FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Beach Management Funding Assistance Program

Local Government Funding Requests: Ranking Criteria for Beach and Inlet Management Projects

Updated to include 2013 amendments to
Chapter 62B-36, Florida Administrative Code
08/15/2013

A discussion of statutory and rule authority for ranking criteria and practical methods used by Division staff for the award of ranking points to beach and inlet management projects for determining priority listing in the annual Local Government Funding Request submitted to the Governor and Legislature.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Beach Management Funding Assistance Program Mission 4
Program Eligibility....5

Beach Management Projects

Overview of Beach Ranking Criteria....6
Severity of Erosion 7
Threat to Upland Structures 8
Recreational and Economic Benefits....9
Congressional Authorization of Project Phase 10
USACE Project Agreement 11
Availability of FEMA Funding 12
10-Year Comprehensive Financial Plan 13
Designated Funding Source by Referendum 14
Third Party Funding.... 15
Quarterly Reporting Requirements.... 16
Active Permits 17
Secured Local Funds 18
Previous Cost Sharing in Feasibility or Design.... 19
Enhanced Longevity.... 20
Previously Restored Shoreline 21
Release of Appropriation.... 22
Project Performance: Nourishment Interval.... 23
Project Performance: Cost Per Mile Per Year 24
Mitigating Inlet Effects 25
Innovative Technologies.... 26
Technologies New to Florida.... 27
Enhancing Nesting Sea Turtle Refuges 28
Regionalization.... 29
Significance: Project Length.... 30
Significance: Construction Phase Projects.... 31
Significance: Economic Impact 32
Significance: Advanced Placement Loss.... 33
Significance: Erosion into Design Profile.... 34
Significance: Placement volumes.... 35
Readiness to Proceed 36

Inlet Management Projects

Overview of Inlet Ranking Criteria 37
Sand Reaching the Inlet.... 38
Balancing the Sediment Budget 39
Cost Effectiveness.... 40
10-Year Comprehensive Financial Plan 41
Designated Funding Source.... 42
Third Party Funding.... 43
Quarterly Reporting Requirements.... 44

Active Permits 45
Interlocal Agreement for Inlet Management 46
Previous Cost Sharing in Feasibility or Design..... 47
Enhanced Longevity..... 48
Previously Restored Shoreline 49
Release of Appropriation..... 50
Existing Inlet Management Plan..... 51
Updated Inlet Management Plan..... 52
New Inlet Management Plan 53
Enhanced Project Performance 54
Congressional Authorization of Project Phase 55
USACE Project Agreement 56
Availability of FEMA Funding 57
Inlet Management Studies..... 58

Beach Management Funding Assistance Program Mission

Recognizing the importance of the state's beaches, the Florida Legislature in 1986 committed to protecting and restoring the state's beaches through a comprehensive beach management planning program. The Department of Environmental Protection's Division of Water Resource Management (Division) evaluates beach erosion problems statewide seeking recommended strategies for the preservation of valuable infrastructure, upland development, cultural resources and critical habitat. The primary vehicle for implementing the beach management planning recommendations is the Florida Beach Management Funding Assistance Program, also known as the Beach Erosion Control Program (Program), which was established for the purpose of working in concert with local, state and federal governmental entities to achieve the protection, preservation and restoration of the sandy beaches located on the Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic Ocean, or Straits of Florida. Under the Program, financial assistance in amounts up to 75 percent of project costs is available to Florida's county and municipal governments, community development districts, or special taxing districts for shore protection and preservation activities.

Eligible activities include beach restoration and nourishment, project design and engineering studies, environmental studies and monitoring, inlet management planning, inlet management activities to reduce adjacent beach erosion, dune restoration and protection, and other beach erosion prevention related activities consistent with the adopted Strategic Beach Management Plan. The Program is authorized by Section 161.101, Florida Statutes. Since its inception in 1964, the Program has been a primary source of funding for local governments to address beach erosion control and preservation activities.

This document is designed to be used by local sponsors when preparing annual funding request applications. The document describes each ranking criteria used to establish annual priority order for beach erosion control and inlet management projects. Statutory authority, rule administration, and a discussion of methods used for assigning points are listed for each criterion as they appear in the rule. Where appropriate, techniques for improving the award of points may be discussed or listed.

Statutory authority is provided in Chapter 161, Florida Statutes (Statute). Administrative policy is provided in Chapter 62B-36, Florida Administrative Code (Rule).This revised version incorporates changes to administrative code following the 2013 adoption of revisions designed primarily to address statutory changes to Chapter 161 regarding inlet management projects.

