oakland	State	CA	Zip	94605-0381
	Phone	(510) 544-2346 x 0000	Fax	(888) 327-2757		
d.	Project Start Date	Aug-03-2026	End Date	Jun-29-2029		
e.	Amount of Funds Requested	$5,340,155.00	Project Cost	$6,282,535.00		

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 706852

Contacts

a. Project Administrator

Name	Gail Payne				
Title	Grants Manager				
Mailing Address	2263 Santa Clara Avenue, Rm 130				
City	Alameda	State	CA	Zip	94501
Telephone	(510) 747-6892			Fax	
E-mail Address	gpayne@alamedaca.gov				

General Project Information

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 706852

7. Project Description

In 100 words or less, describe the purpose of the completed project, including all phases through construction and/or implementation of study results.

The project will replenish Alameda's South Shore public beach, which has experienced accelerated erosion. The purpose of the completed project is to protect the beach, which is the highest visited beach in the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). It is a regional source of economic, ecological and recreational benefits. The project also will protect the adjacent San Francisco Bay Trail (Bay Trail) and Shoreline Drive, which provide valuable emergency access and transportation. Additionally, the project will provide flood protection to adjacent community members, including the South Shore neighborhood, which houses a disproportionate number of lower income renters. Furthermore, the project includes the required post-project biological monitoring to ensure environmental protection.

7a. Specify which portion(s) of the project scope your agency would fund with this grant.

The grant will fund engineering/permits, construction for sand replenishment and the required post-project biological monitoring.

8. State each of the major problems the project will address and benefits it will provide. Examples of problems include but are not limited to risks to human health and safety, storm surge damage to public infrastructure, and imminent loss of recreational or ecological benefits due to erosion.

Alameda’s South Shore Beach has experienced accelerated erosion between Westline Drive and Broadway. The erosion is within ten feet in some locations of the Shoreline Drive multi-use path, which is part of the Bay Trail, and Shoreline Drive. Due to heavy storms in recent years and sea level rise, the shoreline erosion has accelerated, causing the elimination of the beach area, established dunes and beach access. Further erosion will cause closure of the adjacent Bay Trail, San Francisco Water Trail access points and Shoreline Drive. Shoreline Drive is a major thoroughfare and provides valuable emergency access and transportation. The project will protect city roads, utilities including many of City of Alameda’s drainage outlet structures, and homes, including apartment/condo complexes, which house a disproportionate number of lower income renters in the community. Additionally, the Bay Trail that runs along the beach is commonly used for both recreation and commuting. Bike connectivity is important given the City’s goals to reduce car traffic being that it is an island with limited access points. As such, disruptions to the Bay Trail would prove challenging.

Most importantly, the project will protect Alameda’s South Shore beach, which is the longest swimming beach in the Bay Area, and one of the few beaches in the East Bay at 1.5 miles of sandy beach. It is the highest used park in EBRPD and is a popular site for kayaking, paddle boarding, walking, kitesurfing and windsurfing. The beach supports environmental resources and habitat for San Francisco Bay shorebirds and is the home to the Elsie Romer Bird Sanctuary. This sanctuary of pickleweed salt marsh offers coastal birdwatching and is one of the few remnant salt marshes in the San Francisco Bay. The bird sanctuary has habitat for over 204 species of aquatic birds and other endangered species. An eelgrass bed just offshore of the beach provides juvenile fish habitat. Recreation will be negatively affected in the form of habitat loss and the loss of opportunities for the public to observe wildlife.

The project will replenish the public beach and also will provide protection against impacts to the South Shore Beach, Bay Trail, Shoreline Drive and San Francisco Water Trail, which will be felt broadly across the community.

9. If DBW has previously provided funding for any work on this project, provide the DBW agreement number and indicate when and how much funding was provided. Also provide amounts and dates for other prior State investments in this project.

81-42-12, 1981 $1,355,000

82-42-13, 1982, $585,000

82-42-21, 1982, $275,000

85-42-69, 1985, $449,391

86-42-124, 1986, $1,645,000

10. Identify all public agencies that are involved or will be involved in the project. Explain each entity's role in the project, including its involvement in any previous phases of the project.

The City of Alameda owns the South Shore Beach area between Westline Drive and Broadway. EBRPD maintains it for the City since the establishment of a 1967 memorandum of understanding (MOU), which has been amended several times. The City is responsible for the grant application and management and is the fiscal agent for the project. EBRPD is responsible for project management.

