

Charlotte County Grant Administrative Approval

Department	Making	Request:

Public Works-Engineering

Grant Coordinator Assigned:

April K. Santos

Fiscal Contact Assigned:

Kaitlin Rodriguez

Requested Action:

Approve grant application to Florida Dept of Environmental Protection(FDEP)-Beach Management Funding Assistance Program for FY 21/22 in the amount of \$1,094,456.00 for the reimbursement of work associated with the Charlotte County Erosion Control and Manasota Key Beach Restoration Projects. Est. total project cost for FY 21/22 is \$4,294,001.00.

Is this item budgeted? ⊠ Yes □ No

Budget Action:

No action needed. A budget amendment will be brought to the Board for approval if awarded. There is a local cost share of 63.5% of the total cost.

Financial Impact Summary Statement:

Funding for this expense will come from the Florida department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), Federal share will be provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the local cost share will be provided using funds from Boater Improvement Fund, Tourist Development Council, Stump Pass/Beach Nourishment MSTU, Manasota Key MSBU, and Don Pedro-Knight Island MSBU.

Background: (Why is the Action Necessary, and What Action will be accomplished)

We are requesting approval to apply for approximately \$1,094,456.00 of funding from the FDEP Beach Management Funding Assistance Program for FY 21/22. We also expect Federal funding in the amount of \$1,224,000.00. The total project cost is estimated at \$4,294,001.00 for this funding cycle. Local match required of approximatly \$1,975,545.00 to be determined based on the final amount of funding awarded. The deadline to apply for the grant is September 30, 2020. Funds will be used for reimbursement FY 21/21 Design, Monitoring, and Construction tasks for work associated with the Charlotte County Erosion Control Project and Manasota Key Beach Restoration.

Grant Checklist Attache ⊠ Yes □ No	ed? Ri	sk Assessment X Yes No	Attached?		n Resolutio ∕es ⊠ No	n Attached?
Signatures:	1. 1	lac	luche Plores	Date:	glacia	W
County Administrator	my	4	MICOLAL T. 1. 1. 6	Date:		
Department Director	Fisc	al Services	County At	ttorney	Grant C	Compliance
John Elias	Varga		Janeths	Mund	Eilly,	Digitally signed by Lilly, Cheryl Date: 2020.09.22
Date: 9-22-2020	Datibula		Date: 9/25/	120	Cheryl /	18:03:48 -04'00'
	-		LR20-063	2 PSP	~	



PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Local Sponsor	Charlotte County				
Local Sponsor Fe	ederal ID Number (FEID) #59-600054	1			
Contact Name	Matthew Logan	Title Pr	oject Manager		
Contact Name	Indititiew Logati	Tide Fi	oject Mariager		
Mailing Address	Line 1 410 Taylor Street				
Mailing Address	Line 2				
City Punta Gord	da	Zip Code 33950		Telephone Number	(941) 575-3610
Email Address	Matthew.Logan@charlottefl.com				
Additional Conta	ct Information				ř
	nat all information provided with this			he best of my knowle	dge.
Signature of Loca Electronic or scanned s	- m - M	for Hechr Flor	es		
Printed Name	HectorFlores Standard Attest:		Date	9/25/20	
	Roger D. Eaton, Clerk of the Circuit Court and Ex-officio Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners	Deputy Clerk	8	APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SURFICE COUNTY ATTO L R 2 1 - 063	DRNEY



PART III: EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Project Name: (as listed in the Strategic Beach Management Plan)

Manasota Key Beach Restoration Project and Charlotte County Erosion Control Project

2. Project Description: Include county, location with reference to FDEP range monuments, brief project history, and description of proposed activities. (Note: The box will expand as needed. To expand for printing purposes, click anywhere outside the box when complete.)

Introduction

The Project includes providing erosion control and shoreline stabilization measures including beach nourishment, maintenance dredge bypassing, and stabilizing structures for over eight miles of eroding gulf and inlet shorelines within the Manasota Barriers, Sarasota County and Charlotte County (Attachment A). The northern Project Boundary shall be located at Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) Reference Monument (R-monument) R173.4 in Sarasota County, extending south along Manasota Key for 1.91 miles including the Blind Pass Beach Park, to the Charlotte/Sarasota County line at R183.7, less a 0.60 mile GAP between R177.5 and R180.7, for a total length in Sarasota County of 1.31 miles. The Project continues from R1 in Charlotte County, extending south along Manasota Key for 3.84 miles including the Englewood Beach Park and Stump Pass Beach State Park, to Stump Pass, less a 0.24 mile GAP between R13.2 and R14.4, for a total length in Charlotte County of 3.60 miles. The Project continues on Palm-Knight-Bocilla-Don Pedro Islands extending from approximately 1,200 feet northeast of R22 along Stump Pass' southern inlet shoreline and then along the gulf-front shoreline to the southern southern Project Boundary located approximately 500 feet south of R40, equal to 3.57 miles. The total length of shoreline within the Project boundary that is designated critically eroding by FDEP is approximately 38,423 feet (R173.4 to R21.2, 500 feet of inlet shoreline, and R28 to R40.5).

