

CWG Review 1: Spring 2015

Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action

S-124 Facilitate the creation of regional (inlet-to-inlet) beach management strategies, such as can be achieved through a beach management agreement (BMA), which takes an ecosystem approach to projects such as beach nourishment and storm-water pipe removal to maintain beaches and protect resources.

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

What is the end product/result of this management action?

- A regional, ecosystem-based approach to beach management. Improved regulation and streamlined application / permitting process for beach nourishment. Beach management agreements would be developed for portions of the SEFCRI region, for example from one inlet to another inlet. Development of a region-wide BMA for the entire SEFCRI region is not advised due to differences in the coastal dynamics and nearshore resources throughout this region; moreover, BMAs should be developed in only those areas with political and public support. It may not be feasible to get stakeholders and local governments on-board with BMAs in all portions of the SEFCRI region, but this approach should be applied where practicable. By statutory requirement the implementation of a BMA type agreement requires a net positive environmental benefit.
- There is a required annual (public) review of town of Palm Beach BMA – The agreement allows for adaptive management.
- Some lessons learned have already been identified:
 - The regional cell monitoring approach is a new concept is still a year or two away from being fully implemented and then it takes a few years to see monitoring data that will allow management to base changes on.
 - Not all projects within the town of Palm Beach BMA region were included in the BMA. Road/storm water drainage was not included because it is under a completely different regulatory framework. On a case-by-case basis, DEP Beaches does regulate structures if they are below mean high water and can include them in regional frameworks.
 - The agreement is limited only to those actions regulated under the JCP process. Other activities may be relevant (for example upland stormwater) but these cannot be addressed through the BMA process.
- The town of Palm Beach BMA will be reviewed, as well as similar other projects and processes, in the development of these plans.

3. Duration of Activity

Is this a discrete action or a recurring activity? Explain.

- This management action involves recurring activities. Beach management agreements must be created and management will be on-going. Management should be adaptive and continually improve over time. To date only one such agreement has been executed and it required a considerable effort by all parties. Maintenance of the current agreement is ongoing and requires a fair amount of effort

4. Justification

What issue or problem will this management action address? Explain.

- Permits for beach management activities (including erosion control structures and nourishments) are issued on a project-by-project basis, which reduces the efficiency of permitting and regulatory actions. Additionally, BMAs have a positive environmental benefit; this regional approach to beach management allows for a more holistic evaluation of environmental resources as opposed to the current project-by-project approach.

5. Potential Pros

What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?

- Regional, ecosystem-based beach management can streamline the permitting process, increase efficiencies, reduce costs, and provide net ecosystem benefits. BMAs may result in a more holistic approach to resource management.

6. Potential Cons

What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?

- Creating beach management agreements takes a considerable amount of time and some start-up costs should be expected.
- The use of BMAs is a relatively novel approach to beach management, which will need to be refined and improved-upon over time using an iterative process based on lessons-learned from the current BMA.
- It is uncertain at this time whether the framework meets the intended results.
- As stated above, upfront costs are higher - especially associated with regional monitoring – which may have reduced the number of monitoring sites.
- Good idea to support this concept, but it is premature to create new BMAs until we know the 1st one (in town of Palm Beach) is actually working.

7. Location

County/Countries: Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, Other?

- This management action relates to all 4 counties in the SERCRI region.

Relevant Habitats: Coral reef, seagrass, watershed, etc.?

- A BMA would monitor all nearshore resources such as hardbottom / seagrasses.

Specific Location: City, site name, coordinates, etc.?

-

8. Extent

Area, number, etc.

- This management action is large-scale and long-term.

9. Is this action spatial in nature?

- yes

Do you believe this management action could be informed by the Our Florida Reefs Marine Planner Decision Support Tool?

If yes, you will proceed to the next section on Marine Planner Information.

- no

Tier 2 Information:

WHY?

1. Strategic Goals & Objectives to be Achieved

Refer to the [SEFCRI Coral Reef Management Goals and Objectives Reference Guide](#).

- MICCI Conservation Goal C – Minimize and where possible eliminate habitat destruction from maritime industry and coastal construction activities. MICCI Issue 1 Goal – Protect coral systems from impacts associated with projects in and around the reef tracts of southeast Florida. MICCI Issue 1 Goal Obj 1 – Increase effectiveness of permit conditions to protect coral communities and increase efficiency of regulatory review. MICCI Issue 1 Goal Obj 2 – Avoid and minimize impacts to coral reef ecosystems from dredge and fill activities. Reduce the areal

extent of project-related impacts. MICCI Issue 2 Goal – Change coastal construction practices in ways that protect marine and estuarine habitats. MICC Issue 2 Goal Obj 1 – Demonstrate avoidance and minimization of impacts to resources at the project planning stage. Other Strategic Management Goal A1 – Ecosystem-based approach to management.-

2. Current Status

Is this activity currently underway, or are there planned actions related to this recommendation in southeast Florida? If so, what are they, and what is their status.

