Beach Management Funding Assistance Program

2020 Mid-Town Beach Nourishment – Palm Beach County
Photo credit: Robert Weber, Town of Palm Beach

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

Updated to include 2020 amendments to Chapter 62B-36, Florida Administrative Code.
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.

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 Office of Resilience and Coastal Protection 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 Beach Management Funding Assistance 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, and 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 Sections 161.101, 161.143, and 161.161, 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 the ranking criterion 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 2020 adoption of revisions designed primarily to address statutory changes to Chapter 161 regarding beach and 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 related Inlet Management Plan(s) 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 analyses 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

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 for the upcoming fiscal year will be ranked in priority order for the Department's Local Government Funding Request. Eligible projects will receive a total point score by the Department based on the following criteria:

Specific Authority

161.101, 161.161, F.S. Law Implemented 161.088, 161.091, 161.101, 161.142, 161.143, 161.161, F.S. History–New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.06, 16B-36.006, Amended 12-25-03, 08-05-2013, and 08-26-2020.

Total available points: 100

Table 1. Overview of Beach Ranking Criteria

Tier	Criteria name	Percent of total	Metric name	Points
1	Tourism-related impacts	20	Return on investment	10
			Economic impact	10
2	Federal involvement	15	Federal authorization	5
			Federal cost share	5
			Federal funds available	5
	Storm damage reduction benefits	15	Current conditions	8
			Threat to upland development	2
			Value of upland property	5
	Cost-effectiveness	15	Cost/volume/mile/year	10
			Enhanced longevity, dune addition, innovative technology, and regionalization	5
3	Previous state commitment	5	Previously funded phases	1
			Total amount of previous funding	3
			Previous partial appropriation	1
	Recreational benefits	5	Accessible beach area	2
			Recreational benefits	3
	Mitigation of inlets	5	Mitigation of inlet effects	5
	Sand placement volumes	5	Volume/mile/year	5
4	Successive unfunded requests	5	Successive requests	5
	Environmental habitat enhancement	5	Environmental habitat enhancement	5
	Overall readiness to proceed	5	Readiness to construct	1
			Active permits	1
			Easements acquired	1
			Local funds secured	1
			Erosion Control Line established	1
Total points				**100**

Tourism-related impacts: Return on investment

Intent
Statute- 161.101(14)(a)(1) Tier 1 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of the tourism-related return on investment and the economic impact of the project. The return on investment of the project is the ratio of the tourism-related tax revenues for the most recent year to the amount of state funding requested for the proposed project. The economic impact of the project is the ratio of the tourism-related tax revenues for the most recent year to all county tax revenues for the most recent year. The department must calculate these ratios using state sales tax and tourism development tax data of the county having jurisdiction over the project area. If multiple counties have jurisdiction over the project area, the department must assess each county individually using these ratios. The department shall calculate the mean average of these ratios to determine the final overall assessment for the multicounty project

Rule
Return on investment. The ratio of the sum of the county-wide tourist development tax and tourism-related sales tax revenue for the most recent calendar year to the amount of state funding requested for the proposed construction project. Tourist development tax and tourism-related sales tax data from the Department of Revenue for the county that has jurisdiction over the project area. Tourism-related sales tax revenue is defined as taxes on hotel/motel accommodations, rooming houses, camps, and other lodging places. The calculation includes the amount of state funds requested for the construction and first year post-construction monitoring phases of the project. If the proposed project does not request construction funds, then the project is not eligible for points. The rank score shall be calculated using the ratios of all projects, for a maximum score of 10 points, with greater return on investment ratios receiving a higher score.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. County-wide tourist development tax and tourism-related sales tax revenue data for the most recently-completed calendar year. The Department will obtain the tax data from the Department of Revenue (DOR) website (link below) and calculate the Return on Investment value.

https://floridarevenue.com/taxes/pages/colls_from_7_2003.aspx

To obtain the tourist development tax data: The third tab on the DOR website is titled “Local Tax Receipts” and is where the Form 3 dataset is housed. Form 3 provides the Tourist Development Tax data by county and by month.

To obtain the tourism-related sales tax data: The first tab on the DOR website is titled “Florida Sales Tax Receipts” and is where the Form 10 dataset is housed. Form 10 provides the sales tax collections by county, month, and sales tax type. Code 39 is defined as taxes on hotel/motel accommodations, rooming houses, camps, and other lodging places. Code 39 taxes are added to the tourist development taxes.

If the project is managed by two or more counties, then the tax data will be calculated for each county and the average of all counties will be used to determine the score.

The construction costs include the first year post-construction monitoring and associated mitigation costs. Project funding requests for the post-construction monitoring phase do not retain these points.

Maximum points: 10

Tourism-related impacts: Economic impact

Intent
Statute- 161.101(14)(a)(2) Tier 1 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of the tourism-related return on investment and the economic impact of the project. The return on investment of the project is the ratio of the tourism-related tax revenues for the most recent year to the amount of state funding requested for the proposed project. The economic impact of the project is the ratio of the tourism-related tax revenues for the most recent year to all county tax revenues for the most recent year. The department must calculate these ratios using state sales tax and tourism development tax data of the county having jurisdiction over the project area. If multiple counties have jurisdiction over the project area, the department must assess each county individually using these ratios. The department shall calculate the mean average of these ratios to determine the final overall assessment for the multicounty project.

