

FY2022/2023 Local Government Funding Request

Final Inlet Project Assessment

Project Name	St. Lucie Inlet Management Plan Implementation
Local Sponsor	Martin County

Initial Assessment	8/6/2021
Group Assessment	8/18/2021
Draft Assessment	8/31/2021
Final Review	9/29/2021

Project Description
The St. Lucie Inlet is located between DEP monuments R44 to R45 in Martin County. Federally-authorized improvements began in 1974 with the construction of the first extension of the north jetty, a small south jetty, and a detached breakwater. The Inlet Management Plan (IMP) was adopted in 1996, and since then, regular sand bypassing has been conducted on a 4-5-year cycle, with the placement of over 3.28 million cubic yards of sand on the beaches of Jupiter Island to the south of the inlet. Extensive monitoring and modeling efforts were undertaken after the construction of the sediment impoundment basin in 2002 to understand the impact and functioning of the basin. As a result, a revised IMP was adopted in 2016. The IMP calls for sand bypassing to both the Town of Jupiter Island (161,000 cy/year) to the south and Bathtub Beach/Sailfish Point (34,000 cy/year) to the north. The most recent bypassing event and placement between R45 and R59 was completed in April 2021. The requested funds include additional construction funds for a shortfall from FY2020/2021 and post-construction monitoring. Staff have determined that the project is eligible for a 50% state cost share.

Funds will be used for (list project phase, specify which phase is reimbursement, if applicable)
Construction (reimbursement for FY20/21) and Monitoring

State cost share %	50.00%
--------------------	--------

Project Budget Table					
	State %	Federal	State	Local	Total
Feasibility	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Design	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	50.00%	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000
Year 1 Monitoring	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Year 2+ Monitoring	50.00%	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$600,000
Total Project Costs		\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$1,600,000

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE (80 points)	50.9
--	------

Sand reaching the inlet (10 points)	Score	10
--	-------	----

Local Sponsor: 265,000 cubic yards

Department: The volume of sand reaching the updrift boundary of the inlet is 201,000 cy/yr (Ramsey et al, 2014).
Volume of sand: 201,000

Severity of erosion (10 points)	Score	10
--	--------------	----

Local Sponsor: Annual bypassing objective: 195,000 cy/yr

Department: The annual target bypassing is 161,000 cy to the south and 34,000 cy to the north for a total of 195,000 cy/yr.

Target bypassing volume: 195,000

Balancing the sediment budget (10 points)	Score	10
--	--------------	----

Local Sponsor: Annual average bypass objective since IMP adoption: 293,795 cy/yr. 2016 IMP bypass objectives: 161,000 cy to the south, 34,000 cy to the north

Department: The annual target bypassing is 161,000 cy to the south and 34,000 cy to the north (January 2016 IMP). Both of these quantities have been met.

CEG calculated value: 195,000

Increased bypassing improvements (10 points)	Score	0
---	--------------	---

Local Sponsor: No proposed increase. No annual bypassing shortfall.

Department: Increased bypassing has not been proposed, therefore not eligible for the award of points.

CEG calculated value: 0

Cost-effectiveness of using inlet sand (10 points)	Score	0
---	--------------	---

Local Sponsor: Yes, proposed project is for the construction of a major inlet management project component.

Department: The proposed project is not for the construction of an initial major inlet management project component and is therefore not eligible for the award of points.

Inlet Management Plans

Existing IMP (5 points)	Score	5
--------------------------------	--------------	---

Local Sponsor: Yes

Department: Verified

Updated IMP (5 points)	Score	5
-------------------------------	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Yes

Department: The updated IMP was adopted in January 2016 and is therefore eligible for the award of points.

New IMP (10 points)	Score	0
----------------------------	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: No

Department: Verified

Enhanced longevity of proximate beach projects (10 points)	Score	4.9
---	--------------	------------

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Since the 2016 January IMP adoption, there has been 1,762,768 cy bypassed to the adjacent projects at Bathtub Beach/Sailfish Point and Jupiter Island. These projects placed a total of 3,603,620 cy. Thus, 48.9% of the placement was inlet sand bypassing.

CEG calculated value: 48.9%

Criteria in 161.101(14) applicable to inlets

Active permits (1 point)	Score	0
---------------------------------	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Active state permit, but not an active federal permit (expires 12-21-2021). The federal USACE permit for the previously-approved project limits is currently in the process of being modified to include the St. Lucie Inlet State Park placement area.

Department: Verified and not eligible for the award of points.

Federal funds available (3 points)	Score	0
---	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Yes, Congressman Brian Mast has requested federal funds for the St. Lucie Inlet project as a part of the Community Project Funding. These funds are included in the house Energy and Water appropriation bill. The federal budget is expected to be finalized in the fall of 2021.

Department: Documentation of the secured federal funding for the proposed project activity necessary to be eligible for the award of points.

Department: Documentation to verify the secured federal funding was not submitted to the Department.

Total amount of previous state funding (4 points)	Score	4
--	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Fiscal year 2012/2013 through 2021/2022

Total funds: \$27,205.249.86

Secured local funds (2 points)	Score	2
---------------------------------------	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Yes

Department: Draft Resolution was submitted by application deadline.

Department: Signed Resolution submitted for the award of two points.