Program Eligibility

In order to be eligible for the Beach Management Funding Assistance Program, projects must be sponsored by a local government and comply with the following criteria:

- Project areas must be on a sandy shoreline in Florida fronting the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, or the Straits of Florida.
- Projects must address shoreline designated as “critically eroded” in the Department’s most recent Critical Erosion Report.
- Beach management projects shall be accessible to the general public and access shall be maintained for the life of the project. Inlet management projects generally do not have to provide public access.
- Projects must be consistent with the Strategic Beach Management Plan and be included in the Statewide Long Range Budget Plan.
- Projects shall be conducted in a manner that encourages cost-savings, fosters regional coordination of local sponsors, optimizes management of sediments and project performance, protects the environment, mitigates impacts caused by modified inlets and provides long-term solutions.
- Appropriate feasibility studies or analysis shall be required before design or construction of new projects. Analysis must determine that the project avoids or minimizes adverse impacts and is cost effective.
- Beach management projects authorized by Congress for federal financial participation are eligible. Local governmental entities shall pursue federal appropriations to the maximum extent possible in order to proportionally reduce state and local project costs.
- Local sponsors must submit an Annual Funding Request and Local Long Range Budget Plan for projects expected to be initiated or continued in the fiscal year upon notification by the Department.

Policy

Policy is defined in the Rule 62B-36.003.

Overview of Beach Ranking Criteria

Total Available Points: 115 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14): The intent of the Legislature in preserving and protecting Florida's sandy beaches pursuant to this act is to direct beach erosion control appropriations to the state's most severely eroded beaches, and to prevent further adverse impact caused by improved, modified, or altered inlets, coastal armoring, or existing upland development. In establishing annual project funding priorities, the Department shall seek formal input from local coastal governments, beach and general government interest groups, and university experts. Criteria to be considered by the Department in determining annual funding priorities shall include:

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1): Beach Management Projects. Local sponsor funding requests for beach management projects in the upcoming fiscal year will be ranked in priority order. Eligible projects will receive a total point score by the Department based on the following criteria:

Specific Authority

161.101, 161.161 FS. Law Implemented 161.088, 161.091, 161.101, 161.142, 161.143, 161.161 FS. History–New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.06, 16B-36.006, Amended 12-25-03 and 08-05-2013.

Severity of Erosion

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(a) The severity of erosion conditions, the threat to existing upland development, and recreational and/or economic benefits.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(a) Severity of erosion. The severity of erosion score is determined by the average historical rate of erosion for the project length over 30 years at 2 points per foot of erosion, for a maximum total of 10 points. The Department will use historical MHW data files contained in the Department's Historic Shoreline Database to calculate the average rate of erosion for up to a 30 year period after 1972, but prior to any beach fill placement in the project area. Linear least square fit to the data will be used to determine the erosion/accretion trend. For those project areas where inadequate data prevents the calculation of an average rate, the rate may be obtained from a published study document used in the design of the project.

Discussion

The historical Mean High Water (MHW) data files contained in the Department's Historic Shoreline Database shall be used to calculate the average rate of erosion for a 30-year period after 1972 and prior to any beach fill placement in the project area. Linear least square fit to the data is used to determine the erosion/accretion trend.

Historical data is available through the following link:

ftp://ftp.dep.state.fl.us/pub/water/beaches/HSSD/MHWfiles

Threat to Upland Structures

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(a) The severity of erosion conditions, the threat to existing upland development, and recreational and/or economic benefits.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(b) Threat to upland structures. The percent of shoreline containing structures at or seaward of the projected 25-year return interval storm event erosion limit within the project boundaries times ten, for a maximum total of 10 points. The Department will determine the threat to upland structures by application of the Dean CCCLa, SBEACH (**S**torm-induced **BEA**ch **CH**ange Model) or comparable numeric model using a 25-year return interval storm tide hydrograph on the most recent beach-offshore profile data at each R-monument in the project area as determined by the Department and provided in "Erosion Due to High Frequency Storm Events," which is incorporated by reference. SBEACH results shall be supported with documentation on objectives, data used, model configuration and parameter selection, calibration/validation, applications of forcing conditions and any assumptions made in the modeling analysis.

Discussion

The threat to upland structures is determined by the application of the Dean CCCLa or the SBEACH Storm Erosion Model using a 25-year return interval storm tide hydrograph on the most recent beach-offshore profile data at each R-monument in the project area. The length of the shoreline containing a structure seaward of the erosion limits shall be measured from one shore normal property line to the other shore normal property line.

The Department may use the results of an alternative erosion model submitted in the feasibility study if the study recommends strategies for beach erosion control activities that are accepted by the Department for adoption into the Strategic Beach Management Plan. Such models must be supported with adequate model documentation. The most recent aerial photography available to the Department will be used to determine the presence of structures and armoring seaward of the erosion limits. It should be noted that properties that have existing armoring will be deemed non-threatened.

Recreational and Economic Benefits

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(a) The severity of erosion conditions, the threat to existing upland development, and recreational and/or economic benefits.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(c) Recreational and economic benefits. The percentage of linear footage of property within the project boundaries zoned commercial, recreational, or public lodging establishment, or the equivalent, in the current local government land use map times ten, for a maximum total of 10 points. Un-designated properties will be considered designated or zoned the same as the adjacent property designations. Street ends will be considered recreational if they provide access to the beach, in accordance with Rule 62B.36.002(14).