Rule
Economic impact. The ratio of the sum of the county-wide tourist development tax and tourism-related sales tax revenue for the most recent calendar year to all county-wide sales tax revenues for the most recent calendar year. Tax data from the Department of Revenue for the county that has jurisdiction over the project area. Tourism-related sales tax revenue is defined as the taxes on hotel/motel accommodations, rooming houses, camps, and other lodging places. The rank score shall be calculated using the ratios of all projects, for a maximum score of 10 points, with greater economic impact ratios receiving a higher score.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. County-wide tourist development tax and tourism-related sales tax revenue data for the most recently-completed calendar year. The Department will obtain the tax data from the Department of Revenue (DOR) website (link below) and calculate the Economic Impact value.

https://floridarevenue.com/taxes/pages/colls_from_7_2003.aspx

To obtain the tourist development tax data: The third tab on the DOR website is titled “Local Tax Receipts” and is where the Form 3 dataset is housed. Form 3 provides the Tourist Development Tax data by county and by month.

To obtain the tourism-related and all sales tax data: The first tab on the DOR website is titled “Florida Sales Tax Receipts” and is where the Form 9 and 10 datasets are housed. Form 9 provides the all sales tax collections by county and by month. Form 10 provides the sales tax collections by county, month, and sales tax type. Code 39 is defined as taxes on hotel/motel accommodations, rooming houses, camps, and other lodging places. Code 39 taxes are added to the tourist development taxes.

If the project is managed by two or more counties, then the tax data will be calculated for each county and the average of all counties will be used to determine the score.

Maximum points: 10

Federal involvement: Federal authorization

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(1)(a) The availability of federal matching dollars, considering federal authorization…

Rule
Federal authorization. Projects with a United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Civil Works congressional authorization for the requested project phase shall receive five points. Projects with a signed USACE Chief's report for authorization of the requested project phase shall receive three points.

Discussion
Projects must submit a Civil Works Congressional authorization or a signed USACE Chief's report for the proposed project phase(s) by the application deadline for the award of 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.

Maximum points: 5

Federal involvement: Federal cost share

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(1)(b) The availability of federal matching dollars, considering…the federal cost-share percentage…

Rule
Federal cost share. Projects with a federal cost share percentage by the USACE for the proposed project phase(s). The federal cost share percentage for each project shall be divided by the highest cost share percentage of all projects, and multiplied by five, for a maximum score of five points. Federal cost share percentages from the Flood Control and Coastal Emergency funds or Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds are not included.

Discussion
Federal cost share percentage by the USACE only. Documentation to verify cost share percentage must be received by the application deadline for the award of points.

Maximum points: 5

Federal involvement: Federal funds available

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(1)(c) The availability of federal matching dollars, considering…the status of the funding award.

Rule
Federal funds available. Projects with a current USACE project agreement executed for the requested project phase, projects listed in a USACE work plan, or FEMA projects with an approved Project Worksheet shall receive five points. Projects that are included in the Congressional Appropriations Act shall receive two points.

Discussion
Projects with FCCE funds may be included in a USACE work plan or appropriated separately from the Stafford Act for emergencies (Public Law 84-99). Documentation must be received by the application deadline for the award of points.

Maximum points: 5

Storm damage reduction benefits: Current conditions

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(2)(a) The storm damage reduction benefits of the project based on the following considerations: a. The current conditions of the project area, including any recent storm damage impacts, as a percentage of volume of sand lost since the most recent beach nourishment event or most recent beach surveys. If the project area has not been previously restored, the department must use the historical erosion rate.

Rule
Current conditions. Projects where the volume of advanced nourishment lost since the most recent beach nourishment, as measured above the mean high water elevation, shall receive a score equal to the following: $-\log(1-L)\ x\ 8$, where L = the fraction of advance fill loss, for a maximum score of eight points. If the project area has not been restored, the Department will use historical mean high water data files contained in the Department's Historic Shoreline Database to calculate the average rate of erosion during a representative period after 1972, but prior to any beach fill placement in the project area. Projects shall receive four points for one foot-per-year of erosion and one point for each additional half-foot of annual erosion up to a maximum score of eight points.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. Advance placement loss will be calculated using the pre-construction and post-construction surveys to determine the volume of advance nourishment, and the most recent beach survey available to determine the volume loss, which may be inclusive of any storm erosion losses and emergency beach fill placement to repair storm damage impacts.

Examples: Advance fill loss = 60%, -log(1-0.6) x 8 = 3.2 points
Advance fill loss = 80%, -log(1-0.8) x 8 = 5.6 points
Advance fill loss = 90%, -log(1-0.9) x 8 = 8.0 points

Linear least square fit to the data will be used to determine the trend of shoreline erosion/accretion. For those project areas where inadequate data prevents the calculation of an average shoreline change rate, then the rate may be obtained from a published study document used in the design of the project. Maintenance of dune-only restoration projects will be awarded points based upon percentage of volume of sand lost since the most recent nourishment.

Maximum points: 8

Storm damage reduction benefits: Threat to upland development

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(2)(b) The storm damage reduction benefits of the project based on the following considerations: b. the overall potential threat to existing upland development, including public and private structures and infrastructure, based on the percentage of vulnerable shoreline that exists within the project boundaries;

Rule
Threat to upland development. Projects where existing upland development is at or seaward of the projected erosion limit of a 25-year return interval storm event shall receive points based on the percentage of threatened properties within the project boundaries, multiplied by 10, for a maximum score of two points. Upland development on properties where the mean high water shoreline is seaward of the project design template, or where coastal armoring exists on a property, shall not be deemed threatened.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. The length of the shoreline containing a major habitable or major non-habitable structure at or seaward of the erosion limit of a 25-year return interval storm event shall be measured from one shore normal property line to the other shore normal property line. The Department will determine the threat to upland development by application of the Dean CCCLa, SBEACH (Storm-induced BEAch CHange Model) or comparable numeric model using a 25-year return interval storm on the most recent beach-offshore profile data at each R-monument in the project area. The Department may use the results of an alternative storm 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 and other information available to the Department will be used to determine the presence of structures and armoring seaward of the erosion limits.