The Projects are consistent with the State's Strategic Beach Management Plan and the Stump Pass Inlet Management Plan including these components:

- Renourish critically eroding beaches on Manasota Key;
- Maintain sand placed on Stump Pass Beach State Park to mitigate for inlet maintenance impacts;
- Place available sand from maintenance dredging on updrift and downdrift shorelines of Stump Pass;
- Maintain stabilizing structure at south end of Manasota Key;
- Address hot-spot maintenance or storm impacts using upland sand sources; and
- Maintain project through renourishment using sand from bypassing and offshore sources.

Key Features for FY21-22

The following are the key features for FY21-22:

- Renourish Updrift and North Beach Fills (approved for FEMA post-storm recovery assistance from Hurricane Irma-2017)
- Maintenance dredge Stump Pass on its 4-Year Cycle
- Conduct first year annual monitoring of Manasota Key and South Beach Fill projects.

Please see attached Location Map.



3. Use of Requested Program Funds: Provide a brief description of tasks to be comp Design, Construction, and/or Monitoring). Indicate which tasks are cost reimbursement.	·
UBF / NBF Renourishment Design & Permitting:	
UBF / NBF Renourishment Construction:	
MK Annual Physical and Biological Monitoring:	
 4. Map: Provide as an attachment. The map(s) of the project area must be formatted. Map elements must include: Compass rose with North arrow, scale, and legend. Project boundary, including the length of critically eroded shoreline 	at a minimum of 1" = 200' scale.
 FDEP range monuments Beach access: indicate primary or secondary access, and include the access width, stops, bike racks, and public restroom facilities Public lodging establishments: include the width fronting the project shoreline (fo 	
eligibility determination), and include the length of street-side frontage within on secondary public access point (for eligibility determination)	
· Comprehensive list of current land use designations of properties along the project ranking points)	t shoreline (for recreational benefits
 Include one-quarter mile buffer and provide a comprehensive list of the values of p by the buffer (for value of upland property ranking points) 	properties that are enclosed or intersected
5. Project length: Total restored project length (in feet) of the critically eroded area (as listed in the Strategic Beach Management Plan).	38,423 ft exclusive of GAPS



- 6. Eligibility: Public Beach Access and Public Lodging Establishments (required for all beach projects pursuant to 62B-36, F.A.C.)
 - Location/Name: Use the official name of the park or the name of the street end that is associated with the public access.
 - R-Monument: Use the DEP Range Monument that is closest to the main public access point.
- Type of Access: Indicate "Primary" or "Secondary" beach access in accordance with the definitions in Rule 62B-36, F.A.C.
- Width of Access/Frontage: The length of the legal boundary (in feet) of the public access location along the beach (project shoreline). For public lodging establishments that do not front the beach, indicate the street-side length of the legal property boundary (in feet) that is used as the main access to the establishment.
- Total Public Units:
 - Public lodging: The number of rooms available for public use divided by the total number of rooms in the establishment.
 - Parking spaces: Total number of public parking spaces that are available for use at the public access location.
- Additional Width from Eligibility Units: Total distance added to the shoreline width of a public access location. If there are various types of eligibility units used for this calculation, provide the names of the eligibility units and show the calculation separately.
- Eligible Shoreline: Sum of the Width of Access/Frontage and the Additional Width from Eligibility Units columns. Eligible shorelines cannot overlap.
- DBPR License: Provide the link to the Department of Business and Professional Regulation (DBPR) website for proof of licensure for any public lodging establishments used for eligibility or the Recreational Benefits ranking points (include separately, if needed).

Location/Name	R-Monument	Type of Access	Width of Access/Frontage	Total Public	Additional Width from Eligibility Unit	Eligible Shoreline (feet)	Website Link for DBPR License
BLIND PASS BEACH PARK	R176.4	Primary	3176	260	870	4046	-
Sunset Beach Rentals (fka Ko+	R1.7	Secondary	113	11		113	https:// www.myflorid
ENGLEWOOD BEACH PARK	R10	Primary	1905	312	5175	7080	
STUMP PASS STATE PARK	R16	Secondary	5780	65	951	6731	
ACCESSES A,B,C,D,E	R29-R38	Secondary	35	180	9504	9539	
			·				
					TOTAL	27,509	



7. Schedule and Budget:

- Cost Reimbursement: Specify eligible costs incurred during the three years prior to the current application's fiscal year that have not been reimbursed. Eligible costs will be included in the funding request for the current application.
- Current and Future Costs: Specify eligible costs for the current application's fiscal year that are not in a current DEP agreement and have not been reimbursed. Include the estimated costs for the next 5 years and the proposed phases for the next 10 years.