11. Describe the history of this project up to the date of this grant application.

In the 1950s, the beach was designed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (U.S. Army Corps) and the beach has been constructed in phases. From 1982 through 1988, erosion control projects were completed with funding assistance from the California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW). The State had an interest in shoreline erosion protection for the man-made improvements along Shoreline Drive, and the beach provided the lowest cost alternative with the added amenities of public access and recreational opportunities. Sand is not naturally transported to the beach, so it must be periodically redistributed and replenished as it erodes slowly over time or is suddenly lost in a large storm. Throughout the beach's history, different solutions to erosion have been attempted by the U.S. Army Corps, such as structural revetments, but none of them worked successfully. Extensive studies by the U.S. Army Corps in 1980 demonstrated that beach nourishment was the solution that provided protection as well as ecological and recreational benefits. The studies in the 1980s judged the benefits associated with recreational uses as being a higher benefit than shoreline protection. Nevertheless, in the present day, shoreline protection benefits are greater because of the importance of Shoreline Drive as a major thoroughfare and of the desire to protect the South Shore neighborhood. Most importantly, the recreational and ecological functions could be relocated, but not the storm protection functions. In 1998 and 2006, FEMA funded sand replenishment due to severe storms. The groins have been improved a number of times, including by the CDFW Office of Spill Prevention from the Cosco Busan Oil Spill. In 2006, FEMA agreed to fund the replacement of 20,000 cubic yards of sand and to extend the Park Street groin landward. In 2013, EBRPD and FEMA installed 82,500 cubic yards of sand at a cost of $5.7 million.

DBW Representative Visit / Public Support

12. To the best of your agency's knowledge, has a DBW representative visited the project site in the last 10 years? If so, identify the visitor and the purpose of the visit.

No.

13. Have public meetings related to the project occurred, including but not limited to portions of Local Board / Council meetings?

(●) Have occurred ( ) Will occur ( ) Both ( ) Neither

Meeting Date	Meeting Notice	Minutes of Meeting
September 3, 2019	921_Notice September 3 2019.pdf	213_September 3 2019 Minutes.pdf
December 7, 2021	449_Notice December 7 2021.pdf	932_December 7 2021 Minutes.pdf
August 3, 2024	44228_2_147_Primary - English.jpg	733_August 3 2024 Minutes.pdf

If public meetings are scheduled, indicate when and where they will occur, and attach any notices that have been made public.

When	Where	Meeting Notice

Is your agency aware of opposition to the project? ○ Yes ◉ No

If so, identify the nature of the opposition and your agency's response to that opposition.

14. List the items of public infrastructure and public assets that this project will protect, including but not limited to buildings and roadways.

1. Alameda's South Shore Beach, which is the longest swimming beach in the Bay Area at 1.5 miles and is the highest used park in the East Bay Regional Park District
2. Shoreline Drive path, which is a major thoroughfare for commuters and is part of the San Francisco Bay Trail
3. San Francisco Water Trail access along the beachfront
4. South Shore roads, utilities, stormwater outfalls and homes, including apartment/condo complexes, which house a disproportionate number of lower income renters in the community
5. Emergency access and transportation
6. Elsie Romer Bird Sanctuary, one of the few remnant salt marshes in the San Francisco Bay and habitat for over 204 species of aquatic birds and other endangered species, and a site for coastline birdwatching
7. South Shore Beach Volleyball Courts

15. If this project site is located within one mile of an area with known regular surfing activity, identify each relevant location and state how the project will affect each area.

The project will help protect the South Shore beach area's beginner friendly windsurfing and kiteboarding opportunities. These surfing activities occur along the entire South Shore beach area with the Boardsport rental and school located just west of Westline Drive. The school provides kiteboarding and windsurfing lessons as well as kids camps taught by instructors and gear specialists with over 35+ years of collective riding, teaching, and technical experience. The school also offers rentals to visitors, with the largest selection of gear in the San Francisco Bay Area.

16. If this project is located within one mile of lands reserved for tribal purposes, identify each relevant location and state how the project will affect each area.

Since the beach is a man-made beach, designed by the U.S. Army Corps as an erosion control project, it is not adjacent to tribal lands and is about 1/2 mile from the original island. It is over one mile from cultural resource areas on the main island with known tribal sensitivities.

