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Economic Analysis and Benefit Evaluation For Storm Induced Damages<br>Brevard County, Florida Shore Protection Project Mid-Reach Segment

## INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this Appendix is to provide the economic benefits for the Brevard County Shore Protection Project, Mid-Reach Segment. This was accomplished by identifying potential losses that could occur from storm-induced damages to residential, commercial and retail structures along the beach. The analysis assessed the expected damages caused by storms without the project and the National Economic Development (NED) benefits to be derived from improvements based on the expected reduction in storm damages. An analysis of the recreational benefits to be derived from alternative plans was incorporated into the final results.
2. Brevard County is located on the eastern coast of Florida, about midway between Jacksonville and Miami, and about 14 miles south of Port Canaveral. It is comprised of wetlands, marshes, undeveloped land, agricultural, and urban areas. The Mid-Reach Segment is so named as it is in the middle of the county between the Federally authorized and constructed North and South Reaches of the Brevard County Shore Protection Project. The Mid-Reach Segment contains parts of the cities of Satellite Beach, Indian Harbour Beach, Indialantic, and unincorporated Brevard County. The Mid-Reach consists of approximately 7.78 miles of shoreline, from the south end of Patrick Air Force Base to approximately Flug Avenue in Indialantic (from Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) monument R75.4 to R119).
3. The Brevard County Mid-Reach shoreline is impacted by long term erosion of the shoreline, which has reduced the volume of material available to buffer against storm attack. The beach is impacted additionally by periodic storms that have accelerated beach erosion and increased the probability for damage to structures. The Mid-Reach shoreline is affected by both tropical cyclones (tropical depressions, tropical storms and hurricanes) and extra-tropical storms (northeasters). The results are large-scale erosion and dramatic shoreline changes over relatively short periods of time. Under severe storm conditions, super-elevation of water levels and substantial wave energy allows breaking waves to occur at increasing elevations on the beach, increasing the risk of coastal structures to damage. Economic losses are realized when storms damage coastal properties.
4. The beach along Brevard County is also an important recreational resource to the County and a significant part of the County's tax base. Public beach areas are scattered along the length of the shoreline. Recreational use of the beach is taken into account in a recreational benefit analysis of project alternatives.

## PREVIOUS STUDIES

5. An economic evaluation of the Mid-Reach segment was included in early efforts of the September 1996 Brevard County Shore Protection Project Feasibility Study. The Mid-Reach segment was removed from the selected plan due to environmental concerns that required further analysis. The General Reevaluation Study was initiated to consider the Mid-Reach segment independently so as to appropriately address all concerns.
6. This Economic Appendix attempts to follow the same principles as that initiated in the Feasibility Study and follow current policy and regulations. New alternative formulation, structural inventory, storm damage assessment, and recreational benefit calculations were completed to identify the NED plan for the Mid-Reach segment.

## THE STUDY AREA

7. The Mid-Reach study area extends from the southern end of Patrick Air Force Base (DEP 75.4) south to approximately Flug Avenue in Indialantic (DEP 119) where the Brevard County South Reach project begins. The length of the study area is about 7.78 miles. The study area was divided into six Reaches based on the acreage of nearshore rock. Reach 1 is the farthest south and Reach 6 is the farthest north, as shown in Table B-1 and Figure B-1. These reaches are used in developing the benefits and costs for incremental analysis

Table B-1: Reach Lengths

| Reach | Start DEP <br> Monument | End DEP <br> Monument | Reach Length <br> (feet) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Reach 1 | $\mathrm{R}-109$ | $\mathrm{R}-119$ | 9,599 |
| Reach 2 | $\mathrm{R}-105.5$ | $\mathrm{R}-109$ | 3,406 |
| Reach 3 | $\mathrm{R}-99$ | $\mathrm{R}-105.5$ | 6,239 |
| Reach 4 | $\mathrm{R}-93$ | $\mathrm{R}-99$ | 5,603 |
| Reach 5 | $\mathrm{R}-83$ | $\mathrm{R}-93$ | 9,029 |
| Reach 6 | $\mathrm{R}-75.4$ | $\mathrm{R}-83$ | 7,207 |



Figure B-1: Brevard Mid-Reach Study Area

## Existing Conditions

8. A structural inventory was compiled for all properties vulnerable to coastal waves and surge in the Mid-Reach study area. Jacksonville District real estate specialists completed a physical inspection and field work in April 2005. The real estate values were updated to 2008 price levels using the construction cost index from the Engineering News Record. In addition, information from Brevard County and Olsen Associates 2003 study of the Mid-Reach area was used. The Florida Department of Revenue conducts annual audits for each county to insure that the appropriate values are being used for assessments and that information used to adjust assessments each year has been verified in the market. In Florida, the assessments are based on a depreciated replacement cost and, by law, the assessments are to reflect between 85 to $90 \%$ of the market value. The values of structures and improvements used by the county tax appraiser's office were developed using the cost approach. The assessed values for each structure within the project area were obtained from the County. The subject properties were then analyzed to see if any recent sales had occurred and adjusted accordingly. Structure values are presented in 2008 price level and represent the replacement cost of the structure less depreciation. The predominant structures are condominiums and single-family homes, with few commercial/retail structures. Only structures east of Highway A1A were included in the inventory since the storm damage model used in this analysis is based on recession. Highway A1A is a major highway and would protect areas to the west from being impacted by recession.
9. The existence of hazardous material, which may or may not be present on the property, was not observed by the appraiser. The appraiser has no knowledge of the existence of such materials on or in the property. The appraiser, however, is not qualified to detect such substances. The presence of substances such as asbestos, urea-formaldehyde foam insulation or other hazardous materials may affect the value of the property. The value estimate is predicated on the assumption that there is no such material on or in the property that would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for any such conditions, or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them. Verification of sales data was not completed as part of this study.
10. Research into the content value from insurance sources and similar USACE projects, indicated a range of content values between $10 \%$ and $50 \%$ of the structure value. A factor of $25 \%$ was applied to the structure values to compute the content value. The structure values are shown in Table B-2.
11. Additional information was assembled for the analysis including structure locations, number of floors, year of construction, and coastal armoring. Field investigations, 2004 aerial photography, February 2005 topographic and bathymetric surveys, the Brevard County parcel database, and existing reports were used to gather this information. The majority of structures along the Mid-Reach have no coastal armor. Coastal armor, when present, was inventoried for type and protective
value. A land value of $\$ 15$ per linear foot was determined by Jacksonville District real estate staff for nearshore properties and adjusted to $\$ 16.31$ per linear foot using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The shoreline position change rates were provided by Jacksonville District Engineering Division for each reach along the Mid-Reach based on historical and recent survey information (see Table B-3).
12. Three linear measurements were made for each structure in reference to shoreline position: (1) distance to the coastal armor, (2) distance to the face of the structure, and (3) distance to the failure point of the structure. Structures on slabs were assumed to fail at the midpoint of the structure and structures on piles were assumed to fail at the landward point of the structure. The age of the structure was used to aid in determining which method to use, following a Florida building code change in 1985 that required most coastal construction to use pile supports.
13. A relationship between shoreline recession and storm events (surge), presented as frequency in percent occurrence and recession in feet was also developed. A cooperative study between investigators at the Coastal Engineering Research Center [CERC] and the Department of Water Resources Engineering [DWRE] developed a numerical model program [SBEACH] which calculates dune and beach erosion produced by storm waves and water levels. Use of SBEACH is required for beach fill design projects pursuant to a letter dated 28 September 1990 from the Director of Civil Works, Department of the Army. SBEACH was used to analyze shoreline recession in the 1996 Feasibility Study for Brevard County. Review by Jacksonville District coastal engineers concluded that no new information was available that would change the results of that modeling effort and that the storm frequency relationship used in the 1996 study was still relevant to the current Mid-Reach study. Storm induced recession is defined as the horizontal distance from the mean high water shoreline to the furthermost landward extent of the storm erosion envelope. It is assumed that the storm induced recession distance is the predicted mean recession distance for a given surge event.

Table B-2: Structure Values (shown by Reach from north to south)

| REACH 6 |  | Structure | Content | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Name | Street Address | Value | Value (25\%) | Value |
| Pineda Phase I | 101 Hwy A1A | \$1,490,832 | \$372,708 | \$1,863,540 |
| Pineda Phase II | 155 Hwy A1A | \$3,641,203 | \$910,301 | \$4,551,504 |
| Pineda Phase III | 175 Hwy A1A | \$4,421,113 | \$1,105,278 | \$5,526,391 |
| Oceanus I | 199 Hwy A1A | \$1,958,061 | \$489,515 | \$2,447,576 |
| Oceanus II | 199 Hwy A1A | \$1,958,061 | \$489,515 | \$2,447,576 |
| Oceanus III | 199 Hwy A1A | \$1,958,061 | \$489,515 | \$2,447,576 |
| Oceanus IV | 199 Hwy A1A | \$1,958,061 | \$489,515 | \$2,447,576 |
| Sandpiper Towers I | 205 Hwy A1A | \$5,684,000 | \$1,421,000 | \$7,105,000 |
| Flores de Playa | 245 Hwy A1A | \$8,558,973 | \$2,139,743 | \$10,698,716 |
| Ocean Residence N | 261 Ocean Residence | \$1,070,264 | \$267,566 | \$1,337,830 |
| Opal Seas | 275 Hwy A1A | \$8,925,235 | \$2,231,309 | \$11,156,544 |
| Park - State of FL | 285 Hwy A1A | \$12,753 | \$0 | \$12,753 |
| Sea Gull Park |  | \$4,251 | \$0 | \$4,251 |
| Silver Sands I | 295 Hwy A1A | \$6,049,708 | \$1,512,427 | \$7,562,135 |
| Silver Sands II | 297 Hwy A1A | \$6,345,000 | \$1,586,250 | \$7,931,250 |
| Sea Breakers | 307 Hwy A1A | \$1,316,804 | \$329,201 | \$1,646,005 |
| Horizon II | 401 Hwy A1A | \$4,683,396 | \$1,170,849 | \$5,854,245 |
| Horizon I | 403 Hwy A1A | \$4,206,550 | \$1,051,638 | \$5,258,188 |
| Horizon III | 405 Hwy A1A | \$4,511,732 | \$1,127,933 | \$5,639,665 |
| Horizon IV | 407 Hwy A1A | \$5,178,319 | \$1,294,580 | \$6,472,899 |
| SPRA Park | 501 Hwy A1A | \$108,321 | \$0 | \$108,321 |
| parking lot |  | \$108,321 | \$0 | \$108,321 |
| parking lot |  | \$108,321 | \$0 | \$108,321 |
| Las Brisas I | 537 Hwy A1A | \$956,650 | \$239,163 | \$1,195,813 |
| Las Brisas II | 553 Hwy A1A | \$986,320 | \$246,580 | \$1,232,900 |
| Monaco Condo | 571 Hwy A1A | \$2,884,143 | \$721,036 | \$3,605,179 |
| Monaco Condo |  | \$2,884,143 | \$721,036 | \$3,605,179 |
| Monaco Condo | 579 Hwy A1A | \$2,922,996 | \$730,749 | \$3,653,745 |
| Monaco Condo |  | \$2,922,996 | \$730,749 | \$3,653,745 |
| TIITF - State of FL |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Brevard County |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Brevard County | 815 Hwy A1A | \$67,871 | \$0 | \$67,871 |
| City of Satellite Beach | North part of parcel | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Reach 6 |  | \$87,882,463 | \$21,868,156 | \$109,750,619 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 5 |  | Structure | Content | Total |
| Site Name | Street Address | Value | Value (25\%) | Value |
| City of Satellite Beach | South Part of Parcel | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| TIITF - State of FL |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| New House | 905 Hwy A1A | \$1,079,232 | \$269,808 | \$1,349,040 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Majesty Palm Condo | 925 Hwy A1A | \$7,957,600 | \$1,989,400 | \$9,947,000 |
| Vacant | 951 Hwy A1A | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Paradise Beach Club | 975 Hwy A1A | \$5,684,000 | \$1,421,000 | \$7,105,000 |
| Oceana Beach Club | 1035 Hwy A1A | \$5,742,464 | \$1,435,616 | \$7,178,080 |

Table B-2 continued

| New House | 1055 Hwy A1A | \$1,086,166 | \$271,542 | \$1,357,708 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drug Store | 1077 Hwy A1A | \$243,600 | \$60,900 | \$304,500 |
| The Oceans | 1085 Hwy A1A | \$15,167,173 | \$3,791,793 | \$18,958,966 |
| The Buccaneer Club I | 1125 Hwy A1A | \$7,522,985 | \$1,880,746 | \$9,403,731 |
| The Buccaneer Club II | 1125 Hwy A1A | \$5,630,603 | \$1,407,651 | \$7,038,254 |
| The Buccaneer Condo Apts | 1175 Hwy A1A | \$11,038,028 | \$2,759,507 | \$13,797,535 |
| Seamark | 1195 Hwy A1A | \$924,147 | \$231,037 | \$1,155,184 |
| Las Olas | 1215 Hwy A1A | \$10,033,981 | \$2,508,495 | \$12,542,476 |
| House | 10 Park Ave | \$487,200 | \$121,800 | \$609,000 |
| House | 20 Park Ave | \$487,200 | \$121,800 | \$609,000 |
| House | 30 Park Ave | \$487,200 | \$121,800 | \$609,000 |
| Park Avenue | Public R.O.W. | \$55,216 | \$0 | \$55,216 |
| House | 5 Park Ave | \$487,200 | \$121,800 | \$609,000 |
| House | 15 Park Ave | \$487,200 | \$121,800 | \$609,000 |
| House | 1253 Hwy A1A | \$487,200 | \$121,800 | \$609,000 |
| Sand Castle Condo | 1273 Hwy A1A | \$4,222,400 | \$1,055,600 | \$5,278,000 |
| Sand Castle - pool |  | \$730,800 | \$0 | \$730,800 |
| New Construction |  | \$112,000 | \$28,000 | \$140,000 |
| City of Satellite Beach | easement | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| La Colonnade Condo | 1303 Hwy A1A | \$1,558,140 | \$389,535 | \$1,947,675 |
| La Playa East pool \& garage |  | \$406,000 | \$0 | \$406,000 |
| La Playa East Condo | 1343 Hwy A1A | \$4,541,613 | \$1,135,403 | \$5,677,016 |
| TIITF - State of FL |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Misty Shore | 1369 Hwy A1A | \$5,309,489 | \$1,327,372 | \$6,636,861 |
| Jordan Realty | 1363 Hwy A1A | \$243,600 | \$60,900 | \$304,500 |
| Summer Cove | 1385 Hwy A1A | \$2,011,664 | \$502,916 | \$2,514,580 |
| Reflections | 1395 Hwy A1A | \$2,905,758 | \$726,440 | \$3,632,198 |
| City of Satellite Beach | public access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Emerald Shores | 1405 Hwy A1A | \$5,723,853 | \$1,430,963 | \$7,154,816 |
| Sea Villa | 1425 Hwy A1A | \$3,030,384 | \$757,596 | \$3,787,980 |
| East Wind II | 1455 Hwy A1A | \$4,481,054 | \$1,120,264 | \$5,601,318 |
| East Wind I | 1465 Hwy A1A | \$4,201,305 | \$1,050,326 | \$5,251,631 |
| Brevard County | 1495 Hwy A1A | \$148,823 | \$0 | \$148,823 |
| Pelican Beach Park | 1525 Hwy A1A | \$95,612 | \$0 | \$95,612 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Reach 5 |  | \$114,810,897 | \$28,343,612 | \$143,154,507 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 4 |  | Structure | Content | Total |
| Site Name | Street Address | Value | Value (25\%) | Value |
| Pelican Beach Park | 1525 Hwy A1A | \$95,612 | \$0 | \$95,612 |
| Brevard County |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Brevard County |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Ocean Royale | 1595 Hwy A1A | \$1,542,800 | \$385,700 | \$1,928,500 |
| Magnolia Ave | public R.O.W. | \$55,216 | \$0 | \$55,216 |