Discussion

Shoreline length within the project boundaries currently designated "commercial", "recreational" or "hotel, motel and vacation rental condominium" is calculated using GIS-based mapping tools. The commercial/recreational/lodging shoreline is then calculated as a percentage of the total project length, defined in Rule 62B-36.006(1)(l).

Designation must be derived from local current land use maps. Rezoning of properties within the project boundaries with subsequent transition of the current land use to commercial or recreational use will increase points in this category.

Congressional Authorization of Project Phase

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(d) Availability of federal funds. Projects with United States Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Congressional authorization for the requested project phase shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Projects that have been authorized by U.S. Congress for a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers project for the proposed project phase receive 5 points. Projects pursuing state funding for subsequent phases of the project will require federal authorization for each specific phase, prior to being awarded points for those subsequent phases.

USACE Project Agreement

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(d) Availability of federal funds….
Projects with a current United States Army Corps of Engineers project agreement executed for the requested project phase or projects listed in a United States Army Corps of Engineers work plan or current federal budget document shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Receipt of an executed project participation agreement for the project phase, or inclusion in the work plan or budget, indicates that federal funding is either secured or is likely to be appropriated for the funding year.

Availability of FEMA Funding

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(d) Availability of federal funds….
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) nourishment projects (Category G or equivalent subsequent program for designed, constructed and routinely maintained beaches) with approved Project Worksheets shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Projects that have been approved by the FEMA for funding to address storm damage repairs to previously designed, constructed and routinely maintained beaches are eligible to receive points in this category. Projects must have obtained signed Project Worksheets guaranteeing that federal reimbursement funding is available for the project.

10-Year Comprehensive Financial Plan

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(c) The extent of local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a designated funding source or sources for initial construction and periodic maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(e) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. Local sponsors who have a designated long term funding source for the management of a beach project as defined in a 10-year comprehensive financial plan shall receive 2 points….

Discussion

Funding for beach management must be a documented line item in the local sponsor's 10-year comprehensive financial plan.

Designated Funding Source by Referendum

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(c) The extent of local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a designated funding source or sources for initial construction and periodic maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(e) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment…. Local sponsors who provide funding for the beach project via a funding source established by referendum or legislative authority will receive 2 points….

Discussion

Long term designated funding sources that are established by referendum or a specific taxing district receives 2 points. Examples include Municipal Service Benefit Units, Municipal Service Taxing Unit, Tourist Development Council taxes (bed taxes), a dedicated portion of local sales tax, or other assessments specifically dedicated to beach management. Voter referendum indicates community-wide support for the project and long term funding source to maintain the project. Line items in an annual capital improvement budget do not qualify due to the susceptibility to budget changes based on annually fluctuating priorities.

Development of a local designated long term funding source is eligible for cost-sharing under the feasibility funding category.

Third Party Funding

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(c) The extent of local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a designated funding source or sources for initial construction and periodic maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(e) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. …Local sponsors who provide additional funding from a third party, other than the federal government, shall receive 1 point for a 10 percent reduction or 2 points for a 25 percent reduction of the non-federal share obtained from a third party, for up to 2 points…

Discussion

Projects that have secured a third party funding source to reduce the state and local cost shares can be awarded points for this criterion. Funding contributions must be documented in a cost sharing agreement or other appropriate document, and a copy must be provided in the funding request application. Funding sources can include grants, donations, or financial support from other governmental entities or special interest groups. The funding threshold of 10% of total project costs must be met or exceeded to receive one ranking point and the threshold of 25% of total project costs must be met or exceeded to receive two ranking points.

Quarterly Reporting Requirements

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(c) The extent of local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a designated funding source or sources for initial construction and periodic maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(e) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. …Local sponsors with a 100 percent compliance record for submitting quarterly reports correctly and on time over the previous state fiscal year shall receive 2 points...

Discussion

Quarterly reports are due 30 days following the end of the fiscal quarter. Fiscal quarters are defined as ending March 31, June 30, Sept 30, and December 31. Reports should be submitted even if no work has been completed for the project and no requests for reimbursements are submitted to the Department. This is a contract requirement and will be a future requirement for processing of all reimbursement requests.

Local sponsors without a current contract may voluntarily submit quarterly reports and receive the award of points in this category.

Active Permits

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(c) The extent of local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a designated funding source or sources for initial construction and periodic maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1) (e) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment… Local sponsors who hold active state and federal permits for the proposed project will receive 1 point…

Discussion

Active federal and state permits are both required for the proposed project activity for the award of one point in this category.

Secured Local Funds

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(c) The extent of local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a designated funding source or sources for initial construction and periodic maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(e) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment… Local sponsors who have secured local funds will receive 1 point…

Discussion

Funding must be secured and available for immediate use in order to qualify for the award of a point in this category.

