

# Beach & Inlet Projects Ranking Methodology Workshop

Hanna Tillotson Office of Resilience and Coastal Protection December 11, 2019



# Rulemaking

- House Bill 325 passed in 2019 Legislature
- Section 1 amended section 161.101(14), Florida Statutes (F.S.)
  - Revised the criteria used to assign annual funding priorities for beach management and erosion control projects
- Section 3 amended section 161.143(2)-(5), F.S.
  - Revised the criteria used to establish funding priorities for studies, activities, or other projects concerning inlet management
- Rulemaking is underway to amend Chapter 62B-36, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), Beach Management Funding Assistance Program



- A revised Beach and Inlet ranking methodology was drafted to facilitate the revised rule development
- During this workshop, the proposed methodology revisions will be discussed:
  - Eleven criteria for ranking beach projects
  - Eight criteria for ranking inlet projects
  - Proposed point values for each metric listed
- A future workshop will be conducted to discuss revised rule language



## **Beach Ranking Criteria**

Tier	Criteria name	Required percent of total	F.S. section	Metric name	DRAFT points (total = 100)
1	Tourism-related impacts	20	161.101(14)(a)	Return on investment	10
				Economic impact	10
2	Federal involvement	15	161.101(14)(b)(1)	Federally authorized	5
				Federal cost share	5
				Federal funds available	5
	Storm damage reduction benefits	15	161.101(14)(b)(2)(a)	Current condition	5
			161.101(14)(b)(2)(b)	Threat to upland development	5
			161.101(14)(b)(2)(c)	Value of upland property	5
	Cost-effectiveness	15	161.101(14)(b)(3)	Cost/volume/mile/year	3
			161.101(14)(b)(3)(a)	Enhanced longevity	3
			161.101(14)(b)(3)(b)	Dune addition	3
			161.101(14)(b)(3)(c)	Innovative technology	3
			161.101(14)(b)(3)(d)	Regionalization	3
3	Previous state commitment	5	161.101(14)(c)(1)	Previously funded	1
				Amount previously appropriated	3
				Previous partial appropriation	1
	Recreational benefits	5	161.101(14)(c)(2)(a)	Accessible beach area	2
			161.101(14)(c)(2)(b)	Recreational benefits	3
	Mitigation of inlets	5	161.101(14)(c)(3)	Mitigation of inlet effects	5
	Sand placement volumes	5	161.101(14)(c)(4)	Volume/mile/year	5
4	Successive unfunded requests	5	161.101(14)(d)(1)	Successive requests	5
	Environmental habitat enhancement	5	161.101(14)(d)(2)	Habitat enhancement	5
	Overall readiness to proceed	5	161.101(14)(d)(3)	Readiness to construct	1
				Active permits	1
				Easements acquired	1
				Local funds secured	1
				Erosion Control Line established	1

4



## Section 161.101(14)(a), F.S.

# Tier 1 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of the following metrics:

- **1.** Tourism-related return on investment (**10** points)
- 2. Economic impact of the project (10 points)



• 161.101(14)(a), F.S. 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.

#### Discussion

- Define tourism-related tax revenues
  - **O Data source: Department of Revenue**
  - ${\rm \circ}\,$  Use most recent verified statewide dataset
- State funding requested for all project phases in the current application



#### • The ratio will be calculated as shown:

 $Ratio = \frac{tourist \ development \ tax \ revenue \ (\$)}{state \ funding \ requested \ (\$)}$ 

### • Scoring

- Proposed maximum: 10 points
- The ratio for each project will be ranked with all other projects. Projects will receive points from 0 to 10, in equally divided intervals, with 10 being the highest return on investment ratio.