- Yes, this action is currently underway in town of Palm Beach, on Palm Beach Island, where a Beach Management Agreement (BMA) was created to enable a region-wide, ecosystem approach to beach management. Monitoring for the Palm Beach BMA is on-going and biological and physical data will be evaluated as they become available. At this time, no other BMAs have been created. However, an ecosystem management agree (EMA) has been established in St. Joe.
- The current BMA is just over a year old and it is too early to determine the effectiveness yet. All parties are engaged and monitoring progress.

3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)

What potential environmental benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?

- A regional, ecosystem-based approach to beach management is the ultimate outcome of this recommended management action. A regional, ecosystem-based beach management can improve comprehensive coastal management (which includes better management of resources), generate cost efficient and efficient permitting process, which will reduce costs, time delays, and uncertain permitting. Additionally, BMAs are required to provide net ecosystem benefits to the environment.-

What potential social/economic benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?

- A regional, ecosystem-based beach management can streamline the application / permitting process for beach nourishment. Regional beach management can provide necessary erosion control, which is needed for protecting beach-front properties and stimulating the economy. Managing large areas can result in an economy-of-scale, therefore, the cost of beach projects may be reduced (e.g., by combining costs, creating efficiencies, and reducing uncertainties).

What is the likely duration of these benefits - short term or long-lasting? Explain.

- The benefits of regional beach management are expected to be long-lasting. Nourishment projects are done at regular intervals and are likely to become increasingly necessary as sea-levels are projected to rise and storm events are expected to become more severe / frequent.

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)

What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?

- None

What potential negative social/economic impacts might this action have?

- Creating beach management agreements takes a considerable amount of time and some start-up costs should be expected.
- The current BMA is under evaluation regarding outcomes. It is too early to make conclusions regarding the costs and benefits. The current BMA required considerable upfront effort and additional costs.

What is the likely duration of these negative impacts - short term or long-lasting? Explain.

- Short term: while start-up costs are expected, once BMAs are in-place, financial impacts are suspected to decrease. The current town of Palm Beach BMA could be evaluated over time to assess if / when costs are recouped.

5. Risk

What is the threat of adverse environmental, social, or economic effects arising from not implementing this action?

- If regional, ecosystem-based beach management agreements are not created, then nourishment projects will continue to be permitted and regulated on a project-by-project basis, which is relatively inefficient for areas where projects often overlap and are handled by multiple permittees, and limits resource monitoring to the direct project area. Managing large areas can result in an economy-of-scale, therefore, continuing to manage projects on an individual level may result in additional costs to permittees, but this has yet to be verified.

6. Relevant Supporting Data

What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)

- BMAs are allowed under 403.0752, Florida Statutes; BMAs are authorized via execution of the agreement.

7. Information Gaps

What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?

- This regional approach to beach management has recently been instituted in Palm Beach County on Palm Beach Island; while there are uncertainties regarding this approach it seems promising.
- It is necessary to determine which portions of the SEFCRI region have sufficient support from local governments and stakeholders to develop BMAs.
- Being currently involved in the current BMA, I see both advantages and disadvantages at present. the jury is still out.

WHEN?

8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation

How long will this recommendation take to implement?

- 0 - 2 years

9. Linkage to Other Proposed Management Actions

Is this activity linked to other proposed management recommendations?

- yes

If so, which ones, and how are they linked? (e.g., is this activity a necessary step for other management actions to be completed?)

- Regional management of beaches is linked to another management action regarding regional biological monitoring of nearshore resources that may be impacted by beach nourishment projects. For example, the BMA for the town of Palm Beach includes regional biological monitoring. However, regional monitoring could potentially be done without BMAs.

Does this activity conflict with other existing or proposed management actions?

- no

WHO?

10. Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation

What agency or organization currently has/would have authority? Refer to the [Agencies and Actions Reference Guide](#).

- The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), which previously authorized the town of Palm Beach Island BMA.

11. Other Agencies or Organizations

Are there any other agencies or organizations that may also support implementation? Explain.

- Yes, local governments (Counties, Cities, towns), as well as FWCC, and federal agencies (USACE, NOAA, FWS,

NMFS) would also be involved in the creation of regional beach management agreements. The BMA approach to beach management requires a high degree of coordination between multiple entities, including but not limited to regulatory agencies, permittees, agents, contractors, and monitoring firms.

12. Key Stakeholders

Identify those stakeholders most greatly impacted by this management action, including those from whom you might expect a high level of support or opposition. Explain.