Maximum points: 2

Storm damage reduction benefits: Value of upland property

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(2)(c) The value of upland property benefiting from the protection provided by the project and its subsequent maintenance. A property must be within one-quarter mile of the project boundaries to be considered under the criterion specified in this sub-subparagraph.

Rule
Value of upland property. The total value of all upland properties within one-quarter mile landward of the project's Erosion Control Line (ECL) or, if not available, the Mean High Water Line (MHWL), or a proposed project boundary alternative. The values of properties that are enclosed or intersected by the one-quarter mile buffer shall be retrieved from the Department of Revenue's most current statewide database and the total value will be calculated in ArcGIS. Property values to be used are established by the property appraiser for ad valorem purposes (i.e., market value). The rank score shall be calculated using the total values of all projects, for a maximum score of five points, with greater total property value receiving a higher score.

Discussion
A project map and supporting documents will be provided by the local sponsor and verified by the Department's GIS staff. The property values of all properties within one-quarter mile of the project's ECL, or if not available, the MHWL or other proposed project boundary, shall be identified in ArcGIS and summed. The MHWL may be from a MHWL survey or estimated from beach profile data. Property values for ad valorem purposes (i.e., market value) are identified as 'Just Value' or 'JV' in the Department of Revenue's statewide property appraisers cadastral map data, which is produced annually and found at the link below. At the bottom of the page, select "Download Current Assessment Roll and GIS Data" to access the tax roll data files and ArcGIS shapefiles.

https://floridarevenue.com/property/Pages/DataPortal_RequestAssessmentRollGISData.aspx

To ensure consistency among applicants, the Department will specify in the current LGFR application form the most recently-verified dataset to use for this calculation.

A quarter-mile buffer from the project's ECL or MHWL will be identified using the buffer geoprocessing tool in ArcGIS, with specified options of a flat end type and geodesic method. The clip geoprocessing tool in ArcGIS will be used to identify the properties enclosed or intersected by the one-quarter mile buffer; the cadastral map shall be the input feature and the buffer created above shall be the 'clip feature' for this function. The output feature class table produced by the clip tool represents all properties within the one-quarter mile buffer. To calculate the total value of upland properties for this metric, all values in the 'Just Value' column of the table produced by the clip tool shall be summed.

Maximum points: 5

Cost Effectiveness: Cost per volume per mile per year

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(3)(a) The cost-effectiveness of the project based on the yearly cost per volume per mile of proposed beach fill placement.

Rule
Cost-effectiveness as a function of cost per volume per mile per year. Cost calculations for the proposed construction event will include the construction phase costs of beach restoration or beach nourishment. Associated project mitigation and post-construction monitoring costs will not be included. The rank score shall be calculated using the costs for all projects requesting construction funds for the current funding year, for a maximum score of 10 points, with lower costs receiving a higher score.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. The construction cost of the project for the proposed funding year may include contractor services, contract management, construction oversight, and construction-related monitoring required by permit or contract. Volume is defined as the estimated volume to be placed at the time of construction as proposed in the funding application and based upon the project design and physical monitoring reports. The nourishment interval for restoration projects will be based on a feasibility study or design document. Once a project has been restored and subsequently nourished, the actual nourishment interval will be used for calculations. 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. The entire authorized design project length as described in the Strategic Beach Management Plan will be used in the calculation.

Maximum points: 10

Cost-effectiveness: Enhanced longevity; dune addition; and innovative technology; and regionalization

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(b)(3) The cost-effectiveness of the project based on the yearly cost per volume per mile of proposed beach fill placement. The department shall also consider the following when assessing cost-effectiveness pursuant to this subparagraph:
a. The existence of projects with proposed structural or design components that could extend the beach nourishment interval; b. Existing beach nourishment projects that reduce upland storm damage costs by incorporating new or enhanced dune structures or new or existing dune restoration and revegetation projects; c. Proposed innovative technologies designed to reduce project costs; and d. Regional sediment management strategies and coordination to conserve sand source resources and reduce project costs.

Rule
Cost-effectiveness as a function of enhanced longevity; dune addition; innovative technology; and regionalization. Projects that have one of the following shall receive three points and projects that have two or more of the following shall receive five points: 1. propose structural or design components that could extend the beach nourishment interval; 2. incorporate new or enhanced dune structures or new or existing dune restoration and revegetation projects that reduce upland storm damage costs; 3. propose innovative technologies designed to reduce project costs; or 4. two or more local sponsors manage their projects together to conserve sand resources or reduce contracting cost, or projects that propose regional sediment management strategies and coordinate to conserve sand source resources and reduce project costs for scheduled beach nourishment purposes. Projects permitted under Rule 62B-41.0075, F.A.C., for Experimental Coastal Construction will qualify for innovative technology points.

Discussion
Extend the beach nourishment interval: A project design analysis must be submitted to demonstrate with reasonable assurance the anticipated increase in nourishment interval. Proposed structural or design components are erosion control structures that generally include conventional breakwaters and groins. Changing the alongshore distribution of fill volume may address localized segments of accelerated beach erosion, but it does not materially extend the beach nourishment interval. Stockpiling fill material for subsequent distribution within the project area is considered a management practice.