# **'Rank Score' Method**

- The calculated values for all projects are ranked from highest to lowest
- To convert the values to a score, the values are divided by (# of projects/max points)
- This method assigns scores with equally divided intervals from 0 to max points

- Example:
  - 25 projects with ratios from 0.012 - 0.191
  - Scores range from 0.4 10 points, with 0.4 intervals







- 161.101(14)(a), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Define tourism-related tax revenues
  - All county (sales) tax revenues
    - **Data source: Department of Revenue**
    - ${\rm \circ}\,$  Use most recent verified statewide dataset



#### • The ratio will be calculated as shown:

 $Ratio = \frac{tourist \ development \ tax \ revenue \ (\$)}{all \ county \ tax \ revenue \ (\$)}$ 

### • Scoring

- Proposed maximum: 10 points
- The ratio for each project will be ranked with all other projects. Projects will receive points from 0 to 10, in equally divided intervals, with 10 being the highest economic impact ratio.



### Section 161.101(14)(b), F.S.

# Tier 2 must account for 45 percent of the total score and consist of the following criterion:

- Availability of federal matching dollars (15 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Storm damage reduction benefits of the project (15 points total, 3 metrics)
- **3.** Cost-effectiveness of the project (15 points total, 5 metrics)



# The availability of federal matching dollars, considering the following:

- **1.** Federal authorization
- **2.** Federal cost-share percentage
- **3.** Status of the funding award



- 161.101(14)(b)(1), F.S. The availability of federal matching dollars, considering federal authorization...
- Discussion
  - Federally-authorized projects shall receive max points
  - Project phase proposed for current state funding request must be included in authorization
    - ${\rm \circ}$  Authorization must be verified by application deadline
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 5 points
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(b)(1), F.S. The availability of federal matching dollars, considering...the federal cost-share percentage...
- Discussion
  - Cost share percentages from a signed agreement with the USACE or FEMA work order

 ${\ensuremath{\circ}}$  Signed agreements must be submitted by application deadline

- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 5 points
  - I point for 1-25%, 3 points for 26-70%, 5 points for 71-100%



- 161.101(14)(b)(1), F.S. The availability of federal matching dollars, considering...the status of the funding award.
- Discussion
  - Projects in a USACE work plan or with a signed FEMA project worksheet shall receive max points
    - Signed agreements must be submitted by application deadline
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 5 points
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



## 161.101(14)(b), F.S.

# Tier 2 must account for 45 percent of the total score and consist of the following criterion:

- **1.** Availability of federal matching dollars (15 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Storm damage reduction benefits of the project (15 points total, 3 metrics)
- **3. Cost-effectiveness of the project (15 points total, 5 metrics)**



The storm damage reduction benefits of the project based on the following considerations:

- **1.** Current condition of the project area
- 2. Overall potential threat to existing upland development
- **3.** Value of upland property benefiting from the protection provided by the project



- 161.101(14)(b)(2)(a), F.S. The current condition 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.
- Discussion
  - Amendment makes a distinction between beach restoration and nourishment





## **Current condition (continued)**

• May revise the existing rule language for 'advanced placement lost' criterion to account for this change

### • Scoring

- Proposed maximum: 5 points
- Restoration projects receive 1 point for the first foot of annual erosion, with an additional 1 point awarded for each additional half foot of annual erosion
- Nourishment projects receive 1 point for every 20 percent of volume lost



- 161.101(14)(b)(2)(b), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Use existing rule methodology?
    - Score based on the percentage of shoreline containing structures at or seaward of the projected 25-year return interval storm event erosion limit within the project boundaries (full methodology on next slide)





#### • Existing rule language:

Tier 2

"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 (Storm-induced BEAch CHange 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."



- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 5 points
  - If the previous rule language is used, the scoring portion may need to be revised to reflect different maximum score
    - e.g., Percent of threatened shoreline times 5 for a maximum of 5 points



- 161.101(14)(b)(2)(c), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - In GIS, a ¼ mile buffer is measured from the project's Erosion Control Line (ECL) or mean high water line survey





Value of upland property (continued)

- Values of the properties that intersect the buffer will be summed
- Most recent verified year of property values available from the Department of Revenue will be used
- Project map and supporting documents will be provided by the Local Sponsor and verified by Department staff
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 5 points
  - Rank scores based on total value



## 161.101(14)(b), F.S.

# Tier 2 must account for 45 percent of the total score and consist of the following criterion:

- **1.** Availability of federal matching dollars (15 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Storm damage reduction benefits of the project (15 points total, 3 metrics)
- **3.** Cost-effectiveness of the project (15 points total, 5 metrics)





## 161.101(14)(b)(3), F.S.

The Department shall consider the following when assessing cost-effectiveness:

- **1.** Cost per volume per mile per year
- **2. Enhanced longevity**
- 3. Dune components that reduce upland storm damage costs
- 4. Innovative technology
- **5.** Regionalization that reduces costs



- 161.101(14)(b)(3), F.S. The cost-effectiveness of the project based on the yearly cost per volume per mile of proposed beach fill placement.
- Discussion
  - Include all projects that have been/will be constructed? Or only projects requesting construction funds?
    - ${\ensuremath{\circ}}$  Reasonable cost estimates must be available
    - Cost calculations will include construction, associated project mitigation, and construction-related and first year postconstruction monitoring costs



#### Calculation :

construction costs (\$)

volume of sand placed (cy)project length (mi)nourishment interval (yr)

#### Scoring

- Proposed maximum: 3 points
- Projects will receive a score based on the 25%, 50%, and 75% quartiles of all of the projects' calculations for the given funding year. Projects with a cost per mile per year less than the 25% quartile will receive 3 points, 25-49% will receive 2 points, 50-74% will receive 1 point, and greater than 75% will receive 0 points.



- 161.101(14)(b)(3)(a), F.S. The existence of projects with proposed structural or design components that could extend the beach nourishment interval.
- Discussion
  - Should proposed structures be limited to typical erosion control structures (e.g., breakwaters, groins)?
  - Does modification of the advance nourishment design component qualify for points?
  - Is an engineering analysis needed to support the costeffectiveness of the design component before points can be awarded?



- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 3 points
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(b)(3)(b), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Projects that are being re-designed to incorporate a vegetated dune feature
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 3 points
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



 161.101(14)(b)(3)(c), F.S. Proposed innovative technologies designed to reduce project costs.

#### Discussion

- Use existing rule language?
  - 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
- Definition of "innovative technology"? Include innovative dredge and fill construction technologies?



- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 3 points
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



 161.101(14)(b)(3)(d), F.S. Regional sediment management strategies and coordination to conserve sand source resources and reduce project costs.

#### • Discussion

- Projects that propose cost savings through:
  - Two or more projects proposed by two or more local sponsors that are entering the same project phase, or construction only?
    - Requires the submission of an executed interlocal agreement
  - The use of dredged sand from an inlet management or navigation project to restore or nourish a beach?



- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 3 points
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



#### 161.101(14)(c), F.S.

# Tier 3 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Previous state commitment (5 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Recreational benefits of the project (5 points total, 2 metrics)
- **3.** Mitigation of inlets (5 points, 1 metric)
- 4. Volume per mile per year (5 points, 1 metric)


# **Previous state commitment and involvement in the project:**

- **1.** Previously funded phases
- **2.** Total amount of previous state funding
- **3.** Previous partial appropriations



- 161.101(14)(c)(1), F.S. Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering previously funded phases.
- Discussion
  - Use existing rule language?
    - Projects where the Department has previously cost shared, reviewed, and approved a feasibility or design phase
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(c)(1), F.S. Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering...the total amount of previous state funding.
- Discussion
  - Time frame to be included? Last 3 years? 10 years?
  - Project funding sources: annual legislative and hurricane funding, but not special appropriations
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 3 points
  - Rank score or quartiles?



