

City of Treasure Island Beach Stewardship Committee

October 6, 1999 1:30 PM

PRESENT: Alan Sansotta, George Greenfield, Dennis Velasco, Bob Minning, Jim Terry, Chuck Coward, Andy Neff, Cliff Truitt.

Also present: Nicole Elko, USF

The Beach Stewardship Committee meeting was called to order at 1:40 PM by Chairman Alan Sansotta in the City Hall Auditorium at 120 - 108th Avenue, Treasure Island, Florida

1. The draft minutes of the September 8, 1999 meeting had been prepared and previously distributed to the members for review. On appropriate motion, the minutes were accepted as drafted.
2. Mr. Terry confirmed that a pre-construction meeting with the Contractor for the north groin project is scheduled for Tuesday, October 12th (Mr. Neff will attend, also). At that meeting the County expects to provide the Contractor with an order to proceed. The contract allows 270 days total time to complete the work. Although there is no specific "early-finish" incentive, the Contractor would likely complete the bulk of the work within about 5 months.
3. The Corps has now awarded a contract for the Upham/Sunset Beach Renourishment Project. However, the same contractor was also selected for a post-storm fill placement/recovery project in St. Augustine and the Corps has directed that the dredge complete that work before mobilizing to Pinellas County. This will extend our start date to after the first of next year.

Mr. Terry reported that the Corps has revised the John's Pass borrow area design to make a wider 'cut,' thereby increasing the maintenance benefits to the navigation channel. As a result, approximately 80,000 to 90,000 more cubic yards of sand would be available for the beach fill. This would assure that the 800-foot additional fill section of Sunset is included and *may* provide enough additional to add slightly to the 800 feet and/or place some sand in the file of the north groin after its completion.

Dr. Greenfield asked about the feasibility of stockpiling sand on the upland to be moved later when/where needed. Discussion continued to the effect that it is feasible and has been done in other projects. However, there can be problems with blocking view/use at the stockpile area, equipment traffic on the beach, noise, excess compaction, etc. It was noted that the large accretionary beach segment at mid-key comprises a natural stockpile.

City of Treasure Island Beach Stewardship Committee
Minutes of October 6, 1999
Page Two

Mr. Neff later noted, and Mr. Terry confirmed, that Rick McMillan from the Corps is planning a general inspection of the county shoreline, both on the ground and by helicopter, on October 7th. Included is a specific look at the area of Sunset proposed for extended fill placement. Alan Sansotta will arrange to meet with Mr. McMillan during the visit.

Mr. Terry noted that the State DEP staff seemed to have mis-counted available parking at Sunset Beach (for funding eligibility purposes). On-street parking in the area is permitted and increases the number of spaces to above the DEP maximum. This led to some general discussion of the eligibility rules and a request for additional information and follow-up coordination between the County and State staff. A copy of the applicable portions of the DEP's administrative rule is attached for information.

4. Bob Minning reported on his research into emergency beach recovery planning. He has talked with Allison Hagerup, the Director of the Captiva Erosion Prevention District, about their efforts. She is forwarding additional written information and a subsequent report by the subcommittee will be made at the next meeting. However, Mr. Minning noted that although Captiva has taken steps to provide funding authorization, long-term permits, pre-design and similar planning, their existing borrow area has only enough sand for one renourishment. Ms. Hagerup stated that they were going to use private funding in the near future to expand their borrow area/sand search to identify additional material. The committee noted the delays with recovery in the panhandle after Opal as an incentive to develop a program for Pinellas County. Similar efforts for several New Jersey beaches were noted again as positive examples.

5. Andy Neff followed-up on his review and previously distributed summary of the Corps General Reevaluation Report (1994)). As noted in his summary paper, the original project design was based on periodic renourishment at 5-year intervals with approximately 275,000 cubic yards (modified as a result of any monitoring data) through the year 2019.

At the previous meeting Jim Terry had offered to contact the Corps staff to request a general review of the shoreline conditions on the island and to have them look at any needed modifications to the project design. Mr. Neff had drafted a letter to Jim confirming this and suggesting several specific issues which the Corps might look at as part of such a review. The issues were discussed and the draft letter revised appropriately.