Previous Cost Sharing in Feasibility or Design

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(d) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(f) Previous state commitment. Projects where the Department has previously cost shared, reviewed, and approved a feasibility or design phase shall receive 1 point…

Discussion

One point is awarded if the Department has previously executed a cost sharing agreement with the local sponsor using program funds to conduct a feasibility or design study and that study has been completed and approved by the Department.

Enhanced Longevity

Maximum Credit: 3 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(d) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(f) Previous state commitment …projects to enhance, or increase the longevity of a previously constructed project shall receive 3 points…

Discussion

Points can be awarded in this category for projects that propose a structural alternative or project design to increase the nourishment interval for the previously constructed project. A project design analysis must be submitted to demonstrate with reasonable assurance the anticipated increase in nourishment interval.

Previously Restored Shoreline

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(d) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(f) Previous state commitment ……and projects that will nourish a previously restored shoreline shall receive 5 points…

Discussion

Points are awarded for nourishment projects in an effort to provide continued state support for established projects. Restoration projects will not receive points until they move into the design phase for the subsequent nourishment.

Release of Appropriation

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(d) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(f) Previous state commitment. Projects where previously approved appropriations for a project phase could not be encumbered and were released in their entirety by the local sponsor due to the project timelines shall receive 1 point...

Discussion

If a local sponsor determines that the project schedule has been delayed and wishes to release a previous fiscal year appropriation in its entirety, that project will be awarded one point.

Project Performance: Nourishment Interval

Maximum Credit: 8 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(e) The anticipated physical performance of the proposed project, including the frequency of periodic planned nourishment.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(g) Project performance. Performance points shall be based upon the expected life of a project, as documented in a feasibility study for restoration projects and on the average nourishment interval for nourishment projects. Projects with a three-year nourishment interval shall receive 1 point, plus 1 point for every additional year of the expected or actual life with a ten-year or more nourishment interval receiving a maximum of 8 points.

Discussion

Project performance, or nourishment interval, is initially estimated in the feasibility study. Award of points for restoration projects will be based on this study

Once a project has been restored and subsequently nourished, an actual performance interval can be established. The award of points for nourishment projects will be based on this actual nourishment interval. If more than one nourishment has been constructed, then the nourishment interval will be the average of those intervals.

An interim beach nourishment event to repair a project impacted by a major storm event may not be used in calculating the nourishment interval if only storm losses were replaced.

Project Performance: Cost Per Mile Per Year

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(e) The anticipated physical performance of the proposed project, including the frequency of periodic planned nourishment.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1) (g) Projects with an average cost per mile per year below the average cost per mile per year of all projects requesting construction funding for a given year shall receive 2 points. Cost calculations, for the upcoming construction event, will include construction, associated project mitigation, and construction-related and first year post-construction monitoring costs.

Discussion

Projects entering the construction phase are eligible for points in this category. In order to address the cost effectiveness of a project as a component of project performance, a cost analysis will be conducted. To obtain a cost per mile per year, the cost of the project provided in the funding table of the application will be distributed over the length of the project, as defined in 62B-36.006(1)(l), F.A.C., and over the nourishment interval, as defined in 62B-36.006(1)(g). This value will be compared to all projects proposing construction for the given funding year to determine the average statewide. Those projects that cost below the statewide average will receive 2 points.

Mitigating Inlet Effects

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(f) The extent to which the proposed project mitigates the adverse impact of improved, modified, or altered inlets on adjacent beaches.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(h) Mitigation of inlet effects. Projects that implement strategies in the Strategic Beach Management Plan for supplemental nourishment to adjacent beaches needed to mitigate deficiencies in the annual sediment budget shall receive points based upon the percentage of the target average annual bypass volume to be achieved by the supplemental nourishment times 10 for a maximum total of 10 points.

Discussion

Beach projects eligible for these points must be located within the area of inlet influence and must provide supplemental nourishment to mitigate for an inlet that is not meeting the Department-approved bypassing objective. If the inlet is meeting or exceeding the Department-approved bypassing objective, then no points will be awarded.

The target annual bypassing volume is the volume of inlet sand bypassing needed to balance the sediment between the inlet and the adjacent beaches. The area of inlet influence and the target annual bypassing volume must be defined in an inlet management study or other Department-approved study.

Innovative Technologies

Maximum Credit: 3 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(g) Innovative, cost-effective, and environmentally sensitive applications to reduce erosion.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(i) Innovative technologies. Projects to address erosion that are economically competitive with nourishment, that will not adversely affect the conservation of fish and wildlife, including endangered or threatened species, or their habitats, and that are designed to demonstrate an innovative application of existing technologies shall receive 3 points;

Discussion

Projects permitted under Section 62B-41.0075, Florida Administrative Code for Experimental Coastal Construction that have not yet been implemented in Florida, will qualify for the award of points in this category. Any other proposed innovative technologies will be submitted for review before a committee of Division staff from permitting, engineering and project management programs. The committee decision to award or withhold points will be documented in the final project assessment.

Technologies New to Florida

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(g) Innovative, cost-effective, and environmentally sensitive applications to reduce erosion.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(i) Innovative technologies…Projects that have been documented to be effective and demonstrate technologies previously untried in the state shall receive 2 points.