- 161.101(14)(c)(1), F.S. Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering... previous partial appropriations for the proposed project.
- Discussion
  - Projects requesting the remainder of a partially-funded request will receive the maximum score
  - Time limit for a shortfall request is 3 years?
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



#### 161.101(14)(c), F.S.

# Tier 3 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Previous state commitment (5 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Recreational benefits of the project (5 points total, 2 metrics)
- 3. Mitigation of inlets (5 points, 1 metric)
- 4. Volume per mile per year (5 points, 1 metric)



#### The recreational benefits of the project based on:

- **1.** Accessible beach area added by the project
- 2. Percentage of linear footage within the project boundaries which is zoned: as recreational or open space; for commercial use; or to otherwise allow for public lodging establishments



- 161.101(14)(c)(2)(a), F.S. The recreational benefits of the project based on: the accessible beach area added by the project.
- Discussion
  - Definition of area
    - How should pre-project area be accounted for when calculating the area added by the project?
    - Which pre-project width is used? Baseline determined during feasibility study?
    - Is dune considered 'accessible beach'? How to account for projects without a "design profile" only advance nourishment?



- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 2 points
  - Above (max pt) or below (0 pt) statewide average



#### 161.101(14)(c)(2)(b), F.S. 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.

#### Discussion

 Shoreline length within project boundaries currently used as recreational, open space, commercial, or public lodging establishment is calculated using GIS-based mapping tools



- Designation derived from current local land use maps
- Street ends that provide access to the beach are included
- Calculation

% shoreline =  $\begin{bmatrix} recreational + open space + commercial + lodging shorelines \\ project length \end{bmatrix}$ 

- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 3 points
  - One point awarded for every 25%, with 75% or higher earning the max score



#### 161.101(14)(c), F.S.

# Tier 3 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Previous state commitment (5 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Recreational benefits of the project (5 points total, 2 metrics)
- **3.** Mitigation of inlets (5 points, 1 metric)
- 4. Volume per mile per year (5 points, 1 metric)



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

#### Discussion

- Keep existing rule language?
- Current guidelines:
  - 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.



- Calculation
  - The percent of the unmet bypass volume mitigated by supplemental nourishment
- Scoring
  - Maximum score: 5 points
  - The value calculated above is multiplied by 5



#### 161.101(14)(c), F.S.

# Tier 3 must account for 20 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Previous state commitment (5 points total, 3 metrics)
- 2. Recreational benefits of the project (5 points total, 2 metrics)
- 3. Mitigation of inlets (5 points, 1 metric)
- 4. Volume per mile per year (5 points, 1 metric)



- 161.101(14)(c)(4), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Include all projects that have been/will be constructed? Or only projects requesting construction funds?
  - Must have reasonable volume estimates
  - Use restored or current project length (e.g., hotspots)?
  - Regional comparisons for Northeast, Southeast, Southwest, and Panhandle



#### Calculation

volume of sand placed (cy)

project length (mi)nourishment interval (yr)

#### Scoring

- Maximum score: 5 points
- Projects placing or proposing to place a volume/mile/year that is greater than one of the two options below:
  - Average within each region (if there is only one project in a region, the score for that project will be zero, as a comparison cannot be made), or
  - The long-term regional average will receive max score



#### 161.101(14)(d), F.S.

## Tier 4 must account for 15 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Increased prioritization for projects with successive unfunded requests (5 points, 1 metric)
- **2.** Environmental habitat enhancement (5 points, 1 metric)
- **3.** Overall readiness of the project to proceed (5 points total, 5 metrics)



- 161.101(14)(d)(1), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Successive unfunded requests for the same project phase
- Scoring
  - Maximum score: 5 points
  - Projects that requested but did not secure state funding in successive years will receive 1, 3, or 5 points for 1, 2, or **3** years of successive requests, respectively



#### 161.101(14)(d), F.S.

# Tier 4 must account for 15 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Increased prioritization for projects with successive unfunded requests (5 points, 1 metric)
- **2.** Environmental habitat enhancement (5 points, 1 metric)
- **3.** Overall readiness of the project to proceed (5 points total, 5 metrics)



 161.101(14)(d)(2), F.S. 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.