Dunes: An existing beach nourishment project that is re-designed to incorporate a new or enhanced dune feature will be eligible for points under this metric. A new or existing dune restoration and revegetation projects will be eligible for points under this metric.

Innovative technologies: Projects permitted under Rule 62B-41.0075, F.A.C., 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 Department staff from permitting, engineering, and project management programs. The committee decision to award or withhold points will be documented in the final project assessment.

Regionalization and regional sediment management strategies: "Regional sediment management" is not defined in existing statute or rule, but regional coordination and approaches to beach management are referenced in several subsections of Chapter 161, F.S., and were not revised by the 2019 statutory amendments. Consequently, regional sediment management (RSM) expands the strategies that could be implemented as a regional approach to beach management, at least with regards to ranking project funding requests.

Although RSM is not defined in statute or rule, it has a commonly understood meaning from the USACE. Broadly speaking, RSM refers to the optimum use of various sediment resources in an environmentally-effective and economically-feasible manner. Specific to beach management activities, it refers to the beneficial use of navigation maintenance dredged material as a sand source for dune restoration and beach nourishment.

Certain provisions of Florida Statutes and policies prevent assumption of the USACE definition of RSM for use in the state's beach management program without some qualifications and exclusions. In particular, navigation construction, operation, and maintenance activities, except those elements whose purpose is to place or keep sand on adjacent beaches, are ineligible for state cost sharing, pursuant to 161.101(13)(i), F.S.

When non-federal inlet navigation channels or shoals are dredged and the material is placed on the adjacent beaches, then the work may be an inlet management or a beach management activity even when safe navigation through the inlet is an incidental benefit of the work. If the timing and volume of the dredging and beach placement is determined by the need to meet the inlet sand bypassing objective, then the activity is inlet management and ranked with the funding requests for inlet projects.

If the timing of the dredging and beach placement is determined by the need to maintain a beach management project on the adjacent beaches (i.e., "place or keep sand on the adjacent beaches"), then the activity is beach management and ranked with the funding requests for beaches. Such an activity would also qualify as regional sediment management if the timing of the inlet dredging and beach placement coincided with or supplemented other sand sources to construct the full replenishment of the project's advance nourishment.

Other regional approaches may qualify for points under this metric. Points can also 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 conservation of sand resources or significant anticipated cost savings through joint contracting.

Maximum points: 5

Previous state commitment: Previously funded phases

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(1)(a) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering previously funded phases … for the proposed project.

Rule
Previously funded phases. Projects where the Department has previously cost shared, reviewed, and approved a feasibility or design phase shall receive one point.

Discussion
Projects are eligible for points 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.

Maximum points: 1

Previous state commitment: Total amount of previous funding

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(1)(b) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering … the total amount of previous state funding … for the proposed project.

Rule
Total amount of previous funding. The total amount of state funding appropriated for projects from the Department's Beach Management Funding Assistance Program through annual legislative and hurricane appropriations shall be summed for the previous 10 years. The rank score shall be calculated using the total amounts for all projects, for a maximum score of three points, with greater amounts of previous funding receiving a higher score.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. The total amount of state funding includes funding received through annual legislative appropriations, legislative hurricane appropriations, and legislative funds reallocated to projects on the ranked LGFR list that were remaining from appropriated projects. Special legislative appropriations, special hurricane appropriations, and similar appropriations from outside the standard LGFR process will not be included.

Maximum points: 3

Previous state commitment: Previous partial appropriation

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(1)(c) Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering … previous partial appropriations for the proposed project.

Rule
Previous partial appropriation. Projects that have received a partial appropriation for the proposed project phase(s) within three years of completion shall receive one point.

Discussion
Only projects that have received an appropriation that did not fully cover their legislative request for a specific project phase will be eligible for this point. The funds must be requested for the same phase(s) of work as the initial request that was partially funded. Only funds from annual legislative appropriations are eligible. Funds from special legislative appropriations, special hurricane appropriations, and similar appropriations from outside the standard LGFR process are not eligible.

Maximum points: 1

Recreational benefits: Accessible beach area

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(2)(a) The recreational benefits of the project based on: a. The accessible beach area added by the project; and ...

Rule
Accessible beach area. The accessible beach area (square feet) added or maintained by the project shall be defined as the alongshore length and cross-shore width, which are bound by the ECL along the landward edge and the MHWL contour along the seaward edge of the design profile. If the project does not incorporate a design profile, then the cross-shore width of accessible beach area shall be bound by the ECL along the landward edge and the historic pre-construction MHWL contour along the seaward edge. If an ECL does not exist, the pre-project MHWL used in the engineering and design of the beach restoration will be used as an alternative. Project area shall be divided by the average for all projects in their region (Gulf coast or Atlantic coast), multiplied by two, for a maximum score of two points.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. If a project design has not been determined in a feasibility study or design document accepted by the Department for the Strategic Beach Management Plan, then points cannot be awarded for this metric. Projects that do not propose to add accessible beach area, such as dune restoration or a backshore berm above the pre-project MHWL, are not eligible for points. For projects that do not incorporate a design profile, the surveys conducted under the project's physical monitoring plan will be used to derive the pre-construction MHWL contour as the seaward edge of the accessible beach area.

Accessible beach area added by the project is calculated using GIS-based mapping tools and by using the mean for all projects in each region. The Atlantic coast region includes projects along the Straits of Florida.