17. Environmental reviews, permits, consistency determinations, and other approvals

List all environmental reviews, permits, consistency determinations, and other approvals required to construct or complete the project. Indicate the current status of each listed item. For studies, list requirements anticipated for subsequent phases.

Name of Document	Status	Supporting Documentation
2010 Mitigated Negative Declaration	For 2013 project, will be updated	773_Mitigated Negative Declaration.pdf
Water Board Permit	For 2013 project, will be updated	
Biological Assessment	For 2013 Project, will be updated	553_Biological Assessment.pdf

Army Corps Permit	For 2013 project, will be updated	
BCDC Permit	For 2013 project, will be updated	986_BCDC Permit No. 9-81 Amendment No. Eight 03-29-13.pdf
Agreement with City of Alameda	Operations and Maintenance Agreement with the City of Alameda	358_MOU EPRD and City of Alameda.pdf
Response to Comments and Mitigation Monitoring Plan	For 2013 project, will be updated	812_Response to Comments and MMP.pdf

18. Explain how all the property within the proposed project area is and will be owned and operated. For physical projects, the entire project area must be publicly owned throughout the project and for 20 years after project completion. Studies and other intellectual property must be fully publicly owned immediately upon acceptance as final.

City of Alameda owns the South Shore beach area between Westline Drive and Broadway including the adjacent Shoreline Drive, walkway and bikeway. EBRPD has had an operations and maintenance agreement with the City of Alameda since 1967 as posted in the previous question #17. The MOU was renewed in 2002 for 25 years and is set to expire in 2027. The City of Alameda and EBRPD plan to renew the MOU before it expires in 2027.

Project Impact / Authorization by Congress

19. Indicate whether any portion of the project area, or the area expected to be impacted by the project, is owned and operated by the Department of Parks and Recreation. ○ Yes ◉ No

If your agency manages this area under an Operating Agreement with the Department of Parks and Recreation, attach a copy of the Operating Agreement.

20. Has this project been authorized by Congress for federal financial participation? ○ Yes ◉ No

If Yes, identify the source (statute / bill number and year) of the authorization

21. Provide a map of the project location. Include markers on the map to show all existing public access points to the shoreline that are located within the project area. Indicate whether each of these points provides access for physically handicapped shoreline visitors. If the project will create additional access points, identify where they will be created. If the project will include beach nourishment, show the constructed footprint and expected changes over time. (More than one map may be necessary to provide this information.) Indicate what areas on the map(s) are legally controlled by the applicant.

Name / Description	Map Attachment
Site Location - City of Alameda South Shore Beach	44243_0_885_South Shore Site Map.JPEG
Site Location - City of Alameda South Shore Beach (2013 design plan map)	44243_1_943_South Shore Map Site Plan.JPEG
Project Site	44243_2_702_Vicinity Map.png

22. To the best of your agency's knowledge, are any other construction projects planned within or near the boundaries of the littoral cell that may change the subject shoreline or access to it? ○ Yes ◉ No

If so, describe the projects and their expected impacts.

23. Does this project protect, encourage, and/or create low-cost tourism and recreational opportunities? If so, describe them.

The project will protect the most used park in the East Bay Regional Park District, providing low-cost recreational opportunities including kiteboarding, wind boarding, volleyball, walking, swimming, birdwatching, kayaking, bicycling and more. The annual estimated economic value of Crown Beach according to Alameda's 2019 Climate Action and Resilience Plan is between $52 and $78 million. If South Shore Beach between Westline Drive and Broadway, which is a portion of Crown Beach, has half of that economic value, it would be between $26 and $39 million annual economic value.

24. If any diking, filling, or dredging requirements are associated with this project, explain why the activity is necessary, and what mitigation measures will be taken to minimize adverse environmental effects. Note that 'filling' includes placing sand anywhere in the project area.

East Bay Regional Park District received a mitigated negative declaration for the restoration of the beach, which included necessary mitigation measures. We are assuming that these mitigation measures would be the same and would include:

Aesthetics Mitigation AES-1. Sand/soil that is excavated during the groin construction should be replaced along the sides of the new groin and contoured/sloped to cover as much of rock/sheet pile structure as possible. No side-cast excavated material should be placed onto vegetated areas.