#### Discussion

- **1.** Projects in federally designated critical habitat for sea turtles
- **2.** Projects where 50% or more of the shoreline is currently armored
- **3.** Projects with a "turtle friendly design": dune features, greater percentage of sand placed on the upper beach, or approximate the equilibrated slope
- 4. Projects that incorporate adaptive management for shore birds
- **5.** Projects that incorporate additional environmental enhancement
- Scoring
  - Maximum score: 5 points
  - 1 point awarded for each discussion item above



#### 161.101(14)(d), F.S.

# Tier 4 must account for 15 percent of the total score and consist of all of the following criterion:

- **1.** Increased prioritization for projects with successive unfunded requests (5 points, 1 metric)
- **2.** Environmental habitat enhancement (5 points, 1 metric)
- **3.** Overall readiness of the project to proceed (5 points total, 5 metrics)



The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a timely manner, considering the project's:

- **1.** Readiness for the construction phase of development
- **2.** Status of required permits
- **3.** Status of any needed easement acquisition
- 4. Availability of local funding sources
- **5.** Establishment of an erosion control line



- 161.101(14)(d)(3), F.S. ...the project's readiness for the construction phase of development...
- Discussion
  - Projects that have active permits, required easements, local funds secured, and an established ECL
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(d)(3), F.S. ...the status of required permits...
- Discussion
  - Projects with active federal and state permits for the proposed project activity
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(d)(3), F.S. ...the status of any needed easement acquisition...
- Discussion
  - Projects that have acquired all easements necessary for the project to proceed
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(d)(3), F.S. ...the availability of local funding sources...
- Discussion
  - Funding must be secured and available for immediate use
    - ${\rm \circ}$  Signed Resolution must be submitted by the application deadline
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(d)(3), F.S. ...the establishment of an erosion control line...
- Discussion
  - Projects that have an established Erosion Control Line (ECL) for the proposed project
  - ECL must be recorded with the county clerk's office
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 1 point
  - Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



### **Inlet Ranking Criteria**

F.S. section	Criteria name	Criteria points	Metric name	DRAFT points (total = 80)
161.143(2)(a)	Sand reaching the inlet	10	Sand reaching the inlet	10
161.143(2)(b)	Severity of erosion	10	Severity of erosion	10
161.143(2)(c)	Mitigating/balancing the sediment budget	10	Balancing the sediment budget	10
161.143(2)(d)	Cost-effectiveness (increased bypassing)	10	Cost-effectiveness (increased bypassing)	10
161.143(2)(e)	Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand	10	Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand	10
161.143(2)(f)	Existing or Updated IMP	10	Existing IMP	5
			Updated IMP	5
			New IMP	10
161.143(2)(g)	Enhanced project performance (increased nourishment interval of beach project)	10	Enhanced project performance	10
161.143(2)(h)	Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets	10	Federal funds available	?
			Active permits	?
			Previously funded phases	?
			Successive requests	?



- 161.143(2)(a), F.S. An estimate of the annual quantity of beach-quality sand reaching the updrift boundary of the improved jetty or inlet channel.
- Discussion:
  - Use existing rule language and scoring?
    - Estimated annual quantity of beach quality sand reaching the updrift boundary of the improved jetty or inlet channel...
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 10 points
  - 1 point per 20,000 cubic yards per year



- 161.143(2)(b), F.S. The severity of the erosion to the adjacent beaches caused by the inlet.
- Discussion
  - Volumetric erosion on the downdrift beaches within the area of inlet influence.
  - Volumetric erosion for those inlet causing erosion to adjacent beaches on both sides of the inlet
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 10 points



### **Inlet Criteria** Balancing the sediment budget

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



# **Inlet Criteria**

#### **Balancing the sediment budget (cont'd)**

- Discussion
  - Use existing rule language?
    - 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

#### Calculation

 $\% = \frac{annual \ average \ by passing \ volume \ (cy)}{annual \ by passing \ objective \ (cy)}$ 

#### Scoring

- Proposed maximum: 10 points
- Percent of annual bypassing objective being met times 10



 161.143(2)(d), F.S. 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.