- Local (city and county) and state government, and other stakeholders involved with beach nourishment projects would be most impacted by this management action. Local sponsors of beach projects may be most affected by the adoption of a BMA-approach to beach management.

HOW?

13. Feasibility

Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.

- Yes, FDEP has previously supported this action and established a BMA for the Town of Palm Beach Island. The level of coordination required should not be underestimated. The current BMA required a huge commitment.

What are the potential technical challenges to implementing this action? Has it been done elsewhere?

- Yes, creation of regional management will require collaboration and cooperation between various stakeholder groups. The BMA approach to beach management requires strong support / commitment from local entities and stakeholders, the importance of which should not be underestimated.

14. Legislative Considerations

Does the recommendation conflict with or actively support existing local, state, or federal laws or regulations? Explain.

- This action is supported in statute (403). The action is consistent with current rule and statute.

15. Permitting Requirements

Will any permits be required to implement this action? Explain.

- Yes – 403, 0752, F.S. authorizes BMAs

16. Estimated Direct Costs

Approximately how much will this action likely cost? (Consider one-time direct costs, annual costs, and staff time, including enforcement.)

- -A summary of costs associated with the existing BMA has not been conducted (yet). Developing the plan is mostly staff time and meetings and such, most likely a relatively low cost

Will costs associated with this activity be one-time or recurring?

- Recurring

If recurring, approximately how long will staff time and annual costs be necessary to implement the management action?

- A lot of money is involved up-front. The start-up costs to establish BMAs are not expected to be incurred one-time. Some costs may be involved in updating BMAs and reviewing their effectiveness.-

17. Enforcement

Does this require enforcement effort?

- No

18. Potential Funding Sources

Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.

- State and local government agencies that are currently responsible for regulating beach nourishment activities would be the funding source for this management action.

- Local municipalities and counties.
- Five additional points would be awarded in the ranking process for the state cost-share funding if a BMA is executed, i.e., if there were two or more projects and two or more eligible governments / sponsors.

19. Measurable Outcomes/Success Criteria/Milestones

How will the success of this recommendation be measured? How will you know when the intended result is achieved?

- The intended result will be achieved when BMAs are in place for all 4 counties in the SEFCRI region. The success can be measured in the cost required for projects. The time to process applications for beach projects could also be tracked. Additionally developing a better understanding of resource management could be measured as a success. This would be measured through development of better resource management tactics and procedures.

SEFCRI/TAC Targeted Questions:

1. **TAC** - Is the recommendation likely to achieve the intended result? Explain.

Tier 1 – #2 (Intended Result - Output/Outcome)

- -

2. **TAC** - Is the recommendation sufficient to address the identified issue or problem? Explain.

Tier 1 – #4 (Justification)

- -

3. **TAC** - Is the recommendation technically achievable from a science or management perspective? Explain.

Tier 2 – #8 (Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #13 (Feasibility)

- -

4. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Has this been done (by SEFCRI, other agencies or organizations in the SEFCRI region)? Explain.

Tier 2 – #2 (Current Status)

- -

5. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Is this recommendation a research or monitoring project? (Recommendations should be turn-dirt management actions, not the step you take before a management action). Explain.

- -

6. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - If either of the following applies to this management action, provide feedback on which information submitted by the Community Working Groups may be more appropriate, or if entries should be merged. Explain.

- There are different viewpoints for an individual management action (i.e. two working group members provided separate information, as indicated by a '/' marking between them).
- Information submitted for this and other draft management actions is sufficiently similar that they might be considered the same.

- -

7. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors** - Non-agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? Explain.

Tier 1 - #5 (Potential Pros), Tier 1 - #6 (Potential Cons), Tier 2 - #3 (Intended Benefits), Tier 2 - #4 (Indirect Costs) and Tier 2 - #12 (Key Stakeholders)

- SEFCRI Team Group Discussion:
- Tried to provide comments to direct the CWGs; direct them to existing BMAs etc. (e.g., read the BMA and if you have comments or concerns start there).
- Better management would include what are more sustainable ways to renourish the beach? Sand bypass, move sand to hotspots. One suggestion at that Coastal Ocean Task Force is to possibly try to manage beach projects more holistically, rather than such a localized focus. Sand bypass could be an option.
- Have tried to get mandatory re-vegetation to beaches in permit applications. This has been an issue as people want clear views of the beach. Or they just want palm trees vs. sea oats, sea grapes, etc. Some counties are better than others. The price of renourishment has gone up (truck haul vs. dredging) the alternatives of vegetation and BMPs are starting to be more attractive.

8. SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - Agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from a management perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your agency's management perspective? Explain.

Tier 2 – #10 (Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #11 (Other Agencies or Organizations)

- -