Discussion

Projects permitted under Section 62B-41.0075, Florida Administrative Code for “Experimental Coastal Construction” that have not yet been implemented in Florida, will qualify for the award of points in this category. Any other proposed innovative technologies will be submitted for review before a committee of Division staff from permitting, engineering and project management programs. The committee decision to award or withhold points will be documented in the final project assessment.

Enhancing Nesting Sea Turtle Refuges

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(h) Projects that provide enhanced habitat within or adjacent to designated refuges of nesting sea turtles.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(j) Enhance nesting sea turtle refuges. Projects that are adjacent or within designated nesting sea turtle refuges shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Archie Carr National Wildlife Refuge is the only designated sea turtle refuge in the state at this time. Therefore only projects within or immediately adjacent to that particular refuge receive points.

Regionalization

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(i) The extent to which local or regional sponsors of beach erosion control projects agree to coordinate the planning, design, and construction of their projects to take advantage of identifiable cost savings.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(k) Regionalization. Projects where two or more local sponsors who manage their projects together to reduce contracting costs shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Points can be awarded in this category for two or more projects proposed by two or more local sponsors that are entering the same phase and can demonstrate significant anticipated cost savings through joint contracting. Cost savings must be documented. Points cannot be awarded until the Department is provided with an executed interlocal agreement between the local sponsors.

Significance: Project Length

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(j) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(l) Significance. Projects shall receive points based upon the project length at one point a mile, rounded to the nearest whole number, for a total maximum of 10 points.

Discussion

Points are awarded based on project length with the assumption that a longer contiguous project will protect more upland structures and habitat and will have a better project performance, i.e. longer nourishment interval.

The project length is the full length of the restoration within a designated critically eroded shoreline, including project tapers. Gaps can be included in the project length for the proposed nourishment if those gaps were filled during the original restoration but have been maintained to the original project design by beach nourishment of the adjacent project segments.

Local sponsors with multiple projects/project segments can combine those segments to produce a longer project length, if the construction phase for all segments is scheduled concurrently. Concurrent scheduling of non-contiguous project segments can also decrease overall projects costs by reducing mobilization/ demobilization costs for the combined project.

Significance: Construction Phase Projects

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(j) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(2) Significance. .Projects entering the construction phase will receive 1 point.

Discussion

Projects proposing to begin construction during the proposed funding year will receive one point.

Significance: Economic Impact

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(j) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(3) Significance... Projects with greater than 25 percent of the shoreline length designated as commercial, recreational, or public lodging establishment shall receive 1 point and projects with greater than 50 percent of the shoreline length designated as commercial, recreational, or public lodging establishment shall receive 2 points, for a total of 2 points.

Discussion

Using the calculation in Rule 62B-36.006(1)(c), projects will receive one point if the calculated value is greater than 25% of the total project length and two points if the value is greater than 50% of the total project length. The points recognize economic or recreational impact of the project.

Significance: Advanced Placement Loss

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(j) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(4) Significance. Projects where the volume of advanced nourishment lost since the last sand placement event of a beach restoration or nourishment project as measured landward of the Mean High Water Line, shall receive 1 point for every 20 percent of volume lost, for a maximum of 5 points.

Discussion

Advanced placement loss will be calculated using the most recent beach and hydrographic profile survey data, from either the most recent monitoring report or from a post storm survey. The percentage of material remaining in the project area above the mean high water line (MHWL) since the last restoration or full nourishment event will be calculated. Points will be awarded based on the volume lost from the placement event.

The baseline MHWL used for this calculation is defined by the immediate post-construction survey. The volume of advance nourishment lost from the beach project will not include emergency or interim fill placement.

Significance: Erosion into Design Profile

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(j) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(5) Significance. Projects where shoreline has eroded into the design profile shall receive 1 point.

Discussion

If the project has eroded into the design template, it will receive one point. Erosion can either be documented over the entire project length or in discreet areas of the project, i.e. “hot spots”.

Significance: Placement Volumes

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(j) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(6) Significance. Projects that place a greater volume/mile/year than the average volume/mile/year for all projects in their region (Florida east coast, Florida west coast, and Florida panhandle) requesting construction funding for a given year shall receive 1 point.

Discussion

In order to recognize geographic limitations on permitted placement volumes, projects proposing construction including nourishment will be divided into geographic regions. Within each region, the average fill volume for the proposed event will be calculated for each project proposing beach nourishment. Projects proposing to place a volume that is greater than the average within each region will receive one point.

Volume per mile is the estimated advanced nourishment volume to be placed at the time of construction for those segments of the project area to be nourished. The number of years used for the calculation will be the nourishment interval determined in the project performance criterion, pursuant to Rule (62B-36.006(1)(g)

Readiness to Proceed

Intent

Statute- 161(14) following (j) In the event that more than one project qualifies equally under the provisions of this subsection, the Department shall assign funding priority to those projects that are ready to proceed.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1) (m) In the event that more than one project receives the same number of points, the Department shall assign funding priority to that project most ready to initiate construction. Factors considered in the award of priority include project phase, construction schedule, the status of state and federal permits, acquisition of easements, securing of local and federal funding, construction bidding schedule, and establishment of an Erosion Control Line.