Maximum points: 2

Recreational benefits

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(2)(b) The recreational benefits of the project based on: b. The percentage of linear footage within the project boundaries which is zoned: (I) As recreational or open space; (II) For commercial use; or (III) To otherwise allow for public lodging establishments.

Rule
Recreational benefits. The percentage of linear footage of property within the total project boundary that is zoned as recreational or open space, for commercial use, or to allow for public lodging establishment, or the equivalent, in the current local government land use map. Only properties fronting the project shoreline will be considered. 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(15), F.A.C. The percentage shall be multiplied by three, for a maximum score of three points.

Discussion
Shoreline length within the project boundaries currently designated “recreational”, “open space”, “commercial” or “hotel, motel, and vacation rental condominium” is calculated using GIS-based mapping tools. The recreational/open space/commercial/lodging shoreline is then calculated as a percentage of the total project length, as determined by a Department-approved feasibility study.

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 recreational, open space, commercial, or public lodging use will increase points in this category.

Maximum points: 3

Mitigation of inlet effects

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(3) The extent to which the project mitigates the adverse impact of improved, modified, or altered inlets on adjacent beaches.

Rule
The extent to which the project mitigates the adverse impact of improved, modified, or altered inlets on adjacent beaches: Projects that provide supplemental nourishment to adjacent beaches needed to mitigate deficiencies in the annual target inlet sand bypassing quantity supplied by inlet management activities shall receive points based on the percent of the target quantity to be achieved by the supplemental nourishment, multiplied by five, for a maximum score of five points.

Discussion
Criteria is calculated by the Department. The beach projects eligible for these points must be located within the area of inlet influence and must provide supplemental nourishment to mitigate for inlet sand bypassing that is not meeting the Department-approved target inlet sand bypassing quantity. If inlet management is meeting or exceeding the Department-approved bypassing quantity, then no points will be awarded.

The target annual bypassing volume is the volume of inlet sand bypassing needed to mitigate the erosive impact of the inlet by balancing the sediment budget between the inlet and the adjacent beaches. The area of inlet influence and the target annual bypassing volume must be defined in an adopted Inlet Management Plan or other Department-approved study.

Maximum points: 5

Sand placement volumes

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(c)(4) The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems as a function of the linear footage of the project shoreline and the cubic yards of sand placed per mile per year.

Rule
The degree to which the project addresses the state's most significant beach erosion problems as a function of the linear footage of the project shoreline and the cubic yards of sand placed per mile per year: The volume per mile per year for projects requesting construction funds in a given year shall be compared by project region (Gulf coast or Atlantic coast). The calculation includes the volume of sand placement for the proposed project, the project length, and nourishment interval. The rank score shall be calculated using all project values within a given region, for a maximum score of five points, with greater volume per mile per year receiving a higher score.

Discussion
In order to recognize geographic limitations on permitted placement volumes, projects proposing construction that includes nourishment will be divided into two geographic regions: Gulf coast or Atlantic coast (including projects along the Straits of Florida).

Volume is the estimated volume to be placed at the time of construction as proposed in the funding application and based upon the project design and physical monitoring reports. The entire authorized design project length as described in the Strategic Beach Management Plan will be used in the calculation.

The nourishment interval for restoration projects will be based on a feasibility study or design document. Once a project has been restored and subsequently nourished, the actual nourishment interval will be used for calculations. 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.

Only projects requesting construction funds are eligible for award of points.

Maximum points: 5

Successive unfunded requests

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(1) Increased prioritization of projects that have been on the department's ranked project list for successive years and that have not previously secured state funding for project implementation.

Rule
Increased prioritization of projects that have been on the Department's ranked project list for successive years and that have not previously secured state funding for project implementation: Projects requesting funds for the same project phase(s) as the previous year, in which the request did not secure state funding, shall be awarded three points for the first successive request and five points for two or more years of successive requests, respectively. If the successive request adds the construction phase, then only one point shall be awarded.

Discussion
Projects requesting funding for the same project phase in consecutive years without receiving legislative funds from the Beach Management Funding Assistance Program are eligible for points under this metric. Three points will be awarded to projects requesting funds for the second time, after not receiving funds in the prior year. Five points will be awarded to projects requesting funds for the third (or greater) time, after not receiving funds in the prior two or more consecutive years. If a project's successive request adds the construction phase, in addition to the phase funds were requested in the prior year(s), then only one point shall be awarded.

Maximum points: 5

Environmental habitat enhancement

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(2) Environmental habitat enhancement, recognizing state or federal critical habitat areas for threatened or endangered species which may be subject to extensive shoreline armoring, or recognizing areas where extensive shoreline armoring threatens the availability or quality of habitat for such species. Turtle-friendly designs, dune and vegetation projects for areas with redesigned or reduced fill templates, proposed incorporation of best management practices and adaptive management strategies to protect resources, and innovative technologies designed to benefit critical habitat preservation may also be considered.

Rule
Environmental habitat enhancement: Projects within designated critical habitat areas for threatened or endangered species that are subject to extensive shoreline armoring or non-designated areas where extensive armoring threatens the habitat of such species shall receive three points. Critical habitat areas shall include Endangered Species Act federally-designated critical habitat (including critical habitat units excluded from federal designation due to inclusion in a Habitat Conservation Plan) for threatened and endangered species pursuant to Rule 62B-36.002(21), F.A.C. Armoring along projects within designated critical habitat areas shall be considered extensive if existing armoring and shoreline that is subject to armoring based on a 25-year storm threat is at least 30 percent of the project's length. Armoring along projects within non-designated areas shall be considered extensive if at least 50 percent of the project's length has existing armoring that threatens the habitat of such species. Projects that are eligible for three points as defined above may be eligible for an additional two points if the project exceeds best management practices to incorporate turtle-friendly designs and management strategies to protect resources or benefit critical habitat preservation.