Table B-2 continued

B-7

| House | 610 Ocean Street | \$98,625 | \$24,656 | \$123,281 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| House | 620 Ocean Street | \$65,610 | \$16,403 | \$82,013 |
| House | 626 Ocean Street | \$157,544 | \$39,386 | \$196,930 |
| Townhouse | 630 Ocean Street | \$116,132 | \$29,033 | \$145,165 |
| Townhouse | 632 Ocean Street | \$118,552 | \$29,638 | \$148,190 |
| Townhouse | 634 Ocean Street | \$117,821 | \$29,455 | \$147,276 |
| House | 638 Ocean Street | \$296,591 | \$74,148 | \$370,739 |
| House | 640 Ocean Street | \$221,204 | \$55,301 | \$276,505 |
| House | 648 Ocean Street | \$222,520 | \$55,630 | \$278,150 |
| House | 609 Ocean Street | \$243,600 | \$60,900 | \$304,500 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Magellan Ave | public R.O.W. | \$55,216 | \$0 | \$55,216 |
| House | 1655 Hwy A1A | \$243,600 | \$60,900 | \$304,500 |
| House |  | \$406,000 | \$101,500 | \$507,500 |
| House | 1683 Hwy A1A | \$555,116 | \$138,779 | \$693,895 |
| House | 1687 Hwy A1A | \$552,160 | \$138,040 | \$690,200 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Townhouses | 1697 Hwy A1A | \$552,160 | \$138,040 | \$690,200 |
| Sunrise Ave | public R.O.W. | \$64,960 | \$0 | \$64,960 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 715 Beach Street | \$321,260 | \$80,315 | \$401,575 |
| House | 721 Beach Street | \$361,453 | \$90,363 | \$451,816 |
| House | 725 Beach Street | \$417,238 | \$104,310 | \$521,548 |
| House | 735 Beach Street | \$406,000 | \$101,500 | \$507,500 |
| House | 745 Beach Street | \$326,749 | \$81,687 | \$408,436 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Palmetto Ave | public R.O.W. | \$48,720 | \$0 | \$48,720 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| City of Satellite Beach |  | \$67,871 | \$0 | \$67,871 |
| House | 785 Shell Street | \$125,583 | \$31,396 | \$156,979 |
| House | 789 Shell Street | \$40,356 | \$10,089 | \$50,445 |
| House | 795 Shell Street | \$40,356 | \$10,089 | \$50,445 |
| House | 797 Shell Street | \$207,872 | \$51,968 | \$259,840 |
| Commerical/strip |  | \$32,000 | \$8,000 | \$40,000 |
| Vacant | 782 Shell Street | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Vacant | 786 Shell Street | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Commerical/strip | 1777 Hwy A1A | \$32,000 | \$8,000 | \$40,000 |
| Volunteer Way | public R.O.W. | \$64,960 | \$0 | \$64,960 |
| Lantana Condo | 1791 Hwy A1A | \$4,877,457 | \$1,219,364 | \$6,096,821 |
| Lantana Condo | 1791 Hwy A1A | \$4,877,457 | \$1,219,364 | \$6,096,821 |
| Lantana Condo | 1791 Hwy A1A | \$4,877,457 | \$1,219,364 | \$6,096,821 |
| Lantana Condo | 1791 Hwy A1A | \$4,877,457 | \$1,219,364 | \$6,096,821 |
| Bicentennial Park |  | \$129,920 | \$0 | \$129,920 |
| Bicentennial Park |  | \$81,200 | \$0 | \$81,200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Reach 4 |  | \$27,994,417 | \$6,832,686 | \$34,827,099 |

Table B-2 continued

| REACH 3 |  | Structure | Content | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Name | Street Address | Value | Value (25\%) | Value |
| Ocean Dunes Drive | public R.O.W. | \$64,960 | \$0 | \$64,960 |
| Aloha Condo | 1891 Hwy A1A | \$1,156,831 | \$289,208 | \$1,446,039 |
| SatCom Direct | 1901 Hwy A1A | \$896,448 | \$224,112 | \$1,120,560 |
| The Christal II | 1907 Hwy A1A | \$6,780,735 | \$1,695,184 | \$8,475,919 |
| The Christal I | 1919 Hwy A1A | \$4,239,468 | \$1,059,867 | \$5,299,335 |
| Seashore Estates I | 1923 Hwy A1A | \$2,597,000 | \$649,250 | \$3,246,250 |
| Seashore Estates II | 1923 Hwy A1A | \$2,597,000 | \$649,250 | \$3,246,250 |
| Seashore Estates Access | 1923 Hwy A1A | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| TIITF - State of FL |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Golden Palm | 1941 Hwy A1A | \$3,789,563 | \$947,391 | \$4,736,954 |
| Serena Shores II | 2025 Hwy A1A | \$6,008,464 | \$1,502,116 | \$7,510,580 |
| Serena Shores I | 2035 Hwy A1A | \$5,946,394 | \$1,486,599 | \$7,432,993 |
| Indian Harbour Bch Club | 2055 Hwy A1A | \$5,967,639 | \$1,491,910 | \$7,459,549 |
| Somerset Condo | 2065 Hwy A1A | \$14,486,371 | \$3,621,593 | \$18,107,964 |
| Somerset Condo | 2065 Hwy A1A | \$14,486,371 | \$3,621,593 | \$18,107,964 |
| Somerset Condo | 2065 Hwy A1A | \$14,486,371 | \$3,621,593 | \$18,107,964 |
| Somerset Condo | 2065 Hwy A1A | \$14,486,371 | \$3,621,593 | \$18,107,964 |
| Oceanique Condo II | 2105 Hwy A1A | \$3,707,592 | \$926,898 | \$4,634,490 |
| Oceanique Condo pool | 2105 Hwy A1A | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Oceanique Condo I | 2105 Hwy A1A | \$3,707,592 | \$926,898 | \$4,634,490 |
| Millenium Park |  | \$129,470 | \$0 | \$129,470 |
| Millenium Park |  | \$129,470 | \$0 | \$129,470 |
| Gardenia Condo | 2195 Hwy A1A | \$10,414,141 | \$2,603,535 | \$13,017,676 |
| Ocean Walk Condo | 2225 Hwy A1A | \$8,120,000 | \$2,030,000 | \$10,150,000 |
| Brevard County Comm. Center | 2289 Hwy A1A | \$198,680 | \$49,670 | \$248,350 |
| Wallace Ave | public R.O.W. | \$32,480 | \$0 | \$32,480 |
| Canova Beach Park | 3299 Hwy A1A | \$97,440 | \$0 | \$97,440 |
| Canova Beach Park | 3299 Hwy A1A | \$193,532 | \$48,383 | \$241,915 |
| Canova Beach Park | 3299 Hwy A1A | \$193,532 | \$0 | \$193,532 |
| Lou's - commercial | 3191 N. Hwy A1a | \$145,593 | \$36,398 | \$181,991 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Reach 3 |  | \$125,059,511 | \$31,103,040 | \$156,162,552 |

Table B-2 continued

| REACH 2 |  | Structure | Content | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Name | Street Number | Value | Value (25\%) | Value |
| Melbourne Ocean Club Condo | 3101 N. Hwy A1A | \$8,120,000 | \$2,030,000 | \$10,150,000 |
| Brevard County |  | \$164,960 | \$0 | \$164,960 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Hilton Hotel | 3003 N. Hwy A1A | \$7,305,952 | \$1,826,488 | \$9,132,440 |
| Villa Riviera | 2925 N. Hwy A1A | \$4,547,200 | \$1,136,800 | \$5,684,000 |
| Coral Palms | 2875 N. Hwy A1A | \$14,692,362 | \$3,673,091 | \$18,365,453 |
| Club Residence | 2855 N. Hwy A1A | \$2,436,000 | \$609,000 | \$3,045,000 |
| Sandy Kaye | 2835 N. Hwy A1A | \$7,394,120 | \$1,848,530 | \$9,242,650 |
| Silver Palms | 2805 N. Hwy A1A | \$5,760,474 | \$1,440,119 | \$7,200,593 |
| Beach Access | easement | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Ocean Sands N | 2727 N. Hwy A1A | \$5,648,000 | \$1,412,000 | \$7,060,000 |
| Ocean Sands S | 2725 N. Hwy A1A | \$5,648,000 | \$1,412,000 | \$7,060,000 |
| Holiday Inn | 2605 N. Hwy A1A | \$10,241,529 | \$2,560,382 | \$12,801,911 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Reach 2 |  | \$71,958,601 | \$17,948,410 | \$89,907,011 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 1 |  | Structure | Content | Total |
| Site Name | Street Number | Value | Value (25\%) | Value |
| Brevard County | beach access | \$48,720 | \$0 | \$48,720 |
| TIITF - State of FL |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| TIITF - State of FL |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 2301 N. Hwy A1A | \$64,960 | \$0 | \$64,960 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 2301 N. Hwy A1A | \$113,680 | \$0 | \$113,680 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 2301 N. Hwy A1A | \$1,254,248 | \$0 | \$1,254,248 |
| House | 2175 N. Hwy A1A | \$166,720 | \$41,680 | \$208,400 |
| House | 2165 N. Hwy A1A | \$90,048 | \$22,512 | \$112,560 |
| House | 2155 N. Hwy A1A | \$255,520 | \$63,880 | \$319,400 |
| House | 2145 N. Hwy A1A | \$440,997 | \$110,249 | \$551,246 |
| House | 2135 N. Hwy A1A | \$124,187 | \$31,047 | \$155,234 |
| House | 2125 N. Hwy A1A | \$147,199 | \$36,800 | \$183,999 |
| House | 2115 N. Hwy A1A | \$147,199 | \$36,800 | \$183,999 |
| House | 2105 N. Hwy A1A | \$67,639 | \$16,910 | \$84,549 |
| House | 2095 N. Hwy A1A | \$145,156 | \$36,289 | \$181,445 |
| House | 2085 N. Hwy A1A | \$150,350 | \$37,588 | \$187,938 |
| House | 2075 N. Hwy A1A | \$168,799 | \$42,200 | \$210,999 |
| House | 2065 N. Hwy A1A | \$209,122 | \$52,281 | \$261,403 |
| House | 2055 N. Hwy A1A | \$364,181 | \$91,045 | \$455,226 |
| House | 2045 N. Hwy A1A | \$248,699 | \$62,175 | \$310,874 |
| beach access |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 2035 N. Hwy A1A | \$109,116 | \$27,279 | \$136,395 |
| House | 2025 N. Hwy A1A | \$75,272 | \$18,818 | \$94,090 |
| House | 2015 N. Hwy A1A | \$201,928 | \$50,482 | \$252,410 |
| House | 2005 N. Hwy A1A | \$110,285 | \$27,571 | \$137,856 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 1965 N. Hwy A1A | \$32,480 | \$8,120 | \$40,600 |
| House | 1955 N. Hwy A1A | \$126,250 | \$31,563 | \$157,813 |
| House | 1945 N. Hwy A1A | \$164,024 | \$41,006 | \$205,030 |
| beach access |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 1935 N. Hwy A1A | \$146,695 | \$36,674 | \$183,369 |
| House | 1925 N. Hwy A1A | \$122,270 | \$30,568 | \$152,838 |
| House | 1915 N. Hwy A1A | \$320,837 | \$80,209 | \$401,046 |
| House | 1905 N. Hwy A1A | \$767,015 | \$191,754 | \$958,769 |

Table B-2 continued

| House | 1885 N. Hwy A1A | \$226,531 | \$56,633 | \$283,164 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| House | 1875 N. Hwy A1A | \$363,516 | \$90,879 | \$454,395 |
| The Barringer Condo I | 1835 N. Hwy A1A | \$5,911,912 | \$1,477,978 | \$7,389,890 |
| The Barringer II | 1845 N. Hwy A1A | \$5,799,945 | \$1,449,986 | \$7,249,931 |
| Casa Blanca Inn | 1805 N. Hwy A1A | \$595,683 | \$148,921 | \$744,604 |
| Bella Vista | 1755 N. Hwy A1A | \$3,396,011 | \$849,003 | \$4,245,014 |
| Apartments | 1745 N. Hwy A1A | \$227,360 | \$56,840 | \$284,200 |
| Blue Seas Apts. | 1725 N. Hwy A1A | \$178,640 | \$44,660 | \$223,300 |
| Ocean Park Condo | 1665 N. Hwy A1A | \$10,052,560 | \$2,513,140 | \$12,565,700 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Sea Pearl Condo | 1575 N. Hwy A1A | \$6,761,063 | \$1,690,266 | \$8,451,329 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Outrigger | 1555 N. Hwy A1A | \$2,718,819 | \$679,705 | \$3,398,524 |
| Majestic Shores | 1525 N. Hwy A1A | \$7,243,076 | \$1,810,769 | \$9,053,845 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Claridge Condo | 1515 N. Hwy A1A | \$4,161,079 | \$1,040,270 | \$5,201,349 |
| Royal Palms | 1505 N. Hwy A1A | \$4,490,360 | \$1,122,590 | \$5,612,950 |
| Vacant |  | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| The Dunes | 1415 N. Hwy A1A | \$4,649,739 | \$1,162,435 | \$5,812,174 |
| Jade Palm | 1345 N. Hwy A1A | \$10,994,903 | \$2,748,726 | \$13,743,629 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 1315 N. Hwy A1A | \$237,689 | \$59,422 | \$297,111 |
| House | 1245 N. Hwy A1A | \$214,465 | \$53,616 | \$268,081 |
| House | 1235 N. Hwy A1A | \$247,563 | \$61,891 | \$309,454 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 1225 N. Hwy A1A | \$83,392 | \$20,848 | \$104,240 |
| House | 1215 N. Hwy A1A | \$118,274 | \$29,569 | \$147,843 |
| Coral Reef Condo | 1177 N. Hwy A1A | \$4,484,122 | \$1,121,031 | \$5,605,153 |
| House | 1163 N. Hwy A1A | \$154,181 | \$38,545 | \$192,726 |
| TIITF - State of FL | 1137 N. Hwy A1A | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| Brevard County | access | \$1 | \$0 | \$1 |
| House | 1135 N. Hwy A1A | \$118,274 | \$29,569 | \$147,843 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Reach 1 |  | \$79,812,768 | \$19,582,790 | \$99,395,560 |