Air Quality Mitigation AIR-1. The staging areas shall be covered with mats or watered as needed, but at least daily to minimize dust emissions.

Mitigation AIR-2. The staging areas and adjacent streets shall be swept as needed to prevent tracking of sand or sediment onto public streets.

Mitigation AIR-3. All land-based equipment (dozers, cranes, forklift, and generators) shall use engines certified by the Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board to meet Tier 2 emission standards as listed in Title 40 Part 89 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Mitigation AIR-4. All portable equipment shall be registered under the Statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program and implement all emissions and reporting requirements. Mitigation AIR-5. Provided suitable vessels and equipment are available, marine equipment shall use engines certified to meet Tier 1 emission standards as listed in Title 40 Part 94 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Biological Resources Mitigation BIO-1. Unless otherwise allowed by the resource agencies, groin construction "activities" that could affect the resources within Elsie Roemer Marsh shall be completed between September 1 and the end of January, to avoid the breeding season of the California clapper rail. No construction equipment shall be allowed within the vegetated habitats of the Elsie Roemer Marsh.

Mitigation BIO-2. If the rock rip-rap groin design is constructed, monitoring of the effect of rodents on the bird species within the Elsie Roemer Marsh will be initiated. If significant effects are observed, a plan for the trapping or preclusion of rodents within the rip-rap will be developed and instituted by the Park District after consultation with CDFG and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service staff.

Mitigation BIO-3. The slurry pipeline will be placed at up to two locations and the pipeline would be floating (supported by pontoons equipped with visibility lighting) across bay bottom areas that support eelgrass.

Mitigation BIO-4. The booster pump and support platform will not be placed within areas that support eelgrass.

Mitigation BIO-5. Project sand-fill will not be deposited seaward of the +2 ft (MLLW) to minimize impacts to eelgrass habitat.

Mitigation BIO-6. Construction vehicles and personnel will not be allowed seaward of the 0.0 ft (MLLW) tide line to minimize possible impacts to eelgrass habitat.

Mitigation BIO-7. The total project sand-fill footprint will not be seaward of that filled during the 1988 beach development.

Mitigation BIO-8. Unless approved by resource agencies, beach replenishment activities will not occur from December 1st through February 28th, the Pacific herring spawning season.

Mitigation BIO-9. Prior to initiating construction activities during CDFG-predicted periods within the May through July grunion spawning season, pre-construction surveys will be completed to determine if the beach has been used by grunion. Construction activities will not occur on areas of the beach that have been used by grunion during the previous two week period. Mitigation BIO-10. Construction vehicles will not travel along the beach shoreward of the vegetation line of the existing dunes to avoid impacts to dune grass habitat.

Mitigation BIO-11. Because the fact that the project site is proximal to an eelgrass habitat, additional information on the project and its potential effects to the least tern will be provided to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. In support of the application to the U.S. Army Corps, EBRPD will prepare and submit a Biological Assessment that will include an assessment of potential impacts to the least tern and will identify project-specific mitigations to reduce or eliminate those impacts.

Hazards and Hazardous Material Mitigation HAZ-1. As required by the California Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) and if onboard petroleum quantities warrant, a project specific oil spill response and recovery plan shall be developed. The plan will be based on the Park District's existing spill prevention and emergency response plan to include discussions on: appropriate precautions to prevent or contain spilled hazardous materials such as petroleum products; notification and response procedures in the event of an emergency; training requirements for field personnel; and available support resources. Refueling of the booster pump will be conducted in accordance with U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) regulations for vessel to vessel refueling.

Mitigation HAZ-2. If onshore refueling of equipment is to occur, a designated refueling site(s) will be specified and will be located at least 100 ft from the mean high tide line (MHTL) and at least 100 ft from the boundary of the Elsie Roemer Marsh. The ground of the onshore refueling site(s) will be covered with an impervious material and a berm of ration of Robert W. Crown Memorial State Beach Mitigated Negative Declaration Page 4 of 63 impervious material, sufficient to retain the volume of the worst-case petroleum spill plus storm water, will be placed around the entire fueling site. No onshore refueling will occur outside of the designated site. Mitigation HAZ-3. Sufficient and appropriate petroleum recovery equipment (i.e. sorbent pads, containers, etc.) will be located within the refueling site(s) and will be available for immediate use in the event of a spill.