6. Mr. Neff also confirmed that the City had submitted a letter of interest to the Coastal Partnerships Initiative grants program, administered by the Florida Coastal Management Office in the Department of Community Affairs. He expects to complete the full application by

October 15th to request grant money to help fund the work of the Beach Stewardship Committee including the technical assistance provided to the City by Dr. Truitt's contract.

City of Treasure Island Beach Stewardship Committee
Minutes of October 6, 1999
Page Three

7. Ms. Elko provided a progress report on the USF study and some preliminary graphics showing shoreline change and accretion vs. erosion trends for the past year. She also showed aerial photography of the island at several times since 1970. The City has also located a file aerial from 1969, immediately following the original restoration project. Committee members continued review and discussion of this information following formal adjournment of the meeting.

8. The following were member comments and suggestions:

Mr. Coward stated that he was very encouraged by the recent positive developments in the groin and fill projects.

Mr. Velasco agreed and felt that the Committee seemed to be coming together in a very positive and directed way.

Dr. Greenfield asked two questions, the first of which was what effect might a proposed renovation and/or replacement of the Blind Pass bridge have on beach conditions at the north end. Mr. Terry responded with the reverse point, that a FDOT bridge consultant had reviewed the beach/groin plans and stated that he did not see any potential for our work to affect any bridge proposals. Mr. Coward noted that there would be ample time and opportunity to coordinate with FDOT, but that the City wanted to approach the bridge project as an 'opportunity' to improve several situations.

Dr. Greenfield re-stated his concern about emergency recovery following a storm, especially one which might be severe enough to cause damage to the beach, but not sufficient to "trigger" a formal FEMA/Corps emergency response. He asked what steps the County had taken, or *could* the City take, to address such a situation. No formal response plan exists, but might result from our review of the Captiva and New Jersey experience. It was suggested that this be added as an item in our letter to the County as a point of discussion with the Corps

9. The next committee meeting date was set for November 10, 1999.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 PM.

Draft Proposed Amendments
August 19, 1999

(15) "Public Beach Access" is a entry zone adjacent to a sandy beach under public ownership or control which is specifically used for providing access to the beach for the general public. The types of public beach access sites are defined as follows:

(a) "Primary Beach Access" is a site with at least 100 public parking spaces and public restrooms.

(b) "Secondary Beach Access" is a site with less than 100 public parking spaces, or no public restrooms.

(16) "Revalidation" is the annual process of evaluating the Statewide Long Range Budget Plan for which the Department shall seek legislative funding.

(17) "Statewide Long Range Budget Plan" is the planning document used by the Department to schedule the disbursement of funds over a given period of time. It is developed in coordination with eligible governmental entities based on the Strategic Beach Management Plan, and in accordance with procedures specified in section 62B-36.006 of this rule.

(18) "Strategic Beach Management Plan" is the Department's adopted plan for management of the sandy beaches of the state and their related coastal system pursuant to Section 161.161, F.S.

Specific Authority 161.088, 161.161, 370.021 FS. Law Implemented 161.091, 161.101, 161.161 FS. History-New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.02, 16B-36.002, Amended

(Substantial rewording of Rule 62B-36.003. See Florida Administrative Code for present text.)

62B-36.003 Policy.

(1) The Beach Erosion Control Program is established to develop and execute a Strategic Beach Management Plan for erosion control, beach preservation, restoration, renourishment and storm protection for the sandy beach resources of the State of Florida pursuant to sections 161.088, 161.091, 161.101, and 161.161, F.S.

(2) Projects receiving cost-sharing funds from the Department shall be conducted for the purpose of preserving sandy beaches and controlling erosion.

(3) No other funding source administered by any agency of the state of Florida may be used as the local government's required matching share. The local government's matching share shall include contributions from other local sources including the Florida Inland Navigation District, the West Coast Inland Navigation District, or local port authorities provided the funds are not derived from state appropriations. Federal funds may not be used for the local share, however, the state may contract with the Federal government directly.