Discussion

Points are awarded in this category when all other ranking assessments have been completed in order to rectify any project ties in the ranking list. Readiness to Proceed is determined by Department staff based on the project phase, status of the permit, local funding source, federal funding if applicable, construction easements, and construction schedule for each project.

Overview of Inlet Ranking Criteria

Total Available Points: 90 Points

Intent

161.143(2) The Department shall establish annual funding priorities for studies, activities, or other projects concerning inlet management. Such inlet management projects include, but are not limited to, inlet sand bypassing, modifications to channel dredging, jetty redesign, jetty repair, disposal of spoil material, and the development, revision, adoption, or implementation of an inlet management plan. The funding priorities established by the Department must be consistent with the requirements and legislative declaration in ss. 161.101(14), 161.142, and 161.161(1)(b). In establishing funding priorities under this subsection and before transmitting the annual inlet project list to the Legislature under subsection (5), the Department shall seek formal input from local coastal governments, beach and general government associations and other coastal interest groups, and university experts concerning annual funding priorities for inlet management projects. In order to maximize the benefits of efforts to address the inlet-caused beach erosion problems of this state, the ranking criteria used by the Department to establish funding priorities for studies, activities, or other projects concerning inlet management must include consideration of:: …

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2): Inlet Management Projects. Local sponsors requesting funding for inlet management projects for the upcoming fiscal year will be ranked in priority order for the Department's Local Government Funding Request. Eligible projects will be assigned a total point score by the Department based on the following criteria:
:

Specific Authority

161.101, 161.161 FS. Law Implemented 161.088, 161.091, 161.101, 161.142, 161.143, 161.161 FS. History–New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.06, 16B-36.006, Amended 12-25-03 and submitted for certification and second amendment on 07-08-2013.

Sand Reaching the Inlet

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(a) An estimate of the annual quantity of beach-quality sand reaching the updrift boundary of the improved jetty or inlet channel.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2) (a). Estimated annual quantity of beach quality sand reaching the updrift boundary of the improved jetty or inlet channel, quantified at the rate of one point per 20,000 cubic yards per year, for a total maximum of 10 points.

Discussion

Points will be calculated based on the volume of sediment reaching the inlet as determined by an inlet management study, design study, or other Department-approved study.

Balancing the Sediment Budget

Maximum Credit: 20 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)
(b) The severity of the erosion to the adjacent beaches caused by the inlet and the extent to which the proposed project mitigates the erosive effects of the inlet.
(c) The overall significance and anticipated success of the proposed project in balancing the sediment budget of the inlet and adjacent beaches and addressing the sand deficit along the inlet-affected shorelines.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2) (b). Balancing the sediment budget. Annual average bypassing volume to be placed on the adjacent eroding shorelines divided by the annual bypassing objective as determined by the Inlet Management Plan or Department approved study times 20 for a maximum of 20 points.

Discussion

The two concepts in the statute listed above were combined into one ranking criterion, since the severity of erosion, or rate of material lost from the adjacent shorelines, may be defined as a component of the sediment budget. The sediment budget and the target annual bypass volume must be defined in an inlet management study, design study, or other Department approved study.

Ranking points will be calculated based on the percentage of the target annual bypass volume that is met through actual bypassing activities on an annually averaged basis, using material either from within the inlet system or from supplemental sources. The annual average will be calculated using bypass records since the date that the bypass objective was established.

If no inlet study has been completed which defines the area of inlet influence, the volume of sand reaching the updrift boundary of the inlet, the sediment budget and the target bypassing volume, then the local sponsor should first propose to conduct an inlet management study, which will be ranked based on criteria pursuant to Rule 62B-36.006(2)(i).

Cost Effectiveness

Maximum Credit: 10 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(d) The extent to which existing bypassing activities at an inlet would benefit from modest, cost-effective improvements when considering the volumetric increases from the proposed project, the availability of beach-quality sand currently not being bypassed to adjacent eroding beaches, and the ease with which such beach-quality sand may be obtained.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(c) Cost effective alternatives. The proposed annualized increase in bypassing of material from within the inlet system divided by the unmet annual bypassing objective times 10, for a maximum of 10 points. The unmet annual bypassing objective is equal to the annual bypassing objective less the current annualized bypassing volume using material from within the inlet system.

Discussion

For this criterion, it is assumed that the project will be more cost effective in the long term if sand can be used from within the inlet system for achieving the target annual bypass volume (bypassing objective). Therefore, points are awarded for proposed alternatives to identify and use material within the inlet system instead of using alternative sand sources, including offshore borrow areas and upland mined sand.