Mitigation HAZ-4. Impervious material will be placed under all stationary equipment during operating and non-operating (parked) periods to collect leaking petroleum products. Each piece of equipment will be checked for leaks daily prior to operation and leaks will be repaired immediately. The leaked petroleum will be cleaned up and disposed of in a legal manner.

Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation - WQ-1. Institute spill response requirements specified in Mitigation Measures HAZ1 and HAZ-2. Mitigation

WQ-2. Minimize the number of anchor sets and activities that result in bay bottom contact to reduce sediment disturbance.

Land Use Mitigation LUP-1. Following completion of the Park Street groin extension, assure that lateral access is available around the Park Street groin. Implement mitigation TRA-2 during construction activities.

Noise Mitigation NOI-1. Use of heavy equipment or tools that generate high noise levels shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and weekday (Monday through Friday) operations. Nearby residents and businesses should be given advanced written notification of construction activity scheduling and hours of construction.

Mitigation NOI-2 (sheet pile groin). Unless limited by engineering considerations, the groin extension construction will maximize the excavation and placement of the sheet piles without a pile driver. If required, a vibratory-type pile driver will be used for placement of the sheet piles and its use will be minimized.

Mitigation NOI-3. Noise monitoring will occur during the first day of vibratory pile placement or rock delivery and, if needed, noise-reduction measures will be implemented to minimize impacts to sensitive noise receptors. Noise-producing stationary equipment (e.g., generators) will be shielded and located as far as possible from sensitive receptors.

25. If work related to this project will include creation of a hardened sand retention structure or a revetment, breakwater, groin, harbor channel, seawall, cliff retaining wall, or any other structure that would alter natural shoreline processes, describe the structure(s) to be built, its anticipated impact on the shoreline, and the intended purpose of this component of the project.

No hardened structures are proposed for the near-term sand replenishment project. Nevertheless, additional nature-based solution structures will be considered as a mid-term project after this near-term project of sand replenishment is completed. Nature-based solutions such as rock and log groins could extend the project lifespan of the beach replenishment project beyond the expected ten years as is the current replacement cycle. Relevant nature-based solutions include coastal marsh, shallow subtidal habitat, and eelgrass restoration and other pioneer, creative, and progressive ideas that enable adaptation to rising seas and provide collective benefits to coastal communities and wildlife, protect groundwater and ecosystems, restore marsh, upland, and transitional habitat, and enable effective shoreline and wastewater management. These nature-based solutions will provide estuarine-upland transition areas behind and east of the beach to maximize the available habitat by protecting the shoreline from future erosion and by creating more functional habitat. As a separate mid-term project, it would include targeted studies such as geotechnical, wind-wave and sediment transport analyses to develop a concept design.

26. Explain how sea level rise may impact the effectiveness of this project, and what steps will be taken in the project design to account for possible sea level rise. In addition, explain how this project will help to solve the long term issues within and near the project area related to sea level rise.

A changing natural shoreline can be expected along the beach and Elsie Roemer Bird Sanctuary, where additional studies are needed to determine how the beach and marsh will respond to rising seas. At present, sand is annually redistributed along the beach because it collects at groins at either end of the beach throughout the year. In 2013, the beach underwent a large restoration effort of replenishing sand that has been partially lost during storms. The slope of the beach and its orientation to waves varies along its length. Additional study may reveal that some spots along the beach are well positioned to keep pace with rising seas to a point. There have been limited studies on Elsie Roemer Bird Sanctuary to date. Nevertheless, it is well understood that marshes need adequate sediment and space to migrate upland with sea level rise, which can be supplied in part by this sand replenishment project. Erosion control projects such as oyster balls or jetties will be explored as part of a mid-term project for Crown Beach. These vulnerability assessments are part of Oakland Alameda Adaptation Committee's (OAAC) efforts on the Subregional Adaptation Plan.

Local and Regional Planning

27. Indicate whether the proposed project addresses recommendations contained in a final, published Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan prepared in collaboration with the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup (https://dbw.parks.ca.gov/29337) or another published regional sediment management plan. If it has, identify the Plan and page number(s).