Table B-3: Shoreline Position Change Rate by Reach

|  | Reach 1 | Reach 2 | Reach 3 | Reach 4 | Reach 5 | Reach 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reach Limits | R119-R109 | R109-R105.5 | R105.5-R99 | R99-R93 | R93-R83 | R83-R75.4 |
| Recession Rate <br> (ft/yr) | 0.71 | 0.58 | 0.84 | 0.81 | 1.01 | 0.60 |

## Future Conditions Without Project

14. Future damages without the project in place would be more severe than existing damages under without project conditions due to continuous erosion and shoreline position change. This would result in reduced beach widths and reduced protective value between damageable structures and the future shoreline position. Damages would be expected to increase as the amount of protective beach area decreased over time. It is assumed that the coastal armor would be sufficient to halt long term erosion, but would not halt recession of the shoreline associated with a storm that would cause erosion greater than its protective value (for example in Table B-4, armor type 2, with a protective value of 135 feet from the mean high water line would protect against storms just under the 0.20 annual probability, i.e. the 5 -year frequency event).
15. The level of development in the storm damage benefit analysis is the same as the existing condition. Although there is some precedence to include growth, a conservative approach was followed wherein the existing level of development was maintained into the future.

## THE BASIC METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

16. The basic method was to analyze structures susceptible to damages from storm events. The collected existing information was catalogued into an electronic database. Inputs into the database consisted of damageable structures by their type, the number of floors occupied, the proximity of each damageable structure to a mean high water line, the lot sizes and each structure's value.
17. Estimating damages and benefits that would occur were based on the use of the Storm Damage Model (SDM). This computer model calculated damages based on recession of the beach in proximity of each damageable structure (i.e. change in shoreline position). The estimated benefits were based on the reduction in losses if an alternative solution was in place.

## STORM DAMAGE MODEL

The Jacksonville District has developed a Windows based empirical computer model named the Storm Damage Model (SDM), which simulates damages at existing and future years. The model also computes average annual equivalent
damages. The model uses data developed from storm frequencies and shoreline recessions along with data which describes each structure and computes expected damages to each structure. The SDM model used the input from SBEACH to estimate the recession. The SBEACH engineering model predict the storm response recession of the beach profile, using inputs of both waves and surge. The SDM model is based on recession and does not have separate damage functions for waves or surge.
18. The model takes into account the risk and uncertainty of the input data to statistically determine the storm damage. For the purposes of analysis, storm damage is defined as the damage incurred by the temporary loss of a given amount of shoreline as a direct result of erosion caused by a storm of a given magnitude and frequency. In addition to residential structures, storm damages were calculated for commercial and public buildings, pools, patios, parking lots, roads, utilities, seawalls, revetments, bulkheads, replacement of lost backfill etc. The SDM used in this analysis does not have a flood damage component. The SDM can be used in a deterministic mode and a statistical mode. In deterministic mode, the model does not account for the risk and uncertainty of the input data. In this mode, the model produces similar results as earlier versions of the SDM. In statistical mode, the model runs a number of iterations (set by the user) to approximate the risk and uncertainty in the data. The model will output data for each iteration and a running average of all of the iterations. The greater the number of iterations, the smaller the standard error of estimate. For this study, 1000 iterations were used and the standard error of estimate is near an asymptotic value. A seed number of 1701 was used, which allows the statistical results of the model to be reproduced.
19. The initial step in how the storm damage model computes damages is based on the relationships between storm frequencies and shoreline recessions and expected damages to each structure from a given storm of a given magnitude. Continuous erosion and shoreline position change result in reduced beach width and hence reduced protective value between a structure and the expected shoreline position. The location of the expected shoreline position for each year is based on the historical shoreline erosion on a per year basis. The erosion rates for each reach are shown in Table B-3. After the relationship between shoreline erosion and damage is determined, relationships between the probability of an occurrence of a storm event and damage is then determined by assigning probabilities from a frequency-recession curve for each existing condition and each future time increment. The relationship between probability and damage was then determined by tabulating total damage estimates for varying frequency storm events. Due to continuing erosion and shoreline recession over time, future damages to development would be more severe with a given storm under without project conditions. Therefore, the shoreline recession-damage relationship was modified to accommodate the expected shoreline position in future years with respect to the reference shoreline. Future year damages were simulated by determining the location of the shoreline in future years using the different erosion rates. Future long-term recession is halted at the year a without project seawall or protective
structure is encountered. Replacement armor is included, following the assumption that property owners would repair existing armor or install new armor once their properties become threatened. The model only allows replacement armor once, with subsequent years of no armor. In some instances, future damages could be less, if a coastal armor replacement index is selected which provides greater protection than the current coastal armor type. From a frequency-damage curve average annual equivalent damages for each project condition were calculated. Using this information, a frequency-damage relationship was constructed for each year of the project life. The resulting estimates of expected damages were converted to an average annual equivalent basis using the FY2008 interest rate of 4.875\% (47/8\%) and 2008 price levels for a 50-year period of analysis starting in 2010. The estimation of damage reduction benefits attributable to the with project condition was determined by comparing the without project damages to those for the with project conditions. The difference between the two is damage reduction benefits.

## Assumptions

20. The assumptions used in the development of the estimate of annual storm damages are listed in the following paragraphs.
21. The shoreline recession rate calculated from historical data will remain constant for the duration of the study period.
22. Damages to improvements would not occur until shoreline recession has exceeded the seaward edge of the improvement.
23. When the shoreline receded halfway through a damageable structure of two stories or less built slab-on-grade, the structure would be considered a total loss [a single family house for example].
24. When the shoreline receded completely through a damageable structure with more than two stories built on deeply embedded pilings, the structural value of only the bottom two floors would be considered lost [a condominium as an example].
25. If a damageable structure of two stories or less built slab-on-grade is less than one-half undermined, damage would be assumed to be equal to the product of the structure's value and the ratio of the horizontal distance eroded through the structure divided by one-half the distance from the structure's seaward face to it's landward face.
26. If a damageable structure of two stories or more built on deeply embedded pilings is less than completely undermined, damage would be assumed to be equal to the product of the value of the structure's first two stories and the ratio of the horizontal distance eroded through the structure divided by the distance from the structure's seaward face to it's landward face.
27. All market values of damageable structures were estimated using a version of the cost approach to value [replacement cost new less depreciation], where replacement cost new implies replacing a building using materials and standards having a utility equivalent to the subject structure prior to the damaging event.
28. Seawalls, revetments and other coastal armor would stop all damages from long term erosion and from storm events that would cause shoreline erosion less than or equal to their protective value.
29. Although shorefront areas continue to develop through time, damage estimates are limited to existing buildings and structures.
30. Repair costs to the coastal armor were determined by current engineering estimates of replacement and/or repair costs of such work.
31. After a damageable structure fails, the shorefront development, roads, parking lots, etc., would be repaired to a condition similar to and in the same location as the pre-storm condition. The SDM assumes the damaged element would be rebuilt by the next cycle (year).
32. If no coastal armor is existing, the distance to coastal armor is set at 134 feet or equal to the 5 -year storm event. This distance is required by the model and sets the location of replacement armor. This assumption in practice would approximate a property owner that allowed some erosion to occur before funding a coastal armor project for their property.
33. Local ordinances for construction of new coastal armor were researched in the selection of a replacement armor type.
34. The Mid-Reach analysis was performed not using the condemnation function available within the SDM program. Team discussions took place about what would be the most likely future without project condition. It was agreed that following the history of very few condemnations in Florida, no condemnation would be included either manually or using the function. Instead, it was agreed that property owners were more likely to armor their properties rather than be bought out. For the model runs, it is assumed that once threatened, all residential and commercial properties will build replacement armor. Vacant parcels and public lands (parks) will have no armor.

## Storm Damage Model Input

35. The collected information and assumptions were assembled into the input format for the storm damage model. Each reach was input separably so that the damages in the future without project and future with project conditions could be
examined for each reach. An example input file for the storm damage model is shown in Table B-4.
36. Shoreline Position. The assessment of damages to the existing development is based on the present conditions. Continuous erosion and shoreline position change results in reduced beach width and hence reduced protective value between a structure and the referenced shoreline. Therefore, damage to development is expected to be more severe with a given storm in future time periods. Future year damages are simulated in the model by description of the location of the reference shoreline in future years. The location of the reference shoreline is based on the historical shoreline position change rate for the study area. Table B-3 shows the rates by reach used to calculate the shoreline positions over the project life. Therefore, the shoreline position input information is different for each reach. In the risk mode of operation, the SDM applies a normal distribution to the shoreline position. For each iteration the model randomly selects a shoreline position within the normal distribution with the given standard deviation. Standard deviations and ranges of uncertainty are assigned to certain variables in the risk file described in Table B-5.
37. Storm Frequency Recessions. Recession rates (frequency recession) are also given in Tables B-4. The recession rates are the same for all reaches. The number of storm return periods and associated shoreline recessions is also given in the risk data file. The standard deviation is given in the risk file and used to randomly select a recession for each return period in each iteration.
38. Coastal Protective Armor. Field inspections were made to determine the existing type and the general location of coastal armor. The coastal protective armor types were grouped and categorized by the level of protection each provided, the unit cost, the ability of the armor to halt shoreline position change, and a damage factor. The level of protection provided by each armor type was based on field inspection and engineering judgment and represents the amount of shoreline recession each type of armor would prevent until failure. In the risk mode, this variable is randomized using a uniform distribution. The end points of the distribution are assigned in the risk data file. The unit replacement cost per linear foot was based on engineering cost estimates. The replacement cost is variable based on parameters input into the risk file to account for uncertainty in the cost. The damage factor was the percent of armor repair/replacement needed after failure.
39. Backfill Cost. A cost of backfill is included to account for fill behind replacement coastal armor in future years. In risk mode, the SDM randomizes the unit costs of the backfill with a normal distribution. The mean value is input in the SDM input file and the standard deviation is assigned in the risk data file.
40. Damageable Structure Values. The structure values tabulated in Table B-2 are used in the SDM input file along with other values used to describe each property.

The structure values used in this analysis contain the best available up-to-date information collected by Real Estate Division to reflect replacement cost less depreciation. In risk mode, additional parameters are used to describe the structure cost uncertainty. The model internally calculates the standard deviation associated with the structure value given in the main input file.
41. Physical Dimensions. The physical dimensions pertaining to damageable structures were defined by structure locations relative to the referenced shoreline and coastal armor, lot widths, and if the damageable structure was built slab-on grade or above the ground on pilings. The data that defined the lot widths and distances to the shoreline were provided from aerial photography and the Brevard County Property Tax Office. Lot widths were defined in linear feet along the oceanfront. Examples of physical dimensions are shown in Tables B-4. In risk mode, the model applies a normal distribution to the distances from the armor and structure to the reference shoreline. The normal distribution is based upon a standard deviation of the measured distances. In the case of damageable structures such as single-family homes or condominiums built slab-on-grade, the full value distance point is the mid-point or center of the damageable structures. If a damageable structure was built on pilings, the full value distance would be the landward face of the structure.