### Inlet Criteria Cost-effectiveness (cont'd)

#### Discussion

- Use existing rule language and scoring?
  - 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.

#### Scoring

#### Proposed maximum: 10 points

proposed bypass increase

 $Score = \frac{proposed by pass intervals}{annual by pass objective-annual by passed volume} \times 10$ 



### **Inlet Criteria** Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand

- 161.143(2)(e), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Cost analysis of sand sources (e.g., inlet dredging, offshore borrow area, upland truck haul)
  - Method to calculate costs for comparison?
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: 10 points


- The existence of a proposed or recently updated Inlet Management Plan or a local-governmentsponsored inlet study addressing the mitigation of an inlet's erosive effects on adjacent beaches.
- Three metrics are proposed:
  - **1.** Existing IMP
  - 2. Updated IMP
  - 3. New IMP

Section 161.143(2)(f), F.S. is worth 10 points total



- 161.143(2)(f), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Use existing rule language and scoring?
    - Proposed projects that have an existing IMP 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



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

### Discussion

- Use existing rule language and scoring?
  - Projects where the Department has received and approved an update to an existing IMP 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 IMP shall receive an additional 5 points



- 161.143(2)(f), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Use existing rule language?
    - Projects proposing to develop a new inlet management study to be submitted to the Department for adoption of an IMP

## Scoring

Proposed maximum: 10 points



# **Inlet Criteria** Enhanced project performance

 161.143(2)(g), F.S. 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.

## Discussion

- Use existing rule language?
  - 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.



• Scoring

#### Proposed maximum: 10 points

 $Score = \frac{proposed increase in annually average bypass volume}{\left(\frac{beach project placement volume}{beach project nourishment interval}\right)} \times 10$ 



- Beach ranking criteria in Section 161.101(14), F.S., applicable to inlets, but not duplicative of Sections 161.143(2)(a)-(g), F.S.
- Possible criteria to include:
  - Federal funds available
  - Active permits
  - Previously funded
  - Successive requests
  - Others?

• Section 161.143(2)(h), F.S. is worth 10 points total



- 161.101(14)(b)(1), F.S. The availability of federal matching dollars, considering...the status of the funding award.
- Discussion:
  - Projects in a USACE work plan or with a signed FEMA project worksheet shall receive max points
    - ${\rm \circ}$  Signed agreements must be submitted by application deadline
    - $\circ$  Participation agreement must be for the requested project phase
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: ? points
  - Yes (max pts) or No (0 pts)



- 161.101(14)(d)(3), F.S. ...the status of required permits...
- Discussion

 Projects with active federal and state permits for the proposed project activity

- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: ? points
  - Yes (max pts) or No (0 pts)



• 161.101(14)(c)(1), F.S. Previous state commitment and involvement in the project, considering previously funded phases.

## Discussion

- Use current rule language?
  - Projects where the Department has previously cost shared, reviewed, and approved a feasibility or design phase

## Scoring

- Proposed maximum: ? points
- Yes (max pt) or No (0 pt)



- 161.101(14)(d)(1), F.S. 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.
- Discussion
  - Successive unfunded requests for the same project phase
- Scoring
  - Proposed maximum: ? points



## Hanna Tillotson

## **Office of Resilience and Coastal Protection**

**Beach Management Funding Program** 

Hanna.Tillotson@FloridaDEP.gov

**Beaches\_Funding@FloridaDEP.gov** 

850-245-7540