Year	Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
18/19	,					
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19						
18/19			,			
Year	Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
19/20		•				
19/20						
19/20						
19/20			1	i		
19/20						
19/20 19/20						
1 1						
19/20						
19/20 19/20						
19/20 19/20 19/20						
19/20 19/20 19/20 19/20						



Year	Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
20/21						
20/21						
20/21						
20/21				*		
20/21						
20/21						
20/21						
20/21						
20/21					35.65%	
20/21		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
20/21						
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
21/22	Design	Inlet Bypass, UBF & NBF Renourishment	\$43,000	\$0	\$15,330	\$27,671
21/22	Monitoring	Manasota Key and South Beach Annual Monitoring (Yr 1)	\$542,000	\$0	\$193,223	\$348,777
21/22	Construction	Inlet Bypass, UBF & NBF Renourishment	\$3,709,000	\$1,224,000	\$885,903	\$1,599,097
21/22						
21/22						
21/22						
21/22						
21/22						
21/22						
21/22						
21/22		,	,			
	y	• .				
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
22/23	Monitoring	Mana Key & South Beach (Yr 2), UBF & NBF (Yr 1)	\$678,000	\$0	\$241,707	\$436,293
22/23						



22/23			T			
22/23						
22/23						
22/23						
22/23						
22/23				,·		
22/23						
22/23						
22/23				v		
Year	Proposed Phase	Description .	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
23/24	Monitoring	Mana Key & South Beach (Yr 3), UBF & NBF (Yr 2)	\$679,000	\$0	\$242,064	\$436,937
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
23/24						
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
24/25	Design	Inlet Bypass, UBF & NBF Renourishment	\$47,000	\$0	\$16,756	\$30,245
24/25	Monitoring	UBF & NBF (Yr 3)	\$130,000	\$0	\$46,345	\$83,655
24/25						
24/25						
24/25						
24/25						
24/25				,	,	
		,				



	T		T			
24/25						
24/25						
24/25						
24/25						
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
25/26	Construction	Inlet Bypass, UBF & NBF Renourishment	\$4,015,000	\$0	\$1,431,348	\$2,583,653
25/26						
25/26		,				
25/26						
25/26						
25/26						
25/26						
25/26						
25/26						
25/26						
25/26						
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
26/27	Monitoring	UBF & NBF (Yr 1)				
26/27						
26/27						
26/27						
26/27						
26/27			,			
26/27						
26/27						
26/27						
26/27				,	,	
26/27						
į.	I					I



Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
27/28	Design	Mana Key & South Beach Renourishment				
27/28	Monitoring	UBF & NBF (Yr 2)				
27/28						
27/28						
27/28						
27/28						
27/28						
27/28						
27/28		,				
27/28						
27/28						
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
28/29	Design	Inlet Bypass, UBF & NBF Renourishment				
28/29	Monitoring	UBF & NBF (Yr 3)				
28/29	Construction	Mana Key & South Beach Renourishment				
28/29	,					
28/29						
28/29						
28/29						
28/29						
28/29						
28/29						
28/29						
Year	Proposed Phase	Description .	Total Estimated _Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
29/30	Monitoring	Mana Key & South Beach (Yr 1)				
29/30	Construction	Inlet Bypass, UBF & NBF Renourishment				



29/30						
29/30						
29/30	,					
29/30						
29/30						<u> </u>
29/30						
29/30						
29/30						
29/30						,
Year	Proposed Phase	Description	Total Estimated Cost	Federal Cost Share	State Cost Share	Local Cost Share
30/31	Monitoring	Mana Key & South Beach (Yr 2), UBF & NBF (Yr 1)				
30/31						
30/31						
30/31						
30/31						
30/31						
30/31						
30/31						
30/31						
30/31 30/31 30/31						

- **8. Tourism-related impacts:** Criteria is calculated by the Department. For reference, tax data can be obtained from the Department of Revenue website: https://floridarevenue.com/taxes/pages/colls from 7 2003.aspx.
 - Current funding request includes construction and year one post-construction monitoring
 - Project is managed by two or more counties

Additional comments

Project is managed by Charlotte and Sarasota Counties through an Interlocal Agreement. Please see attached.