Table B-4: Example Input to Storm Damage Model

| Reach 6 - Brevard Mid-Reach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010, 50 - Baseline Year, period of analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.8 - Shoreline position in Year Zero |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Shoreline Position | Year | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Shoreline } \\ \text { Position } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Year | Shoreline Position | Year | Shoreline Position | Year | Shoreline Position |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 | 2.4 | 2011 | 3.0 | 2012 | 3.6 | 2013 | 4.2 | 2014 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 5.4 | 2016 | 6.0 | 2017 | 6.6 | 2018 | 7.2 | 2019 | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 8.4 | 2021 | 9.0 | 2022 | 9.6 | 2023 | 10.2 | 2024 | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2025 | 11.4 | 2026 | 12.0 | 2027 | 12.6 | 2028 | 13.2 | 2029 | 13.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2030 | 14.4 | 2031 | 15.0 | 2032 | 15.6 | 2033 | 16.2 | 2034 | 16.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2035 | 17.4 | 2036 | 18.0 | 2037 | 18.6 | 2038 | 19.2 | 2039 | 19.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2040 | 20.4 | 2041 | 21.0 | 2042 | 21.6 | 2043 | 22.2 | 2044 | 22.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2045 | 23.4 | 2046 | 24.0 | 2047 | 24.6 | 2048 | 25.2 | 2049 | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2050 | 26.4 | 2051 | 27.0 | 2052 | 27.6 | 2053 | 28.2 | 2054 | 28.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2055 | 29.4 | 2056 | 30.0 | 2057 | 30.6 | 2058 | 31.2 | 2059 | 31.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 - Number of probabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Probability | Recession (ft) | Return Period (yrs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.005 | 214 | "200 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.007 | 209 | "150 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.01 | 196 | "100 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.013 | 184 | "75 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.02 | 164 | "50 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.04 | 156 | "25 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.1 | 148 | "10 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.2 | 134 | "5 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.5 | 111 | "2 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 24 | "1 year" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 - Number of Armor Types |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Level of | Erosion | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Armor No. | Description of Armor |  |  | Unit Cost | Protection | Halted? | Replace |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | "No Coastal Armor" |  |  | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | "CSP-Small" |  |  | \$1,070 | 135 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | "CSP-Medium" |  |  | \$1,610 | 150 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | "RR-Minimum" |  |  | \$750 | 120 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | "Geotextile Tubes" |  |  | \$320 | 135 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | "RR-Small" |  |  | \$1,070 | 150 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | "RR-Large" |  |  | \$1,860 | 175 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$1.22-Cost of Backfill per cubic yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total |  | Number | Existing | Replacem't | Dist | Dist | Dist | Type | Land |  | DEP | Condemn |
| Site Name |  | Value | Lot Width | Floors | Armor | Armor | Armor | Front | Failure | Parcel | Value | Duplicate | Monument | on/off |
| "Pineda Phase I" |  | \$2,048,030 | 400 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 170 | 190 | "VC" | -1 | 0 | "R-75.4" | 0 |
| "Pineda Phase II" |  | \$5,002,103 | 330 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 155 | 215 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Pineda Phase III" |  | \$6,073,504 | 270 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 155 | 220 | "VC" | -1 | 0 | "R-76" | 0 |
| "Oceanus I" |  | \$2,689,886 | 240 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 80 | 85 | 110 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Oceanus II" |  | \$2,689,886 | 240 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 80 | 180 | 210 | "VC" | -1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| "Oceanus III" |  | \$2,689,886 | 240 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 80 | 85 | 110 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Oceanus IV" |  | \$2,689,886 | 240 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 80 | 180 | 210 | "VC" | -1 | 1 | "R-77" | 0 |
| "Sandpiper Towers I" |  | \$7,808,395 | 250 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 60 | 215 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Flores de Playa" |  | \$11,757,889 | 250 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 185 | 275 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Ocean Residence N" |  | \$1,470,275 | 230 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 160 | 190 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Opal Seas" |  | \$12,261,042 | 260 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 175 | 270 | "VC" | -1 | 0 | "R-78" | 0 |
| "Park - State of FL" |  | \$14,016 | 150 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 183 | 189 | "PC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Sea Gull Park |  | \$4,672 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 190 | 195 | "PC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Silver Sands I" |  | \$8,310,786 | 350 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 90 | 190 | 260 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Silver Sands II" |  | \$8,716,444 | 300 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 90 | 190 | 265 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Sea Breakers" |  | \$1,808,959 | 200 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 110 | 135 | 190 | "VC" | -1 | 0 | "R-79" | 0 |
| "Horizon II" |  | \$6,433,815 | 150 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 170 | 250 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Horizon I" |  | \$5,778,748 | 220 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 165 | 245 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Horizon III" |  | \$6,197,992 | 150 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 155 | 240 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Horizon IV" |  | \$7,113,716 | 220 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 155 | 240 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "SPRA Park |  | \$119,045 | 200 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 125 | 130 | 131 | "PC" | -1 | 0 | "R-80" | 0 |
| "parking lot" |  | \$119,045 | 75 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 125 | 150 | 190 | "PC" | -1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| "parking lot" |  | \$119,045 | 75 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 125 | 150 | 190 | "PC" | -1 | 1 |  | 0 |
|  |  | \$1,314,198 | 230 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 140 | 170 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Las Brisas I" |  | \$1,354,957 | 190 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 140 | 170 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Monaco Condo" |  | \$3,962,091 | 90 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 140 | 230 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Monaco Condo" |  | \$3,962,091 | 150 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 140 | 230 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Monaco Condo" |  | \$4,015,466 | 85 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 140 | 230 | "VC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Monaco Condo" |  | \$4,015,466 | 110 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 134 | 140 | 230 | "VC" | -1 | 0 | "R-81" | 0 |
| "TIITF - State of FL" |  | \$1 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 135 | 136 | "PN" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "City of Satellite Beach" |  | \$1 | 1100 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 135 | 136 | "PN" | -1 | 0 | "R-82" | 0 |
| "Brevard County" |  | \$1 | 135 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 135 | 136 | "PN" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "Brevard County" |  | \$74,590 | 115 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 145 | 150 | "PC" | -1 | 0 |  | 0 |
| "City of Satellite Beach" |  | \$1 | 440 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 134 | 135 | 136 | "PN" | -1 | 0 | "R-83" | 0 |

Table B-5: Risk File

| Reach 6 - Brevard Mid-Reach, risk specification file |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| 0.06 | std dev of shoreline position 10\% of value |
| 0.1 | armor cost uncertainty |
| 0.1 | structure value uncertainty |
| 2.5 | std dev of distance measurements |
| 0.125 | std dev of backfill cost |
| 11 | number of probabilities in storm recession curve |
| 19 | std dev of recession |
| 20 | std dev of recession |
| 21 | std dev of recession |
| 29 | std dev of recession |
| 31 | std dev of recession |
| 32 | std dev of recession |
| 13 | std dev of recession |
| 3 | std dev of recession recession |
| 3 | std dev of recession |
| 3 | std dev of recession |
| 3 | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $1,0,0$ | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $2,11,148$ | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $3,140,160$ | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $4,90,140$ | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $5,111,148$ | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $6,140,160$ | armor number, lower limit of protection, upper limit of protection |
| $7,160,190$ | end |
| $9999,9999,9999$ |  |

## ASSESSMENT OF STORM DAMAGES

42. The Storm Damage Model simulated damages that were based on the existing and future year conditions and computed average annual equivalent damages associated with those conditions. The resulting damages were displayed in a spreadsheet as damages to structures, damages to the coastal armor, damages to the backfill (land area between the coastal armor and the structure), and damages as a result of loss of land. Damages forecasted to affect structures near the shoreline included damage to buildings, pools, patios, parking lots, roads, utilities, seawalls, revetments and bulkheads etc. Although individual "damage elements" such as pools, patios, parking, utilities, etc., were not separately evaluated and quantified in the SDM analysis, damages to armor such as seawalls, revetments, and bulkheads were accounted for by the model. Damages to armor were calculated based on estimated cost per linear foot of individual armor types present. The values for each reach in the future without project condition are shown in Table B-6.
43. SDM model runs were developed to simulate the future with project condition and associated damages. The model allows user input of a future shoreline position
that can be used to simulate a beach fill condition. In a typical beach nourishment project, a design fill is constructed and a sacrificial advanced fill is placed seaward of the design fill. The advanced fill is allowed to erode naturally until close to the design fill, then a renourishment construction project replaces the advanced fill. In the Brevard County Mid-Reach analysis, the storm damage benefits are derived from the design fill only with no benefit calculated for the advanced fill. The alternatives evaluated were described in terms of the design fill seaward advancement of the mean high water line. Table B-7 displays the assumptions used in the SDM for the with project shoreline extensions. The first future with project alternative is "Alternative Plan number 3 with a 10 foot extension of the MHW in Reach 1. This means that the with project condition is a 10 foot seaward movement of the mean high water line. Other beach fill alternatives were evaluated in the same manner with the appropriate movement of the shoreline position. In the Dune and Vegetation alternative, the future with project condition will be the addition of small amount of fill landward of the mean high water line. The effect of this fill will be to halt the shoreline position change in future years. The input parameters for the SDM used a 1 foot extension of the mean high water line to approximate this alternative, as an input value of 0 feet is not allowed in the model. The combination alternatives consider a seawall in the future with project condition. The input file for this alternative was modified to place a coastal armor type of the appropriate level of protection in the existing armor column.
44. During the course of the study Reach 5 was separated into Reach 5A and Reach 5B. One of the alternatives is a seawall, which is a coastal armor type that is constructed parallel to the shoreline along the bluff or dune line. This type of construction is within the Coastal Management Zone which is permitted by the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Construction is restricted to properties that are vulnerable to the 15 -year storm. Approximately $28 \%$ of the properties along the Mid-Reach study area are vulnerable to the 15-year storm. However, many are scattered in a fashion that makes implementation engineeringly unfeasible. A portion of Reach 5 totally 3,320 feet of shoreline fit the criteria and was separated out for analysis as Reach 5A. Reach 5B is the remainder of the parcels within Reach 5 that do not fit the criteria for a seawall. For a complete analysis of all alternatives, Reach 5A and Reach 5B were run using the SDM and benefits calculated in the future without project condition and the future with project condition.

## DEVELOPMENT OF STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION BENEFITS

45. Damage reduction benefits are defined as the difference between estimated average annual equivalent damages under without project conditions and the estimated average annual equivalent damages that will remain if some selected project alternative is in place. In the without project condition, assessment of damages to existing development is a function of the protection afforded by existing widths of beach and dunes. As a result of future erosion, damages to development in the future will tend to be more severe with a given storm due to the fact that the
amount of beach protection between a structure and the shoreline will decrease with time. After the relationships between recession and damage are determined, relationships between probability and damages are then determined by assigning probabilities from the appropriate frequency-recession relationship. This computational process results in without and with project frequency-damage curves for the existing condition and each future time increment analyzed. The frequencydamage relationships are integrated to produce average annual equivalent damages for the without and with project conditions.
46. Storm damage reduction benefits are defined as the total primary benefits derived from the project. Storm damage reduction benefits are summarized in Table B-6. The alternative that displays the largest difference between the with and without project average annual equivalent damages is the alternative which will give the greatest primary benefits.

## NATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BENEFITS

47. National Economic Development (NED) benefits are defined in the Principles \& Guidelines Manual as increases in the total value of goods and services to the Nation from some project which results from a given alternative being selected. Although the optimum project is determined on primary benefits, the total benefits are a summation of both primary and incidental benefits. In addition to the storm damage reduction benefits, recreation benefits were calculated for the Mid-Reach study area. Recreation benefits are secondary benefits and can be added to primary benefits provided they do not equal more than fifty percent of the total NED benefits for project justification.
48. The recreational benefit analysis is provided as an attachment to this appendix. The travel cost method was used to determine the value of a beach visit and the methodology used for the recreational benefit analysis presented in the attachment. The travel cost method consists of deriving a demand curve by using the variable costs of travel and the value of time as proxies for price or willingness to pay for a beach visit. The value of a beach visit based on this analysis was $\$ 2.35$. This compares to other travel cost method analyses for Broward County Segment III project with a beach visit value of $\$ 3.87$ and $\$ 3.91$ for Broward County Segment II. ${ }^{1}$ The value may appear to be a little low compared to other reports but there are other quality beaches that are in close proximity to these beaches.
49. Recreation benefits were calculated for each reach and added to the storm damage reduction benefits to produce the total benefits shown in Table B-6. Under the with-project condition all project reaches are parking limited. Because parking constraints limit participation, recreational benefits remain constant even if the

[^0]proposed project width is increased. The recreational benefit analysis in attachment 2 was completed in 2006 using a discount rate of 5.125 percent. The recreational benefits in Table B-6 have been updated to 2008 price levels and discounted at 4.875\% for this analysis.
50. The total project net benefits and benefit to cost ratios for five of the alternatives are displayed in Table B-8. The table also lists the estimated acres of impacted hard bottoms that will be mitigated. The costs shown in Table B-8 include the costs associated with the mitigation. Table B-9 display in detail how the average annual equivalents were computed for the periodic renourishments.

Table B-6: Storm Damage Model Benefits Summary


Table B-7: Shoreline extension by Reach

| Alternative Plan | Alternative <br> Plan <br> Description |  | Reach 1 | Reach <br> 2 | Reach <br> 3 | Reach <br> 4 | Reach <br> 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Reach <br> 6 |  |
| No Action | 0 | no action | no <br> action | no <br> action | no <br> action | no <br> action | no <br> action |
| Highest NED Plan feasible | 19 | 10 foot | 20 foot | 30 foot | dune | 10 foot | dune |
| Second Highest NED | 3 | 10 foot | 30 foot | 30 foot | dune | 10 foot | dune |
| Third Highest NED | 35 | 10 foot | 10 foot | 30 foot | dune | 10 foot | dune |
| Local Option 1 | 67 | S-3B 90 foot | 7 foot | 7 foot | 7 foot | 7 foot | 7 foot |
| Local Option 6 | 72 | 10 foot | 20 foot | 20 foot | 10 foot | 10 foot | dune |

Table B-8: Summary of Cost and Benefits

| Alternative Plan | Alternative <br> Plan <br> Number | Total First Cost | AAEQ Cost | AAEQ Benefit | Net Benefits | Benefit- <br> Cost <br> Ratio | Hardbottom Impact <br> (Acres) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Action Plan | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highest NED plan feasible | 19 | \$22,747,650 | \$2,898,830 | \$11,671,920 | \$8,773,090 | 4.03 | 2.9 |
| Second highest NED | 3 | \$23,696,660 | \$2,973,710 | \$11,731,000 | \$8,757,290 | 3.94 | 3.1 |
| Third highest NED | 35 | \$22,052,680 | \$2,853,700 | \$11,580,650 | \$8,726,950 | 4.06 | 2.8 |
| Local Option 1 | 67 | \$33,249,260 | \$3,913,720 | \$10,534,180 | \$6,620,450 | 2.69 | 3.2 |
| Local Option 6 | 72 | \$24,307,660 | \$3,050,370 | \$11,420,710 | \$8,370,340 | 3.74 | 3.0 |

Table B-9: Average Annual Equivalent Calculations


Table B-9: Average Annual Equivalent Calculations (continued)


Table B-9: Average Annual Equivalent Calculations (continued)


## FINAL REVISED NED AND LPP

51. The total project net benefits and benefit to cost ratio were updated using the FY10 discount rate of $43 / 8(4.375)$ percent and March 2010 price levels.
MCACES MII cost estimates were prepared for the NED plan and the locally preferred plan (LPP). The MCACES MII estimates are in March 2010 price levels. The Total Project Cost Summary (TPCS) was updated to October 2010 price levels. For economic considerations the March 2010 price levels and the FY 2010 discount rate of 4.375 were used in this report which is the discount rate and price levels at time of report submission. The annual operation and maintenance (O\&M) cost and the assumptions used to estimate annualized O\&M are presented in Table B-10. The O\&M include cost for aerial beach profile surveys, yearly inspections surveys and water quality certification permit surveys. Table B-11 display in how the average annual equivalents were computed for the monitoring cost of mitigation and periodic renourishments. The summary of storm damage reduction benefits are presented in Table B-12. The summary of the updated benefits and cost are presented in Table B-13. The recreation benefits in Table B-13 were updated using the appropriate FY10 discount rate of $43 / 8$ (4.375) percent and March 2010 price levels. The NED plan has a benefit to cost ratio of 3.02 and the LPP has a benefit to cost ratio of 2.96. Even though the LPP had a slightly lower total cost the NED had more storm damage reduction benefits and therefore higher net benefits.