To calculate the ranking points, the volume of material bypassed from within the system will be subtracted from the target annual bypass volume to determine the unmet bypassing volume. Then, the proposed bypass volume increase, using material from within the inlet system, will be divided by the unmet target annual bypass volume and multiplied by 10.

If no inlet study has been completed which defines the area of inlet influence, the volume of sand reaching the updrift boundary of the inlet, the sediment budget and the target bypassing volume, then the local sponsor should first propose to conduct an inlet management study, which will be ranked based on criteria pursuant to Rule 62B-36.006(2)(i).

10-Year Comprehensive Financial Plan

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(d) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. Local sponsors who have a designated long term funding source for the management of a beach project as defined in a 10-year comprehensive financial plan shall receive 2 points.

Discussion

Funding for inlet management must be a documented line item in the local sponsor's 10-year comprehensive financial plan.

Designated Funding Source

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(d) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. Local sponsors who provide funding for the beach project via a funding source established by referendum or legislative authority will receive 2 points.

Discussion

Long term designated funding sources that are established by referendum or a specific taxing district receives 2 points. Examples include Municipal Service Benefit Units, Municipal Service Taxing Unit, Tourist Development Council taxes (bed taxes), a dedicated portion of local sales tax, inlet district taxes, or other assessments specifically dedicated to beach management. Voter referendum indicates community-wide support for the project and long term funding source to maintain the project. Line items in an annual capital improvement budget do not qualify due to the susceptibility to budget changes based on annually fluctuating priorities.

Development of a local designated long term funding source is eligible for cost-sharing under the feasibility funding category.

Third Party Funding

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(d) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. Local sponsors who provide additional funding from a third party, other than the federal government, shall receive 1 point for a 10 percent reduction or 2 points for a 25 percent reduction of the non-federal share obtained from a third party, for up to 2 points.

Discussion

Projects that have secured a third party funding source to reduce the state and local cost shares can be awarded points for this criterion. Funding contributions must be documented in a cost sharing agreement or other appropriate document, and a copy must be provided in the funding request application. Funding sources can include grants, donations, or financial support from other governmental entities or special interest groups. The funding threshold of 10% of total project costs must be met or exceeded to receive one ranking point and the threshold of 25% of total project costs must be met or exceeded to receive two ranking points.

Quarterly Reporting Requirements

Maximum Credit: 2 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(d) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. Local sponsors with a 100 percent compliance record for submitting quarterly reports correctly and on time over the previous state fiscal year shall receive 2 points.

Discussion

Quarterly reports are due 30 days following the end of the fiscal quarter. Fiscal quarters are defined as ending March 31, June 30, Sept 30, and December 31. Reports should be submitted even if no work has been completed for the project and no requests for reimbursements are submitted to the Department. This is a contract requirement and will be a future requirement for processing of all reimbursement requests.

Local sponsors without a current contract may voluntarily submit quarterly reports and receive the award of points in this category.

Active Permits

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(d) Local sponsor financial and administrative commitment. Local sponsors who hold active state and federal permits for the proposed project will receive 1 point.

Discussion

Active federal and state permits are both required for the proposed project activity for the award of one point in this category.

Interlocal Agreement for Inlet Management

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(d) local sponsors who have entered into an interlocal agreement with regional partners for the purpose of joint inlet management will receive 1 point.

Discussion

Often inlets are bound by several governing authorities with competing interests. Project will receive 1 point if an interlocal agreement has been executed between all interested parties, defining the management strategies acceptable to the Department.

Previous Cost Sharing in Feasibility or Design

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(e) Previous state commitment. Projects where the Department has previously cost shared, reviewed, and approved a feasibility or design phase shall receive 1 point.

Discussion

One point is awarded if the Department has previously executed a cost sharing agreement with the local sponsor using program funds to conduct a feasibility or design study and that study has been completed and approved by the Department.

Enhanced Longevity

Maximum Credit: 3 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(e) Previous state commitment ……projects to enhance, or increase the longevity of a previously constructed project within the area of inlet influence shall receive 3 points.

Discussion

Points can be awarded in this category for inlet projects that propose a structural alternative, project design or maintenance practice to improve the nourishment interval of the beach project located within the area of inlet influence. A project design analysis must be submitted to demonstrate with reasonable assurance the anticipated increase in nourishment interval.

Previously Restored Shoreline

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(e) Previous state commitment ……and projects that will nourish a previously restored shoreline shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Points are awarded in this category when a beach restoration project has been constructed within the area of inlet influence.

Release of Appropriation

Maximum Credit: 1 Point

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The interest and commitment of local governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet management project and their financial plan for funding the local cost-share for initial construction, ongoing sand bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(e) Previous state commitment. Projects where previously approved appropriations for a project phase could not be encumbered and were released in their entirety by the local sponsor due to the project timelines shall receive 1 point.

Discussion

If a local sponsor determines that the project schedule has been delayed and wishes to release a previous fiscal year appropriation in its entirety, that project will be awarded one point.

