

**MANAGEMENT & PLANNING COMMITTEE  
AGENDA REQUEST FORM  
COMMISSION DISTRICT #3**

**PRESENTED BY:**  
Steve Boutelle

**REQUESTED BY:**  
Public Works / Natural Resources

**TITLE OF ITEM FOR THE AGENDA:**  
Fort Myers Beach Renourishment Status

**1. DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVE OF THE ISSUE**

Discuss details and provide policy direction regarding continued viability of the Estero Island Federal Shore Protection Project.

**2. PROPOSE POLICY, PROCEDURE OR PLAN OF ACTION**

On April 28, 2009, the County executed an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the Town of Fort Myers Beach to define roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Estero Island Shore Protection Project. Prior to that date there had been considerable discussion about easements required to construct the project as designed (3/2/09 M&P; 3/14/09 BOCC Commissioner Item). The discussion and direction to staff was clear that key parcels should be identified, easements should be solicited, and based on the success of that effort, a decision on project implementation would be made. Since the execution of the ILA, there have been 3 mailings, 1 workshop, 1 radio show, and over 24 meetings with individual property owners.

The ILA included a rescission clause for anyone with existing easements. That resulted in an immediate decline in easement coverage from 63.4% (pre-ILA) to 42.4% (5/29/09; 31 days post-ILA). The result of the outreach efforts described above has been an increase in coverage to 49.7% (11/13/09). The continued difficulty in securing easements and the year-end expiration of a \$2MM State appropriation for construction require that the Board consider their options and provide direction to staff. Similar concerns have been expressed by the Town in the November 10, 2009 letter from Mayor Kiker (attached). FDEP has requested that we notify them as soon as possible regarding the likelihood of project construction in 2010 so they can determine reallocation of the state funding.

**3. OPTIONS (List Advantages/Disadvantages of Each Option Listed)**

See attached Options and Impacts.

**4. FINANCIAL IMPACTS/FUNDING SOURCE**

See attached Options and Impacts.

**5. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS, AND JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

**6. Mandated:**    Y     N

**BY WHAT AUTHORITY?**

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR SIGNATURE

COUNTY MANAGER SIGNATURE

MEETING DATE

TIME REQUIRED

December 7, 2009

15 minute presentation  
plus BOCC discussion  
time est. 30 mins.

**MANAGEMENT & PLANNING COMMITTEE  
AGENDA REQUEST FORM  
COMMISSION DISTRICT #3**

**TITLE OF ITEM FOR THE AGENDA:**  
Fort Myers Beach Renourishment Status

December 7, 2009

## Options and Impacts

### A. Terminate Project Work

This option would entail stopping efforts to complete any nourishment project on Estero Island at this time. The \$2MM appropriation would be released to FDEP for use on other state beach projects. The permits would expire 3/5/2012.

Advantages include reallocation of staff time to other projects. The action would be consistent with the majority opinion of the private beachfront property owners as expressed through their unwillingness to execute easements.

Disadvantages include remaining vulnerability of the critically eroded shoreline and adjacent properties.

### B. Construct the Project

This option entails finalizing construction plans and specifications and hiring a contractor to build the project with whatever easements we have or can obtain. In the best scenario we will not reach 100% participation; our history with many property owners suggests it will be below 75%. That will translate to a more complicated, less effective and more expensive project, particularly for the County. The BOCC will need to make a policy decision about the value of doing the project with gaps and lower federal (increased County) funding. Based on owner comments, the only apparent option to improve easement participation would be to relax the vegetation planting requirement and make it voluntary.

Even a project with gaps in it will provide some level of storm protection as well as recreational and natural resource value. The tradeoff is that the unit cost of sand placement would be higher, the cost to the County would be higher, and the longevity of the project would be lower. We should be able to implement this option quickly enough to preserve the State cost sharing. The ILA requires the County to advance the **entire** cost of the project. State and Town reimbursement can be expected within 30 days of invoice. Federal reimbursement will likely take several years. [Example: Gasparilla Restoration was completed in Spring 2007; Federal share = \$5,866,811.52; reimbursement to date = \$3,504,400.00; outstanding balance = \$2,362,411.52 with only \$645,000 anticipated in FY10.]

### C. Design and Construct a Modified Project

The primary County coastal infrastructure on Estero Island consists of Lynn Hall and Bowditch Beach Parks and the navigation channel into Matanzas Pass. It would be possible to reduce the dredge frequency requirement of the channel and to stabilize the northern end of the island (currently the most eroding) by construction of the terminal groin that was designed to be a part of the comprehensive project.

This option would require at least a new state permit. The permit review process could take over a year to complete and would determine how much sand might also be required to ensure there are no negative impacts to adjacent shorelines. This smaller scale option would probably not qualify for federal funding, but would be eligible for WCIND funding because of the direct connection to navigation. State cost sharing eligibility would need to be determined. Total project cost is estimated at \$3.5MM. Temporary easements in this area are more likely to be obtained although vegetation requirements will still result in some objection or holdouts.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### Cost Estimate

#### Construction Cost Estimate based on Gasparilla Island Bid Prices (2006/2007)

(Design, Permitting and Engineering Costs have not been included.)

| Item                    | Unit Cost        | Quantity  | Estimated Cost      |
|-------------------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Mob / Demob             | 1 ea.            | 1         | \$1,500,000         |
| Monitoring & Misc.      | 1ea.             | 1         | \$225,000           |
| Sand Placement          | \$8 / cyd        | 1,010,000 | \$8,080,000         |
| Groin Construction      | 1 ea.            | 1         | \$508,000           |
| Vegetation              | 1 ea.            | 1         | \$82,368            |
| Construction Management | \$60,000 / month | 3         | \$180,000           |
| <b>Total</b>            |                  |           | <b>\$10,575,368</b> |

Federal Cost Share Based on Linear Feet of Shoreline Encompassed in a Storm Reduction Easement (Federal); maximum Federal eligibility based on acquiring 100% of Easements is 63.01%.

### Cost Distribution Estimate by Easement Level

Percent shoreline under  
Federal easement:

|      | Federal Cost | State Cost  | Bed Tax     | Town        |
|------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 100% | \$6,663,539  | \$1,788,879 | \$1,708,550 | \$ 414,400  |
| 90%  | \$5,997,185  | \$1,788,879 | \$2,244,831 | \$ 544,472  |
| 80%  | \$5,330,832  | \$1,788,879 | \$2,781,113 | \$ 674,544  |
| 75%  | \$4,997,655  | \$1,788,879 | \$3,049,254 | \$ 739,580  |
| 70%  | \$4,664,478  | \$1,788,879 | \$3,317,395 | \$ 804,617  |
| 60%  | \$3,998,124  | \$1,788,879 | \$3,853,676 | \$ 934,689  |
| 50%  | \$3,331,770  | \$1,788,879 | \$4,389,958 | \$1,064,761 |

Grayed out scenarios are not deemed feasible but included for reference.