Table B-10: Annual O\&M cost

| assumptions: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yearly inspection | \$5,000 | per mile | yearly |
| Surveys | \$10,000 | per mile | yearly |
| WQC surveys | \$20,000 | per year after 3 years |  |
| Year | Total Expenditure | Present Worth Factor | Present Worth |
| 0 |  | 1.000000 | \$0 |
| 1 | \$116,700 | 0.958084 | \$111,808 |
| 2 | \$116,700 | 0.917925 | \$107,122 |
| 3 | \$116,700 | 0.879449 | \$102,632 |
| 4 | \$136,700 | 0.842586 | \$115,181 |
| 5 | \$136,700 | 0.807268 | \$110,353 |
| 6 | \$136,700 | 0.773430 | \$105,728 |
| 7 | \$136,700 | 0.741011 | \$101,296 |
| 8 | \$136,700 | 0.709951 | \$97,050 |
| 9 | \$136,700 | 0.680192 | \$92,982 |
| 10 | \$136,700 | 0.651681 | \$89,085 |
| 11 | \$136,700 | 0.624365 | \$85,351 |
| 12 | \$136,700 | 0.598194 | \$81,773 |
| 13 | \$136,700 | 0.573120 | \$78,346 |
| 14 | \$136,700 | 0.549097 | \$75,062 |
| 15 | \$136,700 | 0.526081 | \$71,915 |
| 16 | \$136,700 | 0.504030 | \$68,901 |
| 17 | \$136,700 | 0.482903 | \$66,013 |
| 18 | \$136,700 | 0.462661 | \$63,246 |
| 19 | \$136,700 | 0.443268 | \$60,595 |
| 20 | \$136,700 | 0.424688 | \$58,055 |
| 21 | \$136,700 | 0.406887 | \$55,621 |
| 22 | \$136,700 | 0.389832 | \$53,290 |
| 23 | \$136,700 | 0.373492 | \$51,056 |
| 24 | \$136,700 | 0.357836 | \$48,916 |
| 25 | \$136,700 | 0.342837 | \$46,866 |
| 26 | \$136,700 | 0.328467 | \$44,901 |
| 27 | \$136,700 | 0.314699 | \$43,019 |
| 28 | \$136,700 | 0.301508 | \$41,216 |
| 29 | \$136,700 | 0.288870 | \$39,488 |
| 30 | \$136,700 | 0.276761 | \$37,833 |
| 31 | \$136,700 | 0.265161 | \$36,247 |
| 32 | \$136,700 | 0.254046 | \$34,728 |
| 33 | \$136,700 | 0.243397 | \$33,272 |
| 34 | \$136,700 | 0.233195 | \$31,878 |
| 35 | \$136,700 | 0.223420 | \$30,542 |
| 36 | \$136,700 | 0.214056 | \$29,261 |
| 37 | \$136,700 | 0.205083 | \$28,035 |
| 38 | \$136,700 | 0.196487 | \$26,860 |
| 39 | \$136,700 | 0.188251 | \$25,734 |
| 40 | \$136,700 | 0.180360 | \$24,655 |
| 41 | \$136,700 | 0.172800 | \$23,622 |
| 42 | \$136,700 | 0.165557 | \$22,632 |
| 43 | \$136,700 | 0.158617 | \$21,683 |
| 44 | \$136,700 | 0.151969 | \$20,774 |
| 45 | \$136,700 | 0.145599 | \$19,903 |
| 46 | \$136,700 | 0.139496 | \$19,069 |
| 47 | \$136,700 | 0.133649 | \$18,270 |
| 48 | \$136,700 | 0.128047 | \$17,504 |
| 49 | \$136,700 | 0.122680 | \$16,770 |
| 50 | \$136,700 | 0.117537 | \$16,067 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Accumulated |  |  |
|  | Present Worth = |  | \$2,702,209 |
|  | CRF ( $\mathrm{i}=4.375 \%$, $\mathrm{n}=50$ ) |  | 0.049577164 |
| Average Annual Equivalent (AAEQ) |  |  | \$133,968 |

Table B-11: Average Annual Equivalent Calculations


Table B-12: Storm Damage Benefits by Reach

|  | NO ACTION | NED |  | LPP |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | SDM AAEQ <br> Damages | SDM <br> AAEQ <br> Damages | SDM AAEQ <br> Benefit | SDM AAEQ <br> Damages | SDM AAEQ <br> Benefit |
| Reach 1 | $\$ 808,472$ | $\$ 273,576$ | $\$ 534,896$ | $\$ 273,576$ | $\$ 534,896$ |
| Reach 2 | $\$ 963,137$ | $\$ 180,942$ | $\$ 782,195$ | $\$ 242,848$ | $\$ 720,289$ |
| Reach 3 | $\$ 5,592,317$ | $\$ 733,086$ | $\$ 4,859,231$ | $\$ 1,234,460$ | $\$ 4,357,857$ |
| Reach 4 | $\$ 1,758,350$ | $\$ 885,373$ | $\$ 872,977$ | $\$ 647,883$ | $\$ 1,110,467$ |
| Reach 5 | $\$ 5,569,987$ | $\$ 1,579,075$ | $\$ 3,990,912$ | $\$ 1,579,075$ | $\$ 3,990,912$ |
| Reach 6 | $\$ 1,805,060$ | $\$ 953,157$ | $\$ 851,903$ | $\$ 953,157$ | $\$ 851,903$ |
| Total | $\$ 16,497,323$ | $\$ 4,605,209$ | $\$ 11,892,114$ | $\$ 4,930,999$ | $\$ 11,566,324$ |

Notes: AAEQ: Average annual equivalent

Table B-13 Summary of Project Costs and Benefits (Mar 2010 price levels and $43 / 8$ percent)

|  | NED Plan - Alternative 19 | LPP - Local Option 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mob/Demob | \$2,031,970 | \$2,031,970 |
| LERRD | \$86,100 | \$86,100 |
| PED | \$384,990 | \$384,990 |
| Engineering Monitoring | \$778,840 | \$778,840 |
| Beach Nourishment Fill | \$19,578,660 | \$19,381,030 |
| Construction Management (S\&I) | \$2,441,400 | \$2,424,600 |
| Mitigation | \$7,111,740 | \$7,111,740 |
| Total First Cost | \$32,413,700 | \$32,199,270 |
|  |  |  |
| Mob/Demob | \$708,420 | \$708,290 |
| LERRD | \$86,100 | \$86,100 |
| PED | \$384,990 | \$384,990 |
| Engineering Monitoring | \$140,840 | \$140,840 |
| Periodic Nourishment Fill | \$6,301,510 | \$6,300,780 |
| Construction Management (S\&I) | \$595,840 | \$595,770 |
| Total Each Periodic Nourishment (3 yrs) | \$8,217,710 | \$8,216,770 |
|  |  |  |
| Annual OMRR\&R | \$133,970 | \$133,970 |
|  |  |  |
| Total Project Cost | \$163,896,990 | \$163,667,640 |
|  |  |  |
| Interest During Construction | \$34,340 | \$34,150 |
| AAEQ Cost (4 3/8\%) | \$4,255,530 | \$4,244,410 |
|  |  |  |
| Primary AAEQ Benefit | \$11,830,210 | \$11,566,320 |
| Incidental AAEQ Benefit (Recreation) | \$1,013,900 | \$1,013,900 |
| Total AAEQ Benefit | \$12,844,110 | \$12,580,220 |
|  |  |  |
| Net Benefits | \$8,588,580 | \$8,335,820 |
| Benefit-Cost Ratio | 3.02 | 2.96 |

Notes: LERRD: Land, Easements, Rights-Of-Way, Relocation, and Disposal Areas
PED: Planning, Engineering and Design
AAEQ: Average annual equivalent
OMRR\&R : Operation and Maintenance, Repair, Replacement and Rehabilitation

## ATTACHMENT 1

## COST EFFECTIVENESS AND <br> INCREMENTAL COST ANALYSIS (CE/ICA)

A mitigation reef is necessary to mitigate the impacts to the nearshore rock from beach renourishment. Cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis of the mitigation measures was performed using IWR-PLAN decision support software. Engineering Regulation (ER) 1105-2-100 provides guidance for selection of the most cost effective mitigation measure. The mitigation measures which produce expected habitat units are referred to as mitigation plans in this analysis. These mitigation plans are associated with varying acreage which produces varying habitat units. Cost effectiveness and incremental cost analysis begins with a comparison of the average annual costs and outputs of mitigation plans to identify the least cost plan for every level of output (habitat units) considered. Mitigation plans are compared to identify those that would produce greater levels of output at the same cost, or at a lesser cost, as other alternative mitigation plans. Alternative mitigation plans identified through this comparison are the cost effective alternative mitigation plans. Next, through incremental cost analysis, the cost effective alternative plans are compared to identify the most economically efficient alternative plans, that is, the "Best Buy" alternative plans that produce the "biggest bang for the buck." Cost effective plans are compared by examining the additional (incremental) costs for the additional (incremental) amounts of output produced by successively larger cost effective plans. The plans with the lowest incremental costs per unit of output for successively larger levels of output are the "Best Buy" plans. The results of these calculations and comparisons of costs and outputs between alternative plans provide a basis for addressing the decision question "Is it worth it?," i.e., are the additional outputs worth the costs incurred to achieve them?

## COSTS

Cost estimates were prepared for two types of proposed mitigation reefs. The proposed mitigation reefs are the Limestone and Marine Mattress and the Articulated Concrete Mattress. Cost estimates for each alternative mitigation acreage plan's construction/implementation have been developed by the Jacksonville District. For this analysis it was assumed that there would be insignificant expenditures for periodically recurring costs for OMRR\&R (operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation) of the mitigation reef. The O\&M average annual cost does include the estimated cost of the pre-construction physical survey, post-construction physical survey and the post-construction biological surveys. Details about the mitigation reef construction alternatives and detailed cost can be found in Attachments 1 and 2.

For economic evaluation of alternative plans on a comparable basis, these cost estimates are further refined through present worth calculations, use of appropriate price levels, and consideration of the timing of project expenditures. For purposes of this report and analysis, the cost are expressed in 2008 price levels, and are based on costs estimated to be incurred over a 50 -year period of analysis. The timing of when a plan's costs are
incurred is important. Construction and other initial implementation costs cannot simply be added to periodically recurring costs for project operation and maintenance. Also, construction costs incurred in a given year of the project can't simply be added to construction costs incurred in other years if meaningful and direct comparisons of the costs of the different alternatives are to be made. A common practice of equating sums of money across time with their equivalent at an earlier single point in time is the process known as discounting. Through this mathematical process, which involves the use of an interest rate (or discount rate) officially prescribed by Federal policy for use in water resource planning analysis (currently set at $4.875 \%$ per year), the cost time streams of each alternative are mathematically translated into a present worth value. An annual value, equivalent to the present worth, can also be computed for the 50-year period of analysis. This average annual value represents an equivalent way of expressing the costs of a plan or alternative. The various costs estimated to be incurred over time to put each plan into place and operating have been computed and expressed as both a present worth value and an average annual equivalent value. Engineering Regulation (ER) 1105-2-100 requires that interest during construction (IDC) be computed which represents the opportunity cost of capital incurred during the construction period. Interest was computed for construction, supervision and administrative (S/A) and planning engineering and design (PED) costs from the middle of the month in which the expenditures were incurred until the first of the month following the estimated construction completion date. Corps guidance (ER 1105-2-100) also requires that average annual equivalent costs be used for cost effectiveness and incremental cost analyses (CE/ICA). Construction, interest during construction (IDC) costs, total investment, present worth, and average annual equivalent costs for varying mitigation reef acreage are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: CALCULATION OF COSTS USED IN COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS (\$) Articulated Concrete Mattress

| Acres | 4.64 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | \$6,462,910 | \$6,944,480 | \$8,282,170 | \$9,626,470 | \$10,970,770 | \$12,315,070 |
| S/A | \$674,050 | \$724,270 | \$863,780 | \$1,003,990 | \$1,144,190 | \$1,284,390 |
| PED | \$792,990 | \$852,080 | \$1,016,220 | \$1,181,160 | \$1,346,110 | \$1,511,050 |
| Total Construction | \$7,929,950 | \$8,520,830 | \$10,162,170 | \$11,811,620 | \$13,461,070 | \$15,110,510 |
| IDC | \$136,720 | \$150,520 | \$198,440 | \$257,730 | \$293,720 | \$364,450 |
| Total Investment | \$8,066,670 | \$8,671,350 | \$10,360,610 | \$12,069,350 | \$13,754,780 | \$15,474,960 |
| Average <br> Annual <br> Equivalent <br> Cost | \$433,360 | \$465,840 | \$556,600 | \$648,390 | \$738,940 | \$831,350 |
| O \& M Annual Cost | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 |
| Total Annual Cost | \$458,720 | \$491,200 | \$581,950 | \$673,750 | \$764,290 | \$856,710 |
| Benefits Average Annual (habitat units) | 2.900 | 3.125 | 3.750 | 4.375 | 5.000 | 5.625 |
| Construction Schedule (Months) | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 10 |

Table 1: CALCULATION OF COSTS USED IN COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS (\$) (Continued)

Limestone and Marine Mattress

| Acres | 4.64 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | \$9,949,690 | \$10,729,670 | \$12,896,290 | \$14,985,720 | \$17,075,150 | \$19,164,580 |
| S/A | \$1,037,700 | \$1,119,050 | \$1,345,010 | \$1,562,930 | \$1,780,840 | \$1,998,760 |
| PED | \$1,220,820 | \$1,316,520 | \$1,582,370 | \$1,838,740 | \$2,095,110 | \$2,351,480 |
| Total Construction | \$12,208,210 | \$13,165,240 | \$15,823,660 | \$18,387,380 | \$20,951,100 | \$23,514,820 |
| IDC | \$322,600 | \$347,890 | \$491,450 | \$656,770 | \$846,560 | \$1,061,050 |
| Total Investment | \$12,530,810 | \$13,513,140 | \$16,315,120 | \$19,044,150 | \$21,797,660 | \$24,575,860 |
| Average <br> Annual Equivalent Cost | \$673,180 | \$725,960 | \$876,490 | \$1,023,100 | \$1,171,020 | \$1,320,270 |
| O \& M Annual Cost | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 | \$25,360 |
| Total Annual Cost | \$698,540 | \$751,310 | \$901,840 | \$1,048,450 | \$1,196,380 | \$1,345,630 |
| Benefits <br> Average <br> Annual <br> (habitat <br> units) | 2.900 | 3.125 | 3.750 | 4.375 | 5.000 | 5.625 |
| Construction Schedule <br> (Months) | 11 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 19 |

## OUTPUTS (HABITAT UNITS)

Outputs (expressed as habitat units) used for CE/ICA are displayed in Table 2 for both the Limestone and Marine Mattress (LMM) and the Articulated Concrete Mattress (ACM). The basis for the average annual output (expressed as habitat units) used for CE/ICA calculations are based on the mitigation ratio calculated following the State of Florida Uniform Mitigation Assessment Method (UMAM). The detailed documentation of the application of UMAM in this analysis is found in Attachment 3. For this analysis the required mitigation for full compensation was calculated to be 2.9 habitat units. The 2.9 habitat units equate to 4.64 acres of the Articulated Concrete Mattress or 4.64 acres of Limestone and Marine Mattress based on the UMAM analysis. Table 2, Table 3, and Figure 1 show costs and outputs for a range of alternative levels for 4.64 acres to 9 acres of mitigation and the associated habitat units.