Draft Proposed Amendments
August 19, 1999

(4) Except as noted in 62B-36.004, for a project to qualify for state funding pursuant to section 161.091, F.S., it must provide permanent public access to project areas at approximately half mile intervals and adequate vehicle parking (section 62B-36.005(2)).

(5) Beach erosion control projects funded by the Department shall be conducted in a manner that encourages cost-saving, fosters regional coordination of projects, optimizes management of sediments and project performance, and provides long-term solutions.

(6) Demonstration projects of new or innovative technologies which have the demonstrated potential to reduce project costs, conserve beach quality sand, extend the life of beach nourishment projects, or improve inlet sand bypassing are authorized for funding under the Beach Erosion Control Program.

Specific Authority 161.088, 161.161, 370.021 FS. Law Implemented 161.091, 161.101, 161.161 FS., History-New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.03, Amended 4-27-86, Formerly 16B-36.003, Amended

(Substantial rewording of Rule 62B-36.004. See Florida Administrative Code for present text.)

62B-36.004 Project Eligibility.

(1) Pursuant to section 161.101, F.S., the Department may cost share with eligible governmental entities for eligible project costs.

(2) To be eligible for cost sharing pursuant to sections 161.091, 161.101 and 161.161, F.S., beach erosion control projects shall meet the following criteria:

(a) Projects must be consistent with the Department's Strategic Beach Management Plan and Statewide Long Range Budget Plan and:

(b) Projects must be located in an area designated by the Department as a critical erosion area; and

(c) The project's sponsor must present sufficient information to the Department to verify that the project will:

1. Protect, preserve, maintain, or enhance the coastal system.
2. Be cost effective, with tangible benefits which exceed costs.
3. Provide a net positive enhancement to the environment and protect historically established habitat.

4. Be consistent with the Local Comprehensive Plan and Chapters 161, 253, 258, and Part IV of Chapter 373, F.S.

5. Be accessible to the general public. This criteria does not apply for inlet sediment bypassing or the initial restoration of downdrift shorelines

Draft Proposed Amendments
August 19, 1999

impacted by improved or altered navigation inlets.

(3) Pursuant to section 161.101, F.S., costs related to the daily operation and management of improved or altered navigation inlet facilities are not eligible for cost sharing. Such costs include but are not limited to the maintenance dredging and least cost disposal of dredged materials, construction of navigation safety features and activities, channel deepening or widening, construction of jetties or other stabilization structures, and the maintenance and operation of bypassing facilities (fixed or mobile).

(4) Subject to the limitations provided in sections 62B-36.004(1) through (3), and 62B-36.005, F.A.C., the costs related to the mitigation of adverse inlet impacts are eligible for cost sharing with the Department. Such costs include but are not limited to:

(a) The incremental costs of placing navigation dredged material on the beach or in a near shore disposal area and the costs of shaping, monitoring, and managing the material regardless of the level of available public access. However, the level of cost sharing shall be adjusted pursuant to section 62B-36.005(2), F.A.C., for projects which are conducted for beach management purposes rather than navigational purposes and for projects in which the sand is obtained from the inlet system;

(b) The acquisition and placement of supplemental sand needed to meet bypassing quantities on the downdrift beach including emptying upland disposal facilities identified in the Strategic Plan or an adopted Inlet Management Plan;

(c) Capital improvements to facilitate sand bypassing;

(d) Monitoring activities to measure bypassing performance; and

(e) Related planning, design, permitting, and monitoring activities.

Specific Authority 161.088, 161.161, 370.021 FS. Law Implemented 161.091, 161.101, 161.161 FS. History--New 6-10-83, Formerly 16B-36.04, Amended 4-27-86, Formerly 16B-36.004, Amended

(Substantial rewording of Rule 62B-36.005. See Florida Administrative Code for present text.)

62B-36.005 Project Cost Sharing.

(1) The maximum level of the Department's cost share is as follows.

(a) Feasibility study costs for potential new beach erosion control projects; 50%.

(b) Design, construction and related monitoring costs for beach erosion control projects; 50% of eligible costs.