Existing Inlet Management Plan

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143 (2)(f) The previous completion or approval of a state-sponsored inlet management plan or local-government-sponsored inlet study concerning the inlet addressed by the proposed project, the ease of updating and revising any such plan or study, and the adequacy and specificity of the plan's or study's recommendations concerning the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(f)(1)… Proposed projects that have an existing Inlet Management Plan or completed Inlet Management Study accepted by the Department that defines the sediment budget, quantifies the volumetric bypassing objective and contains specific management strategies shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Inlets with an adopted Inlet Management Plan or inlet management strategies adopted into the Strategic Beach Management Plan will receive five points.

Updated Inlet Management Plan

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143 (2)(f) The previous completion or approval of a state-sponsored inlet management plan or local-government-sponsored inlet study concerning the inlet addressed by the proposed project, the ease of updating and revising any such plan or study, and the adequacy and specificity of the plan's or study's recommendations concerning the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(f)(2). …Projects where the Department has received and approved an update to an existing Inlet Management Plan in the form of a current inlet management study/sediment budget analysis within the previous 10 years or proposes to conduct an update to an existing inlet management plan shall receive an additional 5 points…

Discussion

Most inlet management plans were adopted in the late 1990's and early 2000's. Regular updates are beneficial to ensure that sediment budgets are accurate and that inlet bypass targets and placement areas for bypass material are optimized.

New Inlet Management Plan

Maximum Credit: 15 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143 (2)(f) The previous completion or approval of a state-sponsored inlet management plan or local-government-sponsored inlet study concerning the inlet addressed by the proposed project, the ease of updating and revising any such plan or study, and the adequacy and specificity of the plan's or study's recommendations concerning the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(f)(3)… Projects proposing to develop a new inlet management study to be submitted to the Department for adoption of an Inlet Management Plan shall receive 15 points.

Discussion

If no inlet management plan has been previously approved and adopted by the Department, the project can receive 15 points to propose a new study. The point award is designed to give incentive to management authorities that have yet to complete an inlet management study.

Enhanced Project Performance

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143 (2)(g) The degree to which the proposed project will enhance the performance and longevity of proximate beach nourishment projects, thereby reducing the frequency of such periodic nourishment projects.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(g) Enhanced project performance. The increased nourishment interval shall be estimated by the annual bypassing volume divided by the annual beach nourishment volume needed by a beach project within the area of inlet influence multiplied by 5 for a total of 5 points.

Discussion

Ranking points are calculated by dividing the proposed increase in the annually-averaged bypass volume by the annually-averaged volume of material required by the beach nourishment project located within the area of inlet influence (placement volume divided by nourishment interval). The value is then multiplied by 5 to determine point award.

The annual beach nourishment volume may be the sum of the advanced nourishment template plus the volume that was anticipated to be placed through inlet bypassing activities used in the design of the original restoration project.

If no inlet study has been completed which defines the area of inlet influence, the volume of sand reaching the updrift boundary of the inlet, the sediment budget and the target bypassing volume, then the local sponsor should first propose to conduct an inlet management study, which will be ranked based on criteria pursuant to program rule 62B-36.006(2)(i).

Congressional Authorization of Project Phase

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1) d) Availability of federal funds. Projects with United States Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Congressional authorization for the requested project phase shall receive 5 points.

Discussion

Projects that have been authorized by U.S. Congress for a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers project for the proposed project phase receive 5 points. Projects pursuing state funding for subsequent phases of the project will require federal authorization for each specific phase, prior to being awarded points for those subsequent phases.

USACE Project Agreement

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(d) Availability of federal funds. …
Projects with a current United States Army Corps of Engineers project agreement executed for the requested project phase or projects listed in a United States Army Corps of Engineers work plan or current federal budget document shall receive 5 points. …

Discussion

Receipt of an executed project participation agreement for the project phase, or inclusion in the work plan or budget, indicates that federal funding is either secured or is likely to be appropriated for the funding year.

Availability of FEMA Funding

Maximum Credit: 5 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.101(14)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(1)(d) Availability of federal funds….
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) nourishment projects (Category G or equivalent subsequent program for designed, constructed and routinely maintained beaches) with approved Project Worksheets shall receive 5 points…

Discussion

Projects that have been approved by the FEMA for funding to address storm damage repairs to previously designed, constructed and routinely maintained beaches are eligible to receive points in this category. Projects must have obtained signed Project Worksheets guaranteeing that federal reimbursement funding is available for the project.

Inlet Management Studies

Total Available Points: 55 Points

Intent

Statute- 161.143 (2)(h) The project-ranking criteria in s. 161.101(14) to the extent such criteria are applicable to inlet management studies, projects, and activities.

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2)(i) Inlet Management studies will be ranked using only the criteria listed in (a), (d), (e), (f), and (h). Ranking of inlet management studies will be a normalization based on the total point value of the above referenced criteria.

Discussion

Since several ranking criteria cannot be assessed until an inlet management study has been completed, proposed inlet management studies must be ranked using a subset of criteria and with the scores normalized.