TABLE 2: ECOLOGICAL OUTPUTS (AVERAGE ANNUAL HABITAT UNITS) USED FOR CE/ICA (Sorted by cost per habitat unit)

| Mitigation Type | Mitigation Acreage | Average Annual Cost (\$) | Habitat Units | Average Cost per Habitat Unit (\$) | Cost Effective |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Action |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| ACM | 9 | 856,706 | 5.625 | 152,303 | Yes |
| ACM | 8 | 764,294 | 5.000 | 152,859 | Yes |
| ACM | 7 | 673,749 | 4.375 | 154,000 | Yes |
| ACM | 6 | 581,952 | 3.750 | 155,187 | Yes |
| ACM | 5 | 491,201 | 3.125 | 157,184 | Yes |
| ACM | 4.64 | 458,716 | 2.900 | 158,178 | Yes |
| LMM | 9 | 1,345,628 | 5.625 | 239,223 | No |
| LMM | 8 | 1,196,376 | 5.000 | 239,275 | No |
| LMM | 7 | 1,048,451 | 4.375 | 239,646 | No |
| LMM | 5 | 751,312 | 3.125 | 240,420 | No |
| LMM | 6 | 901,841 | 3.750 | 240,491 | No |
| LMM | 4.64 | 698,540 | 2.900 | 240,876 | No |

TABLE 3: ECOLOGICAL OUTPUTS (AVERAGE ANNUAL HABITAT UNITS) USED FOR CE/ICA (Sorted by mitigation acreage within type)

| Mitigation Type | Mitigation Acreage | Average Annual Cost (\$) | Habitat Units | Average <br> Cost per <br> Habitat <br> Unit (\$) | Cost Effective |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Action |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| ACM | 4.64 | 458,716 | 2.900 | 158,178 | Yes |


| ACM | 5 | 491,201 | 3.125 | 157,184 | Yes |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| ACM | 6 | 581,952 | 3.750 | 155,187 | Yes |
| ACM | 7 | 673,749 | 4.375 | 154,000 | Yes |
| ACM | 8 | 764,294 | 5.000 | 152,859 | Yes |
| ACM | 9 | 856,706 | 5.625 | 152,303 | Yes |
| LMM | 4.64 | 698,540 | 2.900 | 240,876 | No |
| LMM | 5 | 751,312 | 3.125 | 240,420 | No |
| LMM | 6 | 901,841 | 3.750 | 240,491 | No |
| LMM | 7 | $1,048,451$ | 4.375 | 239,646 | No |
| LMM | 8 | $1,196,376$ | 5.000 | 239,275 | No |
| LMM | 9 | $1,345,628$ | 5.625 | 239,223 | No |

FIGURE 1: ALTERNATIVE PLANS - CE/ICA AVERAGE ANNUAL HABITAT UNITS AND AVERAGE ANNUAL COSTS FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES


Alternative plans are compared to identify those that would produce greater levels of output at the same cost, or at a lesser cost, as other alternative plans. All the articulated concrete mattress alternatives are cost effective since the articulated concrete mattress alternatives cost less for the same level of outputs (habitat units) than the limestone
marine mattress. There were two best buy plans identified by the IWR-PLAN. The best buy plans identified were the no action and the 9 acres of articulated concrete mattress since the average cost per habitat unit decrease as the mitigation acreage increase. The 9 acres of articulated concrete mattress yielded 5.625 habitat units at an average annual cost of $\$ 856,706$ and an average annual incremental cost of $\$ 152,303$ per habitat unit. Even though 9 acres of articulated concrete mattress is considered a best buy, only 4.64 acres of articulated concrete mattress would be needed to achieve the 2.9 habitat units for full compensation. The recommended 4.64 acres of the articulated concrete mattress with an average annual cost of $\$ 458,716$ is $\$ 239,824$ less than the $\$ 698,540$ average annual cost of the limestone marine mattress that would be needed to achieve the 2.9 habitat units for full compensation. The average annual incremental cost of the recommended plan of 4.64 acres would be $\$ 158,178$ per habitat unit.

## TABLE 4: INCREMENTAL ANALYSIS USING AVERAGE ANNUAL COST FOR COST EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES (Sorted by habitat unit)

| Mitigation Type | Mitigation Acreage | Average <br> Annual <br> Cost (\$) | Incremental <br> Average <br> Annual <br> Cost (\$) | Habitat <br> Units | Incremental Average Annual Cost per Habitat Unit | $\begin{gathered} \text { Incremental } \\ \text { Habitat } \\ \text { Unit per } \\ \text { acre } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average <br> Cost per <br> Habitat <br> Unit (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACM | 4.64 | 458,716 |  | 2.900 |  |  | 158,178 |
| ACM | 5 | 491,201 | n/a | 3.125 | n/a | n/a | 157,184 |
| ACM | 6 | 581,952 | 90,751 | 3.750 | 145,202 | 0.625 | 155,187 |
| ACM | 7 | 673,749 | 91,797 | 4.375 | 146,875 | 0.625 | 154,000 |
| ACM | 8 | 764,294 | 90,545 | 5.000 | 144,872 | 0.625 | 152,859 |
| ACM | 9 | 856,706 | 92,412 | 5.625 | 147,859 | 0.625 | 152,303 |

Table 4 shows the average annual cost, incremental cost for each additional mitigation acre, incremental cost per habitat unit and average cost per habitat unit for varying acres of mitigation articulated concrete mattress. The incremental cost per habitat unit of adding additional mitigation acreage ranges from $\$ 145,202$ to $\$ 147,859$. Table 4 also shows the incremental cost of adding each additional acre of mitigation articulated concrete mattress ranges from $\$ 90,546$ to $\$ 92,412$. Even though the average cost per habitat unit may decrease slightly with additional mitigation acreage only 4.64 acres are needed to achieve full compensation.

## TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

The following tables and figure show the CE/ICA using the Total Project Cost. The 9 acres of articulated concrete mattress yielded 5.625 habitat units at a total project cost of $\$ 15,947,020$ and an incremental total project cost of $\$ 2,835,026$ per habitat unit. Even though 9 acres of articulated concrete mattress is considered a best buy, only 4.64 acres of articulated concrete mattress would be needed to achieve the 2.9 habitat units for full
compensation. The recommended 4.64 acres of the articulated concrete mattress with a total project cost of $\$ 8,538,730$ is $\$ 4,464,140$ less than the $\$ 13,002,870$ total project cost of the limestone marine mattress that would be needed to achieve the 2.9 habitat units for full compensation. The incremental total project cost of the recommended plan of 4.64 acres would be a $\$ 2,944,390$ per habitat unit.

## Table 5: CALCULATION OF TOTAL PROJECT COSTS USED IN COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS (\$)

## Articulated Concrete Mattress

| Acres | ACM-4.64 | ACM-5 | ACM-6 | ACM-7 | ACM-8 | ACM-9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | \$6,462,910 | \$6,944,480 | \$8,282,170 | \$9,626,470 | \$10,970,770 | \$12,315,070 |
| S/A | \$674,050 | \$724,270 | \$863,780 | \$1,003,990 | \$1,144,190 | \$1,284,390 |
| PED | \$792,990 | \$852,080 | \$1,016,220 | \$1,181,160 | \$1,346,110 | \$1,511,050 |
| Total Construction | \$7,929,950 | \$8,520,830 | \$10,162,170 | \$11,811,620 | \$13,461,070 | \$15,110,510 |
| IDC Construction | \$136,720 | \$150,520 | \$198,440 | \$257,730 | \$293,720 | \$364,450 |
| Project Implementation cost | \$8,066,670 | \$8,671,350 | \$10,360,610 | \$12,069,350 | \$13,754,780 | \$15,474,960 |
| O\&M Cost <br> (Present Worth) | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 |
| Total Project Cost | \$8,538,730 | \$9,143,410 | \$10,832,670 | \$12,541,410 | \$14,226,840 | \$15,947,020 |
| Benefits (habitat units) | 2.900 | 3.125 | 3.750 | 4.375 | 5.000 | 5.625 |
| Construction Schedule (Months) | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 10 |

Table 6: CALCULATION OF TOTAL PROJECT COSTS USED IN COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS (\$) (Continued)

Limestone and Marine Mattress

| Acres | LMM-4.64 | LMM-5 | LMM-6 | LMM-7 | LMM-8 | LMM-9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction | \$9,949,690 | \$10,729,670 | \$12,896,290 | \$14,985,720 | \$17,075,150 | \$19,164,580 |
| S/A | \$1,037,700 | \$1,119,050 | \$1,345,010 | \$1,562,930 | \$1,780,840 | \$1,998,760 |
| PED | \$1,220,820 | \$1,316,520 | \$1,582,370 | \$1,838,740 | \$2,095,110 | \$2,351,480 |
| Total Construction | \$12,208,210 | \$13,165,240 | \$15,823,660 | \$18,387,380 | \$20,951,100 | \$23,514,820 |
| IDC Construction | \$322,600 | \$347,890 | \$491,450 | \$656,770 | \$846,560 | \$1,061,050 |
| Project Implementation Cost | \$12,530,810 | \$13,513,140 | \$16,315,120 | \$19,044,150 | \$21,797,660 | \$24,575,860 |
| O\&M Cost <br> (Present Worth) | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 | \$472,060 |
| Total Project Cost | \$13,002,870 | \$13,985,200 | \$16,787,180 | \$19,516,210 | \$22,269,720 | \$25,047,920 |
| Benefits (habitat units) | 2.900 | 3.125 | 3.750 | 4.375 | 5.000 | 5.625 |
| Construction Schedule (Months) | 11 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 19 |

TABLE 7: ECOLOGICAL OUTPUTS (HABITAT UNITS) AND TOTAL PROJECT COST USED FOR CE/ICA (Sorted by cost per habitat unit)

| Mitigation <br> Type | Mitigation <br> Acreage | Total Project <br> Cost (\$) | Habitat <br> Units | Average <br> Cost per <br> Habitat <br> Unit (\$) | Cost <br> Effective |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No Action |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| ACM | 9 | $15,947,020$ | 5.625 | $2,835,026$ | Yes |
| ACM | 8 | $14,226,840$ | 5.000 | $2,845,368$ | Yes |
| ACM | 7 | $12,541,410$ | 4.375 | $2,866,608$ | Yes |
| ACM | 6 | $10,832,670$ | 3.750 | $2,888,712$ | Yes |
| ACM | 5 | $9,143,410$ | 3.125 | $2,925,891$ | Yes |
| ACM | 4.64 | $8,538,730$ | 2.900 | $2,944,390$ | Yes |
| LMM | 9 | $25,047,920$ | 5.625 | $4,452,964$ | No |
| LMM | 8 | $22,269,720$ | 5.000 | $4,453,944$ | No |
| LMM | 7 | $19,516,210$ | 4.375 | $4,460,848$ | No |
| LMM | 5 | $13,985,200$ | 3.125 | $4,475,264$ | No |
| LMM | 6 | $16,787,180$ | 3.750 | $4,476,581$ | No |
| LMM | 4.64 | $13,002,870$ | 2.900 | $4,483,748$ | No |

TABLE 8: ECOLOGICAL OUTPUTS (HABITAT UNITS) USED FOR CE/ICA (Sorted by mitigation acreage within type)

| Mitigation <br> Type | Mitigation <br> Acreage | Total Project <br> Cost (\$) | Habitat <br> Units | Average <br> Cost per <br> Habitat Unit <br> (\$) | Cost <br> Effective |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| No Action | 4.64 | $8,538,730$ | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| ACM | 5 | $9,143,410$ | 3.125 | $2,944,390$ | Yes |
| ACM | 6 | $10,832,670$ | 3.750 | $2,888,791$ | Yes |
| ACM | 7 | $12,541,410$ | 4.375 | $2,866,608$ | Yes |
| ACM | 8 | $14,226,840$ | 5.000 | $2,845,368$ | Yes |
| ACM | 9 | $15,947,020$ | 5.625 | $2,835,026$ | Yes |
| ACM | 4.64 | $13,002,870$ | 2.900 | $4,483,748$ | No |
| LMM | 5 | $13,985,200$ | 3.125 | $4,475,264$ | No |
| LMM | 6 | $16,787,180$ | 3.750 | $4,476,581$ | No |
| LMM | 7 | $19,516,210$ | 4.375 | $4,460,848$ | No |
| LMM | 8 | $22,269,720$ | 5.000 | $4,453,944$ | No |
| LMM | 9 | $25,047,920$ | 5.625 | $4,452,964$ | No |
| LMM |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 9: INCREMENTAL ANALYSIS USING TOTAL PROJECT COST FOR COST EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES (Sorted by habitat unit)

| Mitigation <br> Type | Mitigation <br> Acreage | Total <br> Project <br> Cost (\$) | Incremental <br> Total Cost <br> $(\$)$ | Habitat <br> Units | Incremental <br> Total Cost <br> per Habitat <br> Unit | Incremental <br> Habitat <br> Unit per <br> acre | Total <br> Cost per <br> Habitat <br> Unit (\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACM | 4.64 | $8,538,730$ |  | 2.900 |  |  | $2,944,390$ |
| ACM | 5 | $9,143,410$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 3.125 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $2,925,891$ |
| ACM | 6 | $10,832,670$ | $1,689,260$ | 3.750 | $2,702,816$ | 0.625 | $2,888,712$ |
| ACM | 7 | $12,541,410$ | $1,708,740$ | 4.375 | $2,733,984$ | 0.625 | $2,866,608$ |
| ACM | 8 | $14,226,840$ | $1,685,430$ | 5.000 | $2,696,688$ | 0.625 | $2,845,368$ |
| ACM | 9 | $15,947,020$ | $1,720,180$ | 5.625 | $2,752,288$ | 0.625 | $2,835,026$ |