Discussion
Criteria calculated by the Department. Projects within designated critical habitat areas will evaluate both shoreline with existing armoring and shoreline threatened by the 25-year storm (as calculated in Rule 62B-36.006(1)(b)(2)(b) F.A.C.). Armoring along projects within critical habitat shall be considered extensive (and thereby qualify for three points) if the sum of the shoreline lengths of existing armoring and threatened shoreline exceeds 30 percent of the project length. Projects not within critical habitat areas will evaluate shoreline with existing armoring, which shall be considered extensive (and thereby qualify for three points) if the shoreline with existing armoring exceeds 50 percent of the project's length. Both "impactive" and "non-impactive" existing armoring will be included in this evaluation to emphasize the importance of maintaining projects with hardened shorelines so that non-impactive armoring does not become impactive.

Currently, there are four species with designated critical habitat that correspond to beach nourishment: beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus* spp.), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), and critical nesting habitat for loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) and green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*). Maps of federally designated critical habitat may be accessed on the United States Fish and Wildlife Services website: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/table/critical-habitat.html.

Since best management practices (BMPs) are already implemented into permits, the additional two points will be awarded to projects that exceed BMPs. Projects must qualify for the first three points to be eligible for the additional two points. Strategies may include: projects constructed outside of sea turtle nesting season, projects designed and constructed to reach equilibrium before sea turtle nesting season, projects along a beachfront community that has an updated lighting ordinance for sea turtle protection that is enforced during review of local building permits and during annual beach-based nighttime reviews of existing lighting, or projects with a substantial dune feature. To receive the additional two points, the qualifying strategy and any supporting documentation must be provided with the application materials.

The entire project length will be evaluated for this metric. Applicants may submit a geodatabase of map and layers utilized to make their calculation of shoreline armoring percentage.

Maximum points: 5

Readiness to construct

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(3)(a) The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a timely manner, considering the project's readiness for the construction phase of development, the status of required permits, the status of any needed easement acquisition, the availability of local funding sources, and the establishment of an erosion control line. If the department identifies specific reasonable and documented concerns that the project will not proceed in a timely manner, the department may choose not to include the project in the annual funding priorities submitted to the Legislature.

Rule
Readiness to construct. Projects that have all of the following shall receive one point: active state and federal permits, acquired necessary easements, secured local funding, and established ECL.

Discussion
The award of one point for this metric is dependent on the award of all four of the remaining metrics: active state and federal permits, acquired necessary easements, secured local funding, and established ECL.

Maximum points: 1

Active permits

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(3)(b) The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a timely manner, considering the project's readiness for the construction phase of development, the status of required permits, the status of any needed easement acquisition, the availability of local funding sources, and the establishment of an erosion control line. If the department identifies specific reasonable and documented concerns that the project will not proceed in a timely manner, the department may choose not to include the project in the annual funding priorities submitted to the Legislature.

Rule
Active permits. Projects that have active state and federal permits as required for the proposed project phase(s) shall receive one point.

Discussion
Only permits required for the proposed project are necessary for the award of points.

Maximum points: 1

Easements acquired

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(3)(c) The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a timely manner, considering the project's readiness for the construction phase of development, the status of required permits, the status of any needed easement acquisition, the availability of local funding sources, and the establishment of an erosion control line. If the department identifies specific reasonable and documented concerns that the project will not proceed in a timely manner, the department may choose not to include the project in the annual funding priorities submitted to the Legislature.

Rule
Easements acquired. Projects that have acquired all necessary easements for construction of the project shall receive one point.

Discussion
All project phase requests are eligible for points. The local sponsor must be able to provide verification of all necessary easements for the subsequent construction event.

Maximum points: 1

Secured local funds

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(3)(d) The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a timely manner, considering the project's readiness for the construction phase of development, the status of required permits, the status of any needed easement acquisition, the availability of local funding sources, and the establishment of an erosion control line. If the department identifies specific reasonable and documented concerns that the project will not proceed in a timely manner, the department may choose not to include the project in the annual funding priorities submitted to the Legislature.

Rule
Secured local funds. Projects that have secured the local funding necessary for the project shall receive one point.

Discussion
Funding must be secured and available for immediate use in order to be eligible for the award of one point. A copy of the draft Resolution must be provided with the application materials. The signed Resolution must be provided by the deadline for local sponsor comments. The Resolution from the governing board must include the following: support from the local sponsor for the project; willingness to serve as the local sponsor; ability to provide the full local cost share; and identification of the funding source.

Maximum points: 1

Established Erosion Control Line

Intent
Statute-161.101(14)(d)(3)(e) The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a timely manner, considering the project's readiness for the construction phase of development, the status of required permits, the status of any needed easement acquisition, the availability of local funding sources, and the establishment of an erosion control line. If the department identifies specific reasonable and documented concerns that the project will not proceed in a timely manner, the department may choose not to include the project in the annual funding priorities submitted to the Legislature.

Rule
Established ECL. Projects that have an established ECL shall receive one point.