(c) Feasibility and any special studies for maintenance of existing

Draft Proposed Amendments
August 19, 1999

projects; 50% of eligible costs.

(d) Biological and performance monitoring of demonstration or experimental projects sponsored by eligible governmental entities; 50% of eligible costs. However, the total state cost may not exceed 25% of the total eligible project costs.

(e) Departmental sponsored projects not involving local governments; 100% of the non-federal share. This category includes but is not limited to beach erosion control projects on state lands managed by the Department, regional shoreline monitoring, and sand searches.

(2) The maximum level of the state's cost share for projects included in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) above shall be further adjusted to correspond to the level of public accessibility using the following criteria:

(a) Primary beach access sites shall be granted eligibility for one-half mile in each shore-parallel direction from the access site plus the shoreline length of the access site. For example, a public access site having 500 feet of shoreline with 100 public parking spaces and restrooms available will be eligible for 2,640 feet in each shore-parallel direction plus 500 feet which exists at the access site for a total of 5,780 feet of eligibility (2,640' + 500' + 2,640' = 5,780').

(b) The remainder of the proposed project not found eligible under the above will be analyzed in terms of secondary beach access as follows:

1. Determine the project boundary and the total project shoreline length using the Department's aerial photomaps.

2. Locate all public lands currently used for beach access located within the project boundary and within 1/4 mile (1,320 feet) in both shore-parallel directions from the project boundaries. Public lands to be used as future access sites may be included.

3. Determine and map public beach access boundaries. Public beach access boundaries will be determined for each access site, and will include the shore-parallel length of the access site plus one quarter of a mile (1,320 feet) in both shore-parallel directions from the access site edge.

4. Determine the number of public parking spaces available within each public beach access boundary. Parking spaces must be located within 1/4 mile (1,320 feet) in both shore-parallel directions from the access site edge and 1/4 mile landward of the project boundary, and must be available to the public on an equal basis.

5. Determine the length of eligible shoreline within each access boundary. One-Hundred percent eligibility is determined on the basis of 100 parking spaces per mile, or on a prorated number if the public beach access boundaries span less

Draft Proposed Amendments
August 19, 1999

than one (1) mile.

For example, a public beach access with 500 feet of shoreline length would have public beach access boundaries spanning 3,140 feet (500' + 1,320' + 1,320' = 3,140'). The public beach access boundaries encompass 3,140 feet, or 59 percent of one mile. Therefore, because 100 public parking spaces on a per mile basis are required and the accessible beach length is 59 percent of one mile, the required number of public parking spaces for 100% project eligibility within the subject public beach access boundaries is 100 x 59, or 59.

6. If the required number of public parking spaces necessary to obtain 100% eligibility is not available, the length of eligible shoreline shall be determined on the basis of 52.8 feet per available public parking space.

For example, using the same shoreline length of 500 feet as in the example provided above, if only 40 public parking spaces were available then only 2112 feet of the shoreline would be considered eligible (40 x 52.8 = 2112).

7. Determine the percentage of the total project which is eligible for state funding. The percentage shall be determined using the sum in feet of the eligible shoreline length within each public access boundary using the criteria in either paragraph 5 or 6 of this section, divided by the total project shoreline length.

8. Publicly owned or controlled public beach accesses that do not have public parking available and are not considered eligible under a previous factor, shall be granted eligibility for the shoreline length of the public access only.

(c) Public lodging establishments, such as hotels and motels licensed with the Department of Business and Professional Regulation, Division of Hotels and Restaurants shall be granted 100 percent eligibility for its beachfront property. This factor specifically excludes apartment buildings, rooming houses, rental condominiums, time share, and transient apartments.

(3) Cost savings which occur due to the planned geographic coordination or sequencing of two or more discrete erosion control projects will primarily be credited to the local sponsor. For purposes of this section, planned geographic coordination is the linking of two or more independent projects that have not historically been linked, such as an inlet bypassing activity and beach nourishment project, and geographic sequencing means combining two projects together for the purpose of construction contracting. The amount credited shall not exceed the state's maximum cost share amount of 75 percent of the eligible

Treasure Island: 1998-1999 Sediment Budget