FIGURE 2: ALTERNATIVE PLANS - CE/ICA HABITAT UNITS FOR ALL ALTERNATIVES USING TOTAL PROJECT COSTS


## Attachment 2

Economic Analysis of
Incidental Project Benefits

# Brevard County, Florida <br> Federal Shore Protection Project; <br> Mid-Reach <br> Economic Analysis of Incidental Project Benefits 

Olsen Associates, Inc. 4438 Herschel Street
Jacksonville, FL 32210 (904) 387-6114

DRAFT: June 22, 2006
(Prior to selection of plan)

1. Recreational Benefits. Recreational usage of the beaches in Brevard County contributes millions of dollars annually to the local economy and the State of Florida. Generation of recreational benefits is not a primary project purpose, but all benefits associated with Federal shore protection projects are evaluated in order to determine the net benefits generated by the projects. In order to identify the recreational benefits generated by the selected plan demands for saltwater beach usage along the Brevard County Mid-Reach were projected through the year 2060 in ten-year increments. These beach demands were then compared to the with- and without-project recreational beach capacity along the Mid-Reach throughout the 50 -year duration of the project. An average economic value per beach visit was determined and used to compute the dollar value of the visits attributable to the proposed project relative to the without-project condition. The resulting average annual value of beach visits attributable to the project is the recreational benefit.
2. Annual Beach Demand. Annual beach activity on a countywide basis is a combination of Brevard County resident, other Florida resident, and tourist participation. The countywide saltwater beach demand for Brevard County, CD, was determined by
$C D=\left(P_{c} N_{c}+P_{s} N_{s}+P_{t} N_{t}\right) K$
where,
$\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{c}}=$ constant from the Florida Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), denotes participation rate by county residents;
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{c}}=$ county population from State Statistical Abstract (BEBR, 2005);
$P_{s}=$ constant from SCORP, denotes participation from residents of other Florida counties who recreate on Brevard County beaches;
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{s}}=$ State population, less Brevard County Population (BEBR, 2005);
$P_{t}=$ constant from SCORP, denotes participation rate for tourists who visit Brevard beaches;
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}=$ Tourist population for Brevard County, from Brevard County (2002); and
$\mathrm{K}=$ constant as determined from actual counts (value of 1.0 used herein).
3. Tables 1 and 2 shows the projected population, beach demand, and participation rates for Brevard County as provided by various State of Florida agencies and as described below. In Table 1, the County and State population projections were developed from the 2005 Florida Statistical Abstract (BEBR, 2005). Published values include the years 2010 through 2030, whereby data points for 2002 and 2040-2060 were linearly extrapolated.

Table 1 - Brevard County population and saltwater beach demand, 2010 to 2060 (units are given in thousands).

|  |  | 2002 | 2010 | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2060 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resident <br> Population | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | 512.6 | 577.3 | 620.6 | 663.5 | 704.5 | 742.7 | 827.8 | 910.7 | 993.6 |
| Resident <br> Demand | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{C}}$ |  | $2,020.6$ | $2,172.1$ | $2,322.3$ | $2,465.8$ | $2,599.5$ | $2,897.2$ | $3,187.5$ | $3,477.7$ |
| Other Florida <br> Population | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | $16,200.6$ | $19,077.8$ | $20,659.7$ | $22,230.6$ | $23,744.7$ | $25,155.8$ | $28,269.8$ | $31,318.0$ | $34,366.2$ |
| Other Florida | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{s}}$ |  | $1,144.7$ | $1,239.6$ | $1,333.8$ | $1,424.7$ | $1,509.3$ | $1,696.2$ | $1,879.1$ | $2,062.0$ |
| Demand |  | $1,587.6$ | $2,286.6$ | $2,723.5$ | $3,160.4$ | $3,597.3$ | $4,034.2$ | $4,908.0$ | $5,781.8$ | $6,655.6$ |
| Tourist <br> Population | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{t}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2 - Resident and tourist participation rates (SCORP Region 6).

|  | Participation Rate <br> (Uses per Visitor) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County Resident | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{c}}$ | 3.5 |
| In-state Tourist | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$ | 0.06 |
| Out-of-State Tourist | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | 2.84 |

4. The total tourist population for Brevard County was adopted from a 2002 study of the county-wide, economic impact of tourism (PMG Associates, 2002). The published 2002 tourist population of 4,447,000 excludes those visitors associated with visits to either the Kennedy Space Center or the Cruise Port at Canaveral Harbor. According to a second study of tourism conducted via survey by the City of Cocoa Beach, Florida in 2002, approximately 35.7 percent of the respondents were visitors who do not reside in the State of Florida (City of Cocoa Beach, 2002). Thus, the out-of-state tourist population was estimated to be about $1,587,580$ visitors in 2002. Projections of the future tourist population were based on changes in the number of total visitors to the State of Florida between 1999 and 2005, which exhibited an average annual growth of approximately 5.5 percent (Visit Florida ${ }^{1}$, personal communication). Within this period, estimates of beachoriented tourist visits are available from Florida Atlantic University (FAU, 2005) for the years 2000 through 2003 (Table 3). For those years, the average annual rates of rates of growth in total tourist visits and beach-oriented tourist trips were 5.2 and 6.0 percent, respectively. Comparison of these values indicates that the rate of total tourist growth is a conservative proxy estimate of the beach-oriented tourist growth.

Table 3 - Estimated tourist visits 1999 to 2005.

| Year | Estimated Total State <br> Visitors (millions) | Estimated Beach-Oriented <br> Tourist Trips (millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | 58.9 | 23.6 |
| 2000 | 72.8 | 24.9 |
| 2001 | 69.5 | 28.4 |
| 2002 | 73.9 | 27.2 |
| 2003 | 74.6 |  |
| 2004 | 79.7 |  |
| 2005 | 85.0 |  |

[^1]5. The demand listed in Table 1 was computed using participation rates applied to each population category, as listed in Table 2. Participation rates denote the average annual number of beach visits (user occasions) attributable to each member of a given population. In previous years, the Florida Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) published resident and non-resident participation rates, by study region, for saltwater beach use. The most recent SCORP completed for the year 2000 does not list participation rates and instead reports only a total saltwater beach demand for the entire east-central Florida region (FDEP 2002). Data for Region VI of the SCORP report were utilized for the present study. Region VI includes the coastal counties of Volusia and Brevard Counties.
6. The participation rates most recently published in the SCORP data were utilized in computing demand for the present study (DNR 1989) and are equivalent to the values adopted in the prior Feasibility Study for the Brevard County Federal Shore Protection Project (USACE 1996).
7. The total 2010 county-wide demand of about 9,659,211 annual beach visits computed herein is in general agreement with that computed in the 1996 Brevard County Feasibility Study (USACE 1996). That report predicted that the 1998 county-wide beach demand would be about $7,328,200$ uses, suggesting a moderate 2.65 average annual percent increase from 1998 to year one (2010) of the present study. This analysis is also in agreement with a 1989 report prepared by Olsen Associates which estimated the 1990 county-wide beach demand at 9,500,000 uses (Bodge and Savage 1989).
8. According to the 2000 SCORP data, total saltwater beach demand for east-central Florida (Region VI) in the year 2010 is predicted to be approximately $31,093,300$ user occasions (FDEP 2002). Based upon the distribution of recreational beaches within Region VI, (Bodge and Savage 1989; USACE 1996), the 2000 SCORP demand attributable to Brevard County is estimated to be about 10,198,590 user occasions (Bodge and Savage 1989 and USACE 1996). This value is in agreement with beach use demand
computed via estimates of population density and user participation rates, described in Table 2 and adopted herein.
9. The distribution of public beach area was examined in order to apportion county-wide demand to the Mid-Reach. The majority of Brevard County's beaches, however, are accessible to the public due to the ongoing Brevard County Federal Shore Protection Project's North (R1 to R53) and South Reaches (R118.3 to R139). The beach area along the North Reach and South Reach segments currently provides for a respective capacity of 223,117 and 74,783 beach users per day ${ }^{2}$. The public-accessible shoreline along Patrick Air Force Base provides enough beach area for approximately 41,574 users per day, bringing the total public beach area capacity of Brevard County, not including the Mid-Reach, to nearly 340,000 users per day ${ }^{3}$. In comparison, the Mid-Reach currently provides enough publicly owned beach area to support about 12,911 users per day (see Table 6), or less than 4 percent of the county-wide capacity due to the limited alongshore length of publicly owned in the without-project condition. Comparison with previous studies of Mid-Reach beach usage indicates that allocating beach demand by beach area results in a significant and non-realistic underestimation of Mid-Reach beach participation because the allocation of beach-use participation in the County is principally prescribed by available access (parking) not by public beach area (USACE 1996, Bodge \& Savage 1989). For the present study, the demand for beach usage within the MidReach was apportioned from the total county-wide demand as a function of the distribution of public beach parking, which has been demonstrated as being an important factor in explaining how users select their placement on a beach (Pendleton, 2001). Public beach parking along the Mid-Reach constitutes approximately 11.6 percent of the total public beach parking spaces in the County. It was thus assumed that the Mid-Reach experiences approximately 11.6 percent of the County's beach use demand, resulting in about 1,120,468 visits in 2010 (see Table 1). This allocation of demand provides a more realistic estimation and is similar to that used in the 1996 Brevard County Feasibility

[^2]Study which apportions 13.0 percent of the total county-wide beach use demand to the Mid-Reach (USACE 1996). By comparison, the Mid-Reach comprises about 19 percent of Brevard's beach length.
10. Demand Allocation Based on Supply. For each project year, the beach use demand was further apportioned along the Mid-Reach shoreline as a function of available public beach area capacity at each access location, with availability limited by either parking capacity or beach area for both with- and without project conditions. This least density usage approach ensures proportional distribution of participation over the study area beaches. It presumes that if one segment of beach is overcrowded, then all segments are overcrowded; and that the opposite is also true. This approach likewise implies that a participant will find useable beach if it is available in the study area. No attractiveness indexes are used to distribute participation, although it is recognized that participants may exhibit a preference for a given park because of differences in access and facilities and that the more desirable beaches will be occupied first. In a with-project condition, additional public beach is created in the study area and excess demand can be accommodated at the various access points within the limits of available parking capacity. In this way, the allocation of beach demand between access points varies for each year, and for each project alternative, as a function of the available beach-use capacity (supply) at each access point. Benefits attributable to a given project alternative are the excess (unmet) demand which is satisfied by the project.
11. Specifically, for a given project alternative, the beach-use demand was computed for each access point. The beach-use demand ascribed to each access point, for a given demand day, is a function of the access point's available beach-use capacity relative to the total available Mid-Reach capacity, times the total beach-use demand for that day. Or, (daily beach-use demand at access "A") = (available capacity at "A") / (total available Mid-Reach capacity) x (total Mid-Reach demand), in units of users per day. In this way, the beach-use demand ascribed to each access is allocated so that the density of demand is the same at all parks within the project area, and the sum-total of all demand does not exceed the project area's total beach-use demand. When the demand at a given
access point exceeds the access point's available capacity, excess (unmet) demand which is not met by the particular project alternative exists. Excess daily demand, at each access, is the difference between the daily beach-use demand and the access point's available capacity. Or, (excess demand at access "A") = (daily beach-use demand at access "A") - (available capacity at "A"). At each access point, the number of daily beach visits attributable to the project is the difference between excess demand present under without- and with-project conditions. Or, (daily beach visits attributable to the project at "A") $=$ (without-project excess demand at "A") - (with-project excess demand at "A").
12. Daily Beach Activity Demand. Daily beach activity demand varies considerably from day-to-day with the greatest demand occurring on weekends, holidays, and during other special events. Daily demand also varies seasonally throughout the year. The distribution of beach visitation during the year in Brevard County was adopted from that given by the economic analysis completed by Bodge and Savage (1989). Table 4 presents the annual distribution of beach usage in terms of nine use categories. Daily usage is computed by applying the percent of the total usage per day to the annual demand presented in Table 1.

Table 4 - Annual distribution of beach visits in Brevard County.

|  |  |  |  |  | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2060 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User Group | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of Peak } \\ \text { Use } \end{gathered}$ | No. Days | \% of Total Annual Use | Percent Total/day | Daily Demand (uses/day) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 1.5 | 1.50 | 16,807 | 21,979 | 27,085 | 32,246 | 37,387 | 42,528 |
| 2 | 88.3 | 11 | 14.8 | 1.35 | 15,075 | 19,715 | 24,294 | 28,924 | 33,535 | 38,147 |
| 3 | 76.5 | 10 | 11.7 | 1.17 | 13,109 | 17,144 | 21,126 | 25,152 | 29,162 | 33,172 |
| 4 | 64.7 | 7 | 6.9 | 0.99 | 11,045 | 14,443 | 17,799 | 21,190 | 24,569 | 27,947 |
| 5 | 53.0 | 16 | 12.9 | 0.81 | 9,034 | 11,814 | 14,558 | 17,332 | 20,096 | 22,859 |
| 6 | 41.2 | 22 | 13.8 | 0.63 | 7,028 | 9,191 | 11,326 | 13,485 | 15,635 | 17,785 |
| 7 | 29.4 | 19 | 8.6 | 0.45 | 5,072 | 6,632 | 8,173 | 9,730 | 11,282 | 12,833 |
| 8 | 17.7 | 26 | 7.0 | 0.27 | 3,017 | 3,945 | 4,861 | 5,788 | 6,711 | 7,633 |
| 9 | 5.9 | 253 | 22.8 | 0.09 | 1,010 | 1,320 | 1,627 | 1,937 | 2,246 | 2,555 |

13. With- and Without-project Beach Capacity. With- and without-project recreational beach capacities were computed for existing and future predicted conditions. Beach capacity is determined at each public beach access location by the publicly accessible
beach area or the public beach parking/access capacity, whichever is smaller. Year one (2010) with- and without-project constrained beach capacities are approximately 14,500 and 8,776 users per day, respectively (see Tables 6 and 7).
14. In evaluating the without-project condition each public access point was separately evaluated in terms of available public parking and existing beach area. Constrained beach area capacities computed at each access point are summed for each sub-reach in Table 6. For the with-project simulation, public parking and beach area were combined along project reaches within the Mid-Reach in order to account for the public's anticipated use of the project beach up to $1 / 4$ mile alongshore in both directions from the access. Because of the inherent subjectivity in assigning capacity to areas where multiple $1 / 4$ mile radii overlap, only the capacity of each sub-reach is shown in Table 7.
15. Beach Area. Available beach area was computed using data gathered from recent aerial photographs and a February 2005 beach survey. Beach area was computed as the effective alongshore length of publicly accessible shoreline multiplied by the measured cross-shore width of dry beach. In computing area-limited beach capacity, it was assumed that in order to recreate each beach visitor requires a minimum of 100 square feet of dry beach and this area can be used by two persons per day. This unconstrained beach area computation is shown as an example for project year one (2010) in Table 6.
16. Beach width was measured from the vegetation line or toe of the dune/bluff (typically, about +11 ft , NGVD) to the MHW shoreline. Average annual shoreline change rates were applied to the measured beach width in order to project existing conditions from 2005 to 2010 (year one of the economic simulation). Shoreline change rates along prescribed segments within the Mid-Reach are presented in Table 5. These rates were also applied, as required, to the beach width for the duration of the simulation, years 2010 through 2060. All beach widths are given in Table 6.
17. Beach length for without-project conditions was assumed to be the alongshore length of publicly owned property. For with-project simulations, the project easements allow
public beach use along the project length, within which the public is reasonably anticipated to use up to a $1 / 4$ mile alongshore from each public beach access point in the project area. The aforementioned grouping of access points under with-project conditions allows consideration of overlapping $1 / 4$ mile usage zones and is arranged such that beach users from any given parking space utilize the project only within $1 / 4$ mile of the beach access.