Discussion
N/A

Maximum points: 1

Overview of Inlet Ranking Criteria

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2) The department shall establish annual funding priorities for studies, activities, or other projects concerning inlet management. Such inlet management projects constitute the intended scope of this section and s. 161.142, F.S. and consist of inlet sand bypassing, improvement of infrastructure to facilitate 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. Projects considered for funding pursuant to this section must be considered separate and apart from projects reviewed and prioritized in s. 161.101(14), F.S. The funding priorities established by the department under this section must be consistent with the requirements and legislative declaration in ss. 161.101(14), 161.142, and 161.161(1)(b), F.S. In establishing funding priorities under this subsection and before transmitting the annual inlet project list to the Legislature under subsection (4), 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 equal consideration of:

Rule

Rule- 62B-36.006(2) Inlet Management Projects. Local sponsor funding requests 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 receive a total point score by the Department based on the following criteria:

Specific Authority

161.101, 161.161, F.S. Law Implemented 161.088, 161.091, 161.101, 161.142, 161.143, 161.161, F.S. History–New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.06, 16B-36.006, Amended 12-25-03, 08-05-2013, and 08-26-2020.

Total available points: 80

Table 2. Overview of Inlet Ranking Criteria

Criteria name	Criteria points	Metric name	Points
Sand reaching the inlet	10	Sand reaching the inlet	10
Severity of erosion	10	Severity of erosion	10
Balancing the sediment budget	10	Balancing the sediment budget	10
Increased bypassing improvements	10	Increased bypassing improvements	10
Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand	10	Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand	10
Inlet Management Plans	10	Existing IMP	5
		Updated IMP	5
		New IMP	10
Enhanced longevity of proximate beach projects	10	Enhanced longevity of beach projects	10
Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets	10	Active permits	1
		Federal funds available	3
		Total amount of previous funding	4
		Secured local funds	2
Total points			**80**

Sand reaching the inlet

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

Rule
Sand reaching the inlet. Estimate of the annual quantity of beach-compatible 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 the Atlantic coast inlets and one point per 10,000 cubic yards per year for the Gulf coast inlets, for a maximum score of 10 points.

Discussion
Points will be calculated based on the volume of sediment reaching the inlet as determined by an adopted Inlet Management Plan or Department-approved study.

Maximum points: 10

Severity of erosion

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(b) The severity of erosion to the adjacent beaches caused by the inlet.

Rule
Severity of erosion. The target inlet sand bypassing quantity, as adopted in an Inlet Management Plan (IMP) or an inlet component of the statewide Strategic Beach Management Plan, is a volumetric estimate of the severity of erosion to the adjacent beaches caused by the inlet. Projects shall receive one point per 10,000 cubic yards per year of the target inlet sand bypassing quantity for Atlantic coast inlets and one point per 5,000 cubic yards for Gulf coast inlets, for a maximum score of 10 points.

Discussion
The target inlet sand bypassing quantity is a measure of erosion to the adjacent beaches caused by an inlet. The quantity will be documented in an adopted IMP or Department-approved study. Where the updrift beach is experiencing accretion, this volume would not be used to reduce the severity of erosion of the downdrift beach for purposes of this ranking criterion. The severity of erosion for those inlets causing erosion to adjacent beaches on both sides of an inlet will be the total of the target inlet sand bypassing quantity to both beaches.

Maximum points: 10

Balancing the sediment budget.

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(c) The overall significance and anticipated success of the proposed project in mitigating the erosive effects of the inlet, balancing the sediment budget on the inlet and adjacent beaches, and addressing the sand deficit along the inlet-affected shorelines.

Rule
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 IMP or a Department-approved study, multiplied by 10, for a maximum score of 10 points.

Discussion
The target annual bypassing volume is the volume of inlet sand bypassing needed to mitigate the erosive impact of the inlet by balancing the sediment budget between the inlet and the adjacent beaches. The volume of inlet sand bypassing will be calculated based upon actual bypassing activities using sand either from the inlet or from an alternate location, and any anticipated increase as demonstrated in a Department-approved design study. The annual average inlet sand bypassing will be calculated using bypassing records since the date that a bypassing objective was established. The area of inlet influence and the target annual bypassing quantity must be defined in an adopted IMP or Department-approved study.

Maximum points: 10

Cost-effectiveness: Increased bypassing improvements

Intent

Statute- 161.143(2)(d) The extent to which 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

Increased bypassing improvements. The proposed annualized increase in bypassing of material from within the inlet system divided by the unmet annual bypassing objective, multiplied by 10, for a maximum score of 10 points. The unmet annual bypassing objective is equal to the volume of the annual bypassing objective less the current annualized bypassing volume using material from within the inlet system. Projects requesting construction phase funds for modest, cost-effective improvements are eligible for points in this category.

Discussion

A modest, cost-effective improvement includes a modification to an existing inlet structure that does not entail a substantial redesign and reconstruction of the structure. 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). A project design analysis must be submitted to demonstrate with reasonable assurance the anticipated increase in bypassing.

Maximum points: 10

Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(e) The cost-effectiveness of sand made available by a proposed inlet management project or activity relative to other sand source opportunities that would be used to address inlet-caused beach erosion.

Rule
Cost-effectiveness of a proposed project using inlet sand. Cost-effectiveness is the difference in the cost per unit volume of sand made available by a proposed inlet management project versus an alternative source (such as an offshore source, or an inland source, whichever costs less). The cost-effectiveness is equal to one minus the unit cost of the proposed project divided by the alternate source, multiplied by 15, for a maximum score of 10 points. Projects requesting construction phase funds for a major inlet management project component are eligible for points in this category.