9. Federal involvement : The documentation to verify authoriza must be provided with the application materials for the award	•	ge, and status of funding award
Is the project Federally authorized by the USACE? No		
Authorization Year: Expiration Year:		
Does this project have a signed USACE Chief's report for auth	norization of the requested phase	e? No
USACE federal cost share percentage for this project (exclud	ing FCCE):	
Select all that apply for the requested project phase(s):		
© Executed USACE project agreement	1	
○ Included in USACE work plan		
Approved FEMA Project Worksheet		
○ Included in Congressional Appropriations Act		
Other documentation: Please see attached PW for Hurn Beach Renourishment and inclu	ricane Irma that included the 202 Ides the 2021 UBF and NBF Reno	0 South urishment.
10. Storm damage reduction benefits: Criteria is calculated by	the Department.	
What is the volume (cy) of advanced nourishment lost since a beach restoration or nourishment project as measured abordon: Data should be consistent with the annual post-contour?	ve the Mean High Water	20,094 CY lost above MHW since 2017 renourishment of UBF and NBF
For restoration projects, what is the historical erosion rate?		
11. Cost effectiveness: Criteria is calculated by the Department. provided with the application materials for the award of points		pporting documentation must be
What is the proposed sand placement volume (cy)?	180,000 CY	
What is the nourishment interval (years)?	UBF & NBF: 4 Years MKBF	& SBF: 8 Years
Select all that apply for the current project funding request:		
CEnhanced longevity: Propose structural or design comp	onents that could extend the bea	ach nourishment interval
O Dune addition: Incorporate new or enhanced dune stru projects		
○ Innovative technology: Propose innovative technologie	s designed to reduce project cos	ts
Regionalization: Two or more local sponsors manage pr management strategies to conserve sand resources or r		ose regional sediment



Additional comments for storm damage Ir reduction benefits and a cost effectiveness	5	een Charlotte and Sarasota Counties for the regionalization of the	Project is	
12. Previous state commitm	ient			
Has the Department prev	viously reviewed, approved	d, and cost-shared on a feasibility or design phase for this project?	Yes	
Has the current proposed project phase(s) received a partial appropriation within 3 years of phase completion?				
Additional comments P	ending approval of Contra	act Amendment, remaining funds will be provided to the Counties	;	
13. Accessible beach area: C	riteria is calculated by the	Department. Provide data to be considered for the calculation.		
Describe the landward and seaward edge of the accessible beach width		CEC utilized the ECL & design templates for MK and SBF to compaccessible beach area added by the project, defined as the along length and cross-shore width. CEC utilized the 2017 pre-construc	shore	
Provide the project boundaries (R-monuments)		MK: SA: R173.4-R177.5, R180.7-R183.7; CH:R1-R13.2, R14.4-R15.3 SB: R28 to R40.5 SPBSP: R15.3-R21.2	•	
Provide citations of reference sources		ECL by CEC (December 2019) & Construction Monitoring/Surveys (2020) for MK & SBF. Construction Monitoring/Surveys by CEC (2020) for SPBSP (R15.3 to R21.2)		
		Blind Pass Park (3,176') + Sunset Beach Rentals (113') + Englewood Park (1,905') + (Stump Pass Beach State Park (6,731') + WCIND Log 12,125' / 38,423' = 31.6%		
15. Mitigation of inlet effect	ts: Criteria is calculated by	the Department.		
Additional comments				



Additional

comments

Quarterly reports were submitted on time.

16. Successive	unfunded reques	ts			
	nt proposed proje request(s) is the cu	ct phase(s) a successive, unfun urrent application?	nded request? If so, how r	many years of	
Does the su	uccessive request a	dd the construction phase?			
17. Environme	ntal habitat enha	ncement: Criteria is calculated	l by the Department.		
	ct within a designa e shoreline armori	ated critical habitat area for thr ng?	reatened or endangered	species that is subject	No
	ct within a non-de or endangered sp	signated area where extensive ecies?	e shoreline armoring thre	eatens the habitat of	No
		oes the project exceed best m ment strategies to protect reso			No
supporting for the strat	explanation and documentation tegies which t management				
18. Readiness t	o construct				
Does the project h	nave an active state	e permit? Yes	Does the project have	e an active federal pern	nit? Yes
Permit number	ECP:0194790	0-017-JC; MK:0359636-002	Permit number	ECP:1997-05200 (SP-	-MMB); MK:1997-0
Authorization date	e ECP: 9/2015;	MK: 5/2019	Authorization date	ECP: 2/2016; MK: 1/2	020
Expiration date	ECP: 9/2030;	MK: 5/2034	Expiration date	ECP: 2/2031; MK: 1/2	035
Has the nec draft Resolu	essary local fundir ution. The signed F	s been acquired for the upcoming been secured for the proposites of the proposition is due by November ablished along the project leng	sed project? If so, provid r 20, 2020.		
				<u> </u>	



,					
				1	
			· ·		
		(
					,
					•