

FY2022/2023 Local Government Funding Request

Draft Beach Project Assessment

Project Name	Longboat Key Beach Nourishment
Local Sponsor	Town of Longboat Key

Initial Assessment	8/13/2021
Group Assessment	8/20/2021
Draft Assessment	8/31/2021
Final Review	

Project Description
The Longboat Key Beach Nourishment Project is located between DEP monuments R42.7 and R67.3 in Manatee County and R1 and R29.3 in Sarasota County. The Project was initially restored in 1993. A nourishment was completed in 2005/06. Smaller, interim projects included the Central Key truck haul project, New Pass/Longboat Pass dredging and the South End supplemental project in 2016 and a placement of sand near the North End Permeable Adjustable Groins (PAGs) in 2018. A nourishment project was completed in 2021, along with the installation of new groins. The requested funds are for the final year of the federal feasibility study, construction and engineering services for the Greer Island Spit Management Project, construction preparation for the Gulfside Road interim beach nourishment planned for 2024, and year 2 post-construction monitoring. Staff have determined that 100% of the feasibility phase and 53.88% of the construction and monitoring phases of the project are eligible for state cost sharing.

Funds will be used for (list project phase, specify which phase is reimbursement, if applicable)
Feasibility, Construction, Post-Construction Monitoring

State cost share %	50% Feasibility, 26.94% Construction and Monitoring.
--------------------	--

Project Budget Table					
	State %	Federal	State	Local	Total
Feasibility	50.00%	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$600,000
Design	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	26.94%	\$0	\$191,526	\$519,409	\$710,935
Year 1 Monitoring	0.00%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Year 2+ Monitoring	26.94%	\$0	\$134,700	\$365,300	\$500,000
Total Project Costs		\$300,000	\$476,226	\$1,034,709	\$1,810,935

Federal cost share %	50.00%
Federal agency and description	USACE - Feasibility only

TOTAL PROJECT SCORE (100 points)	52.9
---	------

The Department requests verification that the Monitoring funds requested are not a duplicate of the year 2 monitoring funds appropriated from the FY2021/2022 Local Government Funding Request into DEP agreement 22ME1.

Tier 1

Tourism-related impacts		
--------------------------------	--	--

Return on investment (10 points)	Score	10
---	-------	----

Local Sponsor: Project is requesting construction funds.

Department: Verified

Construction + Year 1 Monitoring Cost: \$191,526.00

Value: 222.1

Economic impact (10 points)	Score	9.5
------------------------------------	-------	-----

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Manatee and Sarasota Counties, 2020 data. Tourism-related sales tax data = \$42,536,415.58. County sales tax collections = \$226,166,898.06

Value: 18.81

Tier 2

Federal involvement		
----------------------------	--	--

Federal authorization (5 points)	Score	0
---	-------	---

Local Sponsor: The Project is not federally authorized.

Department: Verified

Federal cost share (5 points)	Score	0
--------------------------------------	-------	---

Local Sponsor: 50% for feasibility

Department: Federal cost share documentation required to be eligible for the award of points.

Federal funds available (5 points)	Score	0
---	-------	---

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: No documentation provided for the availability of federal funds for the feasibility study.

Storm damage reduction benefits		
--	--	--

Current conditions (8 points)	Score	8
--------------------------------------	-------	---

Local Sponsor: L=0.91 (fraction of advance fill loss)
measured change = -245,200 cy above MHW from 2016 post-con to 2021 March
fill placed = 270,300 cy above MHW
2016 Multi-Phase Beach Nourishment (OAI, 2017)

Department: Olsen Associates reports in the application that 245,200 cy of the 270,300 cy placed above MHW in 2016 have been lost as of March 2021. Therefore, 90.7% have been lost above MHW.

CEG calculated value: 90.70%

Threat to upland development (2 points)	Score	0
--	--------------	---

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Armoring is prevalent throughout much of the vulnerable segments, leaving little shoreline which would qualify for ranking points while the remaining hot spots have been nourished by the 2021 project, therefore no threat to upland development.

CEG calculated value: 0

Value of upland property (5 points)	Score	4.5
--	--------------	-----

Local Sponsor: \$4,843,080,286

Department: Calculated by Department GIS staff with 2020 data.
Total value: \$4,842,076,922

Cost-effectiveness

Cost/volume/mile/year (10 points)	Score	8.3
--	--------------	-----

Local Sponsor: Greer Island Spit management: proposed volume = 30,000 cy, nourishment interval = 6 yrs

Department: Calculations for Greer Island Spit management portion only.
Construction cost = \$710,935, volume = 30,000 cy, length = 10.04 mi, nourishment interval = 7 yrs

Value: \$0.34

Enhanced longevity, dune addition, innovative technology, and regionalization (5 points)	Score	0
---	--------------	---

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: None proposed and not eligible for award of points.

Tier 3

Previous state commitment

Previously funded phases (1 point)	Score	1
---	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Yes, feasibility and design.

Department: Verified

Total amount of previous funding (3 points)	Score	2.9
--	--------------	------------

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Fiscal year 2012/2013 through 2021/2022

Total funds: \$21,151,093

Previous partial appropriation (1 point)	Score	0
---	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: No previous partial appropriation.

Department: Verified

Recreational benefits

Accessible beach area (2 points)	Score	2.1
---	--------------	------------

Local Sponsor: 4,801,963 sq ft

Department: Application states (Table 4 in attachment of application gives detailed accessible beach area) design is 120 feet seaward of the baseline which yields 4,801,963 square feet.

Total area: 4,801,963

Recreational benefits (3 points)	Score	0.3
---	--------------	------------

Local Sponsor: 9%

Department: Verified

Percentage: 9%

Mitigation of inlet effects (5 points)	Score	0
---	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Target bypassing for Longboat Pass and New Pass have not been adopted and no mitigation is needed, therefore no points awarded.

CEG calculated value: 0

Volume/mile/year (5 points)	Score	1.3
------------------------------------	--------------	------------

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department:

Restored in 1993 and nourished in 1997, 2006, 2016, and 2021 results in the average nourishment interval of 7 years. The project length is 53,000 feet or 10.04 miles. The planned sand placement volume as stated in the application is 30,000 cy.

CEG calculated value: 427

Tier 4

Successive unfunded requests (5 points)	Score	0
--	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: No

Department: Verified

Environmental habitat enhancement (5 points)	Score	0
---	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Not within designated critical habitat area.

Department: The project is within a designated critical habitat area. 2.32 miles or 23.1% of the project shoreline is armored, which does not meet the threshold of 30% to be considered extensive armoring and therefore be awarded points.

Overall readiness to proceed

Readiness to construct (1 point)	Score	1
---	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: N/A

Department: Eligible for the additional point.

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

Local Sponsor: Yes, both state and federal permits.

Department: Verified

Easements acquired (1 point)	Score	1
-------------------------------------	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Yes

Department: Verified

Local funds secured (1 point)	Score	1
--------------------------------------	--------------	----------

Local Sponsor: Yes

Department: Draft Resolution was submitted by application deadline.

Erosion Control Line established (1 point)	Score	1
--	-------	---

Local Sponsor: Yes

Department: Verified