Discussion
The cost per unit volume of sand made available by the proposed major project component is the anticipated annualized construction contract costs of inlet sand bypassing after implementation of the project component plus the equivalent annual cost of the initial construction and future maintenance of the proposed major project component. Construction contract costs shall include mobilization and demobilization, dredging and/or transport, beach placement, environmental monitoring, and cost of material, if applicable. Major inlet management project components are construction of new inlet structures, or the redesign and substantial reconstruction of existing inlet structures, that facilitate inlet sand bypassing.

For projects that propose cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand, an opinion of probable cost per unit volume of the inlet and all other sand sources, certified by a licensed professional engineer must be provided by the application deadline for the award of points.

Maximum points: 10

Existing Inlet Management Plan

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(f) The existence of a proposed or recently updated Inlet Management Plan or a local-government-sponsored inlet study addressing the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.

Rule
Existing IMP. Projects that have an existing IMP or a Department-approved local-government-sponsored inlet study addressing the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches shall receive five points.

Discussion
Proposed inlet projects with an adopted IMP or inlet management strategies adopted into the Strategic Beach Management Plan will be eligible for points.

Maximum points: 5

Updated Inlet Management Plan

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(f) The existence of a proposed or recently updated Inlet Management Plan or a local-government-sponsored inlet study addressing the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.

Rule
Updated IMP. Projects that have an updated IMP or Department-approved local-government-sponsored inlet study addressing the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches within the last five years shall receive five points.

Discussion
Inlet projects that have updated their IMP or have conducted a Department-approved inlet study within the last 5 years will be eligible for points.

Maximum points: 5

New Inlet Management Plan

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(f) The existence of a proposed or recently updated Inlet Management Plan or a local-government-sponsored inlet study addressing the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.

Rule
New IMP. Projects proposing to develop a new inlet management study to be submitted to the Department for adoption of an IMP shall receive 10 points.

Discussion
If an IMP has not been previously approved and adopted by the Department, then the project is eligible for points to propose a new study.

Maximum points: 10

Enhanced longevity of proximate beach projects

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
Enhanced longevity of proximate beach projects. Projects that enhance and maintain the performance and longevity of proximate beach nourishment projects within the area of inlet influence shall receive points based on the percentage of the annualized beach nourishment volume supplied by the average annual volume of inlet sand bypassing, multiplied by 10, for a maximum score of 10 points.

Discussion
The volume of inlet sand bypassing will be calculated based upon actual bypassing activities using sand either from the inlet or from an alternate location as well as proposed bypassing activities for projects that are considered initial major construction events. 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).

Maximum points: 10

Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets: Active permits

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(h)(1) The project-ranking criteria in s. 161.101(14) to the extent such criteria are applicable to inlet management studies, projects, and activities and are distinct from, and not duplicative of, the criteria listed in paragraphs (a)-(g).

Rule
Projects that have active state and federal permits as required for the proposed project activity shall receive one point.

Discussion
Only permits required for the proposed project are necessary for the award of points.

Maximum points: 1

Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets: Federal funds available

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(h)(2) The project-ranking criteria in s. 161.101(14) to the extent such criteria are applicable to inlet management studies, projects, and activities and are distinct from, and not duplicative of, the criteria listed in paragraphs (a)-(g).

Rule
Projects that have federal funds available for the proposed activities pursuant to the IMP shall receive three points.

Discussion
Federal funds available for the proposed project phase(s). Documentation must be received by the application deadline.

Maximum points: 3

Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets: Total amount of previous funding

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(h)(3) The project-ranking criteria in s. 161.101(14) to the extent such criteria are applicable to inlet management studies, projects, and activities and are distinct from, and not duplicative of, the criteria listed in paragraphs (a)-(g).

Rule
The total amount of state funding appropriated for projects from the Department's Beach Management Funding Assistance Program through annual legislative appropriations shall be summed for the previous 10 years. The rank score shall be calculated using the total amounts for all projects, for a maximum score of four points, with greater amounts of previous funding receiving a higher score.

Discussion
The total amount of state funding includes funding received through annual legislative appropriations, legislative hurricane appropriations, and legislative funds reallocated to projects on the ranked LGFR list that were remaining from appropriated projects. Special legislative appropriations, special hurricane appropriations, and similar appropriations from outside the standard LGFR process will not be included.

Maximum points: 4

Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets: Secured local funds

Intent
Statute- 161.143(2)(h)(4) The project-ranking criteria in s. 161.101(14) to the extent such criteria are applicable to inlet management studies, projects, and activities and are distinct from, and not duplicative of, the criteria listed in paragraphs (a)-(g).

Rule
Projects that have secured the local funding necessary for the project shall receive two points.

Discussion
Funding must be secured and available for immediate use in order to be eligible for the award of two points. A copy of the draft Resolution must be provided with the application materials. The signed Resolution must be provided by the deadline for local sponsor comments. The Resolution from the governing board must include the following: support from the local sponsor for the project; willingness to serve as the local sponsor; ability to provide the full local cost share; and identification of the funding source.

Maximum points: 2

Inlet Management Studies

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 and are distinct from, and not duplicative of, the criteria listed in paragraphs (a)-(g).

Rule

Inlet management studies will be ranked using only the criteria listed in subsections (a), (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 inlet 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 in which they are eligible and with the scores normalized. Scores are normalized by dividing the total point value a project received for subsections (a), (f), and (h) by the total points available for these three criteria (30 points) and multiplying by the total points available for all inlet criteria (80 points).