The proposed project addresses recommendations contained in a final published Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan prepared in collaboration with the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup as it addresses the recommendations in BCDC's Regional Sediment Management Plan. It states that "Renourishment of Crown Beach will likely be required into the future since this beach offers flood protection for the adjacent homes within the communities" (page 54) and under the Recommendations By Reach Section it recommends to "Continue annual sand redistribution at Crown Beach to maintain this shoreline and beach. Monitor the beach nourishment and erosion process to further refine beach management. Investigate the use of small groins made of natural materials, spaced along the beach to help reduce the need for annual redistribution of sand. Consider use of living shorelines on erosive edge of Bay Farm Island to dissipate wave energy and to Explore potential restoration activities within the reach" (pages 58-59). Since South Shore Beach is a portion of Crown Beach, this project will address the recommendation to distribute sand through renourishment to provide flood protection for adjacent homes within the community. Additionally, it will set the stage for further work in OAAC's long term Subregional Adaptation Plan to further explore more long-term solutions such as those outlined by BCDC including considering the use of living shorelines and nature-based solutions.

28. If any other shoreline protection projects costing over $100,000 (including pre-construction costs) have occurred in the project area in the 10 years prior to the date of this Application, describe the projects and the results of those projects.

In 2013, EBRPD and FEMA installed 82,500 cubic yards of sand at a cost of $5.7 million. Sand was hydraulically pumped for beach nourishment to restore the beach to its original configuration for flood protection and to maintain the shoreline habitat protection, public access, and recreation opportunities. It replaced the 82,400 cubic yards of

sand lost at Crown beach from 1988-2006. In 2015, EBRPD extended the Park Street Groin for $350,000.

Grant Request

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 706852

Grant Request and Project Information

29. Identify the grant funding amount being requested from DBW in this application. In addition, indicate whether your agency would accept a lesser amount of funding if DBW cannot fully fund the project phase this year, and if so, the minimum amount of funding that would be useful for this project phase.

The City of Alameda in partnership with EBRPD is requesting $5.3 million from DBW. The total project cost is $6.3 mllion and includes engineering/permits for $500,000, mobilization for $1 million, sand placement for $4.4 million and biological monitoring for almost $400,000. The City/EBRPD would accept partial funding if DBW cannot fully fund the project as less funding would be useful for the hotspot areas of erosion, which include Westline/Shoreline, Grand Street and the Willow Street areas.

30. Attach an estimated project schedule that provides the expected start date and completion date for this phase of the project, and that also includes all project phases, past and future, including all permitting and environmental processes.

228_Schedule_AlamedaBeach_rev.pdf

31. **Project Benefits**

Provide a list of estimated benefits (e.g. protection of human health and safety, storm damage reduction, ecological benefits, low-cost recreational benefits) for the project as a whole, including all benefits that will be realized within the 20 years following completion of construction. Quantify these benefits, bearing in mind that an investment of public funds through this program must result in an equal or greater benefit through value created and/or public costs avoided. If applicable, include estimated state, local, and county tax benefits as well as estimated values of recreational benefits, protection of ecological resources, and environmental justice considerations. It may be helpful to determine an annual value of each category of benefits and multiply it by the length of time over which the benefits will be realized.

Please provide your response below below.

Shoreline protection of city infrastructure, streets, buildings: **$100 million** of benefit within 10 years following completion of construction

600,000 beach visitors at $15 each: **$90 million** of benefit within 10 years after completion of construction

TOTAL estimated benefits: **$190 million** over 10 year life of project

32. **Project Costs**

Provide a list of estimated costs for this phase of the project, and separately for the project as a whole, including expected maintenance costs and any other required costs that will be realized within the 20 years following completion of construction. As applicable, include estimated contingency costs, permitting costs, inspection costs, and escalation costs. Identify the source(s) of funding that are expected to pay costs related to this project that will be incurred through 20 years after completion of this phase, including costs that will be paid through in-kind match provided by the project sponsor. DBW can only provide grant funds for projects that are or will be fully funded.

Please provide your response below.

The City of Alameda in partnership with EBRPD is requesting $6.3 million for this project, which includes engineering/permits for $500,000, mobilization for $1 million, sand placement for $4.4 million and biological monitoring for almost $400,000. The DBW grant will cover 85 percent of the project costs totaling $5.34 million. The local match of 15 percent will be provided by the City of Alameda and EBRPD and will total $942,380. The majority of the local match will be a local cash

contribution of $760,660. An in-kind request of $181,720 would be from the grant and project managers.

Other required costs that will be realized within the 20 years following completion of construction are expected to be as follows:

- Routine inspection and maintenance: $30,000 per year for 20 years totals $600,000.
- Environmental and biological monitoring: $5,000 per year for 20 years totals $100,000.

33. Provide a numeric benefit/cost analysis that justifies the proposed public expenditures on this project.

Please provide your response below.

The estimated benefits of shoreline protection of city infrastructure, streets, and buildings, and the economic value of beach visitors in the next 10 years after construction totals $190 million. The costs as outlined in the Cost and Funding spreadsheet total $6.3 million. The benefits to cost ratio is 27.21:1.

34. Explain why the constructed or completed project would be superior to the 'do nothing' alternative.

The completed project would be superior to the ‘do nothing alternative’ because the ‘do nothing alternative’ would result in a loss of the beach and the adjacent Bay Trail, Shoreline Drive, and apartment condo complexes, which house a disproportionate number of lower income renters in the community. The Bay Trail is over 350 miles of regional shoreline path connecting communities, parks, open spaces, schools, and transit as well as providing space for recreation and active transportation to work, school and more locations throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. The project also would protect the Elsie Roemer Bird Sanctuary that is expected to be replenished with some of the migrating sand from the beach. The adjacent “pelican island” would continue to grow with the sand replenishment project, which would help retain the expanded bird populations and migrating birds that winter in this area.

35. Explain why the constructed or completed project would be superior to managed retreat.

The completed project would be superior to managed retreat as it would protect the most popular park in the East Bay Regional Park District with over 600,000 annual visitors. The beach is considered a major asset for Alameda as the Bay Area’s longest swimming beach, a center for kitesurfing and other recreational opportunities, and is a key sanctuary for migrating birds. The project also would allow flood protection for the adjacent South Shore communities and Shoreline Drive, which is an essential corridor for emergency transportation and for commuting and recreation. Managed retreat also would lose the transportation benefits that the Bay Trail and the San Francisco Water Trail provide in terms of recreation and shoreline connectivity. Nevertheless, managed retreat is a potential long-term strategy that OAAC will be discussing with community members as part of the longer subregional adaptation plan outreach efforts in mid-2025.

36. Explain why the constructed or completed project would be superior to one or two other relevant alternatives. Alternatives could include constructing a larger or smaller project, constructing at a different location, or using a different erosion control method.

Throughout the beach’s history, different solutions have been attempted by the U.S. Army Corps including structural revetments etc., but none of them worked successfully. Alternatives including managed retreat do not provide protection as well as ecological and recreational benefits in the same way that sand replenishment does. Sand replenishment is the first step and then the mid-term step will be to consider adding more nature-based solutions such as log and rock groins to extend the life of the sand replenishment project.

37. Sand compatibility

Gradation: Imported fill shall be predominantly a medium grain mixture of non-friable, non-angular sandy material obtained from alluvial deposits, and conforming to the following gradation: Sieve Sizes Percent Finer (U.S. Standard Square Mesh) (By Weight)

3/8 inch 100

No. 10 90-100

No. 16 70-100

No. 20 40-85

No. 30 0-65

No. 40 0-30

No. 60 0-5

No. 100 0-2

No. 200 0

The original beach volume in 1988 was 409,300 CY. In 2006, the beach volume was estimated at 334,600 CY. In 2009, the estimated volume was 326,900 CY. The 82,400 CY loss equates to a loss of approximately 4,500 CY per year, which would suggest that over 50,000 CY has been lost since the replenishment in 2013, but the final loss has not been calculated.

38. Studies, environmental reports, biological surveys, and designs

Attach any studies, environmental reports, biological surveys, and designs that have been prepared for the project.

Description	Attachment
Biological Assessment for 2013 Project	441_Biological Assessment.pdf
Mitigated Negative Declaration for 2013 Project	752_Mitigated Negative Declaration.pdf
BCDC Permit for 2013 Project	398_BCDC Permit No. 9-81 Amendment No. Eight 03-29-13.pdf
South Shore Erosion and Flooding Images from Winter 2024	128_South Shore.pdf

39. If your agency has retained an outside engineer, designer, or other consultant for the project, provide contact information including individual's name, title, company, address, telephone, and email address.

N/A

40. Resolutions

Attach resolutions from all governing bodies that, through this Application, are formally requesting grant funding from DBW for this project phase.

Governing Body Name	Resolution
City Council	

If resolutions are not yet available, indicate when DBW should expect to receive them via email to Casey Caldwell, Casey.Caldwell@parks.ca.gov

DBW must receive copies of all necessary resolutions in fully executed form by 5:00 pm Tuesday, April 15th, 2025.

It is on the City Council agenda for Tuesday, March 18, 2025.

Match Commitment

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 706852

41. Match Commitment

The Public Beach Restoration Program typically requires local sponsors to contribute at least 15 percent of project costs, in cash and/or pre-approved in-kind services. So for a project with a total budget of $1,000,000, the local contribution would be at least $150,000, and the maximum grant available would be $850,000. List the types of match your agency proposes to provide for this project and dollar amounts of each contribution. If local personnel time will be used, include each individual's title, hourly rate (straight time only) and expected hours worked.

Please provide your response below

The local match totaling $942,380 will be split evenly between the City of Alameda and EBRPD as cash and as in-kind staff contributions if allowed by DBW. The grant and project managers from both agencies have hourly rates of $118. The requested breakdown for the local match is shown in the below table. The City of Alameda and EBRPD are prepared to only make cash contributions if directed by DBW.

Match Type	Amount	Match
DBW Grant Funding	$5,340,155	85%
Local Match: Alameda	$471,190	7.5%
In-kind	$44,840	
Cash	$426,350	
Local Match: EBRPD	$471,190	7.5%
In-kind	$136,880	
Cash	$334,310	

Signature

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 706852

42. Certification and Assurances

☑ Under penalty of perjury, I hereby certify that I am an authorized representative of the Applicant, and that I have been or will be authorized by the Applicant by resolution to execute this Application for DBW funding.

Sign and date the application document underneath this statement. Type or print the name and title of the individual signing the document next to the signature.

Authorized Signature: Gail Payne

Name: Gail Payne

Title: Project Manager Date: 01/30/2025

Attachments Index

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 706852

#	Section	Title	File Name
1	General Project Information	921_Notice September 3 2019.pdf	44228_0_921_Notice September 3 2019.pdf
2	General Project Information	449_Notice December 7 2021.pdf	44228_1_449_Notice December 7 2021.pdf
3	General Project Information	147_Primary - English.jpg	44228_2_147_Primary - English.jpg
4	General Project Information	213_September 3 2019 Minutes.pdf	44229_0_213_September 3 2019 Minutes.pdf
5	General Project Information	932_December 7 2021 Minutes.pdf	44229_1_932_December 7 2021 Minutes.pdf
6	General Project Information	733_August 3 2024 Minutes.pdf	44229_2_733_August 3 2024 Minutes.pdf
7	General Project Information	773_Mitigated Negative Declaration.pdf	44250_0_773_Mitigated Negative Declaration.pdf
8	General Project Information	553_Biological Assessment.pdf	44250_2_553_Biological Assessment.pdf
9	General Project Information	986_BCDC Permit No. 9-81 Amendment No. Eight 03-29-13.pdf	44250_4_986_BCDC Permit No. 9-81 Amendment No. Eight 03-29-13.pdf
10	General Project Information	358_MOU EPRD and City of Alameda.pdf	44250_5_358_MOU EPRD and City of Alameda.pdf
11	General Project Information	812_Response to Comments and MMP.pdf	44250_6_812_Response to Comments and MMP.pdf
12	General Project Information	885_South Shore Site Map.JPEG	44243_0_885_South Shore Site Map.JPEG
13	General Project Information	943_South Shore Map Site Plan.JPEG	44243_1_943_South Shore Map Site Plan.JPEG
14	General Project Information	702_Vicinity Map.png	44243_2_702_Vicinity Map.png
15	Grant Request	228_Schedule_AlamedaBeach_rev.pdf	44257_0_228_Schedule_AlamedaBeach_rev.pdf
16	Grant Request	441_Biological Assessment.pdf	44271_0_441_Biological Assessment.pdf
17	Grant Request	752_Mitigated Negative Declaration.pdf	44271_1_752_Mitigated Negative Declaration.pdf
18	Grant Request	398_BCDC Permit No. 9-81 Amendment No. Eight 03-29-13.pdf	44271_2_398_BCDC Permit No. 9-81 Amendment No. Eight 03-29-13.pdf
19	Grant Request	128_South Shore.pdf	44271_3_128_South Shore.pdf