Table 5 - Measured shoreline change rates within the Mid-Reach (from USACE).

|  | Reach 1 | Reach 2 | Reach 3 | Reach 4 | Reach 5 | Reach 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reach Limits | R118.3-R109 | R109-R105.5 | R105.5-R99 | R99-R93 | R93-R83 | R83-R75.4 |
| Rec Rate $(\mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{yr})$ | -0.7 | -0.6 | -0.8 | -0.8 | -1.0 | -0.6 |

18. Public Parking and Beach Access Capacity. Aerial photographs and ground verification as well as updated parking data obtained from Brevard County were used to locate and account for public beach access parking spaces in the study area. It is assumed that each public parking space can accommodate four persons per vehicle and is turned over twice per day (USACE 1996). Thus, each public parking space provides a daily capacity of eight users per day. Appendix A presents the aerial photographs used in the study, the approximate location and number of parking spaces at each access point, as well as a graphical interpretation of the corresponding with-project $1 / 4$ mile usage radii.
19. In Brevard County, many beach users do not depend on public parking for beach access. Instead they arrive at the beach on foot, on bike, or are dropped-off by cars or city busses. The terms notional parking and notional visitors describe the ability of the public to access the beach by means other than public parking. Based on the number of parking spaces in the project area, the Mid-Reach can accommodate approximately 6,640 visitors per day through public parking access ( 830 spaces x 8 persons/space/day $=6,640$ persons/day). Using the frequency distribution listed in Table 4, peak daily visitation is expected to be about 16,807 visitors in year one. This implies that at peak usage, about 10,167 users access the beach by means other than public parking. Thus the notional parking factor, or ratio of notional users to parking users, is $1.53(10,167 \div 6,640=1.53)$. The notional capacity for each access is therefore computed by multiplying the parking
capacity by the notional factor, 1.53 . The total capacity is then the sum of parking and notional capacities.
20. This method for computing notional beach visitors follows the approach applied in the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) for Broward County, Florida Federal Shore Protection Project, Segment II (USACE 2003). In that instance, a notional parking factor of 1.75 was applied to the available parking capacity to compute the notional capacity. The notional factor of 1.53 computed for the Mid-Reach is smaller than for Broward County owing to the lesser density of population and development in Brevard versus Broward County (Segment II).
21. The notional factor of 1.53 suggests that about $60 \%$ of the Mid-Reach beach users access the beach by other than public parking. This ratio is comparable to that indicated by a 1991 beach user survey completed for Sarasota County, Florida which found that about 50 percent of the total beach users do not require public parking. Development along both Sarasota and Brevard County beaches is considered to be medium density; that is, a mix of multi- and single-family dwellings. (USACE 1996.)
22. All of the Mid-Reach shoreline is within $1 / 4$ mile of a public beach access excepting $1,985-\mathrm{ft}$ located in Reach 5, approximately between monument locations R83.9 and R86.1. No recreational benefits were computed for this short section of shoreline. This segment is reflected in Table 7 as follows: The Patrick street access point in Reach 6 allows access to a point approximately 32,265 feet north of R118.3, as indicated. The Grant street access point allows use to a point approximately 30,280 feet from R118.3. The gap between the two $1 / 4$ mile use radii is about 1,985 feet long $(32,265-30,280=$ 1,985), as shown in Table 7.
23. Maximum Daily Capacity. The maximum daily beach use capacity was computed for each access, or group of access points as the number of beach uses per day that can be accommodated by either (1) the publicly accessible beach area or (2) the public beach parking and notional access, whichever is smaller. This comparison was made for each
year of the analysis, for both the without- and with-project conditions. In the withoutproject condition, the size of the available beach area was modified for each year as a function of the local shoreline change rate. The public beach parking and notional access capacity was held constant for each year. Maximum beach capacity at each access point throughout the project life (in 10-year increments) is given for the without-project condition in Table 6.
24. Projected beach capacities for the with-project alternative are presented in Table 7. In the tables, beach capacity has been grouped and sub-totaled for various project reaches within the Mid-Reach in order to allow for direct comparison between without- and withproject alternatives. The capacity projection values shown in Table 7 represent a project equivalent to maintaining the current location of the MHW shoreline. Because in this instance advanced placement is planned for the project, the economic model assumes the effective shoreline change rate to be zero feet per year. Beach usage under with-project conditions is limited by available parking, which satisfies all of the anticipated demand throughout year one, with about 67 days of unmet demand by year 50. Although the construction of new parking facilities is not planned for the project, construction of additional parking spaces would provide an opportunity to further satisfy unmet demand throughout the project.
25. A uniform maintenance of the existing shoreline may not coincide with the actual proposed project; however, such a condition does represent the minimum project whereby each project reach which will realize recreational benefits. More importantly, under this with-project condition all project reaches are parking limited for the duration of the 50 -year simulation. Because parking constraints limit participation, recreational benefits will be constant along a given reach even if the proposed project width is increased.
26. Beach Use Demand vs. Capacity. Excess (unmet) demand was computed by comparing with-and without-project capacities with daily beach demands for each user group and simulation year. Excess demand met by the with-project condition can be
considered to be the additional visitors attributable to the project. The total excess demand computed for with- and without-project conditions is presented in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. Tables 10 and $\mathbf{1 1}$ divide the total excess demand into demand along each proposed project reach for without- and with-project conditions, respectively. Each of the with-project excess demand projections represents a minimum value and will increase to the without-project quantity should a given reach no longer be included in the final project design.
27. In the without-project condition, beach usage is limited by both available parking and beach area and varies from one access point to the next. Construction of a nourished project reach results in beach use being limited only due to parking constraints (versus beach area). Because construction of new parking is not a planned part of the proposed project, all of the future unmet demand cannot be met by project construction. However, in the with-project condition, the unmet beach use demand along the Mid-Reach is expected to be very small relative to the total demands on the beaches. If all project reaches are maintained at current level of beach width, demand is completely met in year one of the project and is expected to expand to about 67 days by year 50 .
Table 6 - Projected beach capacity for without-proiect conditions (2010-2060).

| Name | Mid-point Mon (R-) | Dist. North of R118.3 (ft) | Approx. Public <br> Parking <br> Spaces | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { Notional \& } \\ \text { Parking } \\ \text { Capacity } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Erosion } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (ttyr) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Beach } \\ \text { Area } \\ \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (ppd) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (visits) } \end{gathered}$ | 2020 |  | 2030 |  | 2040 |  | 2050 |  | 2060 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Beach Width (tt) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cpacity } \\ & \text { (visis) } \end{aligned}$ | Beach Width (tt) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { (visis) } \end{aligned}$ | Beach Width $(\mathrm{tt})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (visis) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Beach } \\ \text { Width (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (visis) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Beach } \\ \text { Width (tr) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Capacity } \\ \text { (visis) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Patrick AFB | 74.9 | 40,890 |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1744 |  |  | 81 | 1012 | 75 | 1012 | 69 | 1012 | 63 | 1012 | 57 | 1012 |
| SE 1st St | 78.2 | 37,750 | 20 | 405 | -0.6 | 200 | 316 | 79 | 316 | 73 | 292 | 67 | 268 | 61 | 244 | 55 | 220 | 49 | 196 |
| Berkley | 80 | 35,900 | 50 | 1,012 | -0.6 | 200 | 277 | 69 | 277 | 63 | 253 | 57 | 229 | 51 | 205 | 45 | 181 | 39 | 157 |
| Patrick | 82.5 | 33,585 | 20 | 405 | -0.6 | 60 | 96 | 80 | 96 | 74 | 89 | 68 | 82 | 62 | 74 | 56 | 67 | 50 | 60 |
| REACH 6 |  |  |  | 2,834 |  |  | 2,433 |  | 1,701 |  | 1,646 |  | 1,591 |  | 1,536 |  | 1,481 |  | 1,425 |
| Grant | 87.5 | 28,960 | 23 | 466 | -1.0 | 50 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 63 | 63 | 53 | 53 | 43 | 43 | 33 | 33 | ${ }^{23}$ | ${ }^{23}$ |
| Park | 88.9 | 27,579 | 4 | 81 | -1.0 | 50 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 48 | 48 | 38 | 38 | 28 | 28 | 18 | 18 | 8 | 8 |
| Ellwood | 90 | 26,910 | 0 | 20 | -1.0 | 5 | 7 | 69 | 7 | 59 | 6 | 49 | 5 | 39 | 4 | 29 | 3 | 19 | 2 |
| Norrood | 91 | 26,020 | 0 | 20 | -1.0 | 5 | 7 | 70 | 7 | 60 62 | 6 | 50 <br> 52 | 5 | 40 | 4 | 30 32 | 3 | 20 | 2 |
| Cassia | 91.5 | 25,575 | 0 | 20 | -1.0 | 5 | 7 | 72 | 7 | 62 | 6 | 52 | 5 | 42 | 4 | 32 | 3 | 22 | 2 |
| REACH 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pelican Beach Park |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Desoto | 94.5 | 22,735 | 11 | 223 | ${ }_{-0.8}$ | 50 | 106 | 106 | 106 | 98 | 98 | 90 | 90 | 82 | 82 | 74 | 74 | 66 | 66 |
| Magellan | 95.4 | 21,984 | 12 | 243 | -0.8 | 50 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 104 | 104 | 96 | 96 | 88 | 88 | 80 | 80 | 72 | 72 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sunrise | 96.1 | 21,355 | 12 | 243 | $-0.8$ | 50 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 95 | 95 | 87 | 87 | 79 | 79 | 71 | 71 | ${ }^{63}$ | 63 |
| Palmetto | 96.9 | 20,595 | 25 | 506 | $-0.8$ | 250 | 452 | 90 | 452 | 82 | 412 | 74 | 372 | 66 | 332 | 58 | 292 | 50 | 252 |
| Eau Gallie Ave | 97.5 | 20,000 | 6 | 121 | $-0.8$ | 50 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 77 | 77 | 69 | 69 | 61 | 61 | 53 | 53 | 45 | 45 |
| Bicentennial | 98.9 | 18,645 | 42 | 850 | -0.8 | 250 | 279 | 56 | 279 | 48 | 239 | 40 | 199 | 32 | 159 | 24 | 119 | 16 | 79 |
| [1_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 439 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| Palm Springs | 100.9 | 16,650 | 2 | 40 | -0.8 | 10 | 19 | 96 | 19 | 88 | 18 | 80 | 16 | 72 | 14 | 64 | 13 | 56 | 11 |
| REACH 3b |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Millenium Park | 103 | 14,600 | 25 | 506 | -0.8 | 50 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 72 | 72 | 64 | 64 | 56 | 56 | 48 | 48 | 40 | 40 |
| Wallace | 104.4 | 13,438 | 20 | 405 | -0.8 | 50 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 97 | 97 | 89 | 89 | 81 | 81 | 73 | 73 | 65 | 65 |
| Eau Gallie Cswy | 105.2 | 12,766 | 65 | 1,316 | -0.8 | 1,250 | 2,698 | 108 | 1,316 | 100 | 1,316 | 92 | 1,316 | 84 | 1,316 | 76 | 1,316 | 68 | 1,316 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,554 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 78 |
| Coral Way East | 107.8 | 10,048 | 6 | 121 | -0.6 | 50 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 98 | 98 | 92 | 92 | 86 | 86 | 80 | 80 | 74 | 74 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harris | 109.4 | 8,456 | 6 | 121 | -0.7 | 50 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 89 | 89 | 82 | 82 | 75 | 75 | 68 | 68 | 61 | 61 |
| REACH 1 C |  |  |  | 142 |  |  | 115 |  | 115 |  | 106 |  | 98 |  | 90 |  | 81 |  | 73 |
| Paradise Beach Park 1098 7992 0 20 -07 650 |  |  |  | 20 | -0.7 | 650 | 1,302 | 100 | 20 | 93 | 20 | 86 | 20 | 79 | 20 | 72 | 20 | 65 | 20 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 110.8 | 7,088 | 225 | 4,554 | -0.7 | 1,350 | 2,660 | 99 | 2,660 | 92 | 2,471 | 85 | 2,282 | 78 | 2,093 | 71 | 1,904 | 64 | 1,715 |
| Beach | 112 | 5,920 | 0 | 20 | -0.7 | 4 |  | 118 | 9 | 111 | 9 | 104 | 8 | 97 | 8 | 90 | 7 | 83 | 7 |
| Surf Walk | 112.5 | 5,475 | 0 | 20 | -0.7 | 4 | 9 | 116 | 9 | 109 | 9 | 102 | 8 | 95 | 8 | 88 | 7 | 81 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coconut | 115.6 | 2,506 | 0 | 20 | -0.7 | 6 | 16 | 131 | 16 | 124 | 15 | 117 | 14 | 110 | 13 | 103 | 12 | 96 | 11 |
| Terrace Shores | 115.9 | 2,269 | 6 | 121 | $-0.7$ | 50 | 138 | 138 | 121 | 131 | 121 | 124 | 121 | 117 | 117 | 110 | 110 | 103 | 103 |
| Flug | 118.8 | -456 | 0 | 20 | -0.7 | 126 | ${ }^{312}$ | 124 | 20 | ${ }^{117}$ | 20 | ${ }^{110}$ | 20 | 103 | 20 | 96 | 20 | 89 | 20 |
| Franklin | 119.9 | -1,441 | 0 | 20 | -0.7 | 6 | 16 | 132 | 16 | 125 | 15 | 118 | 14 | 111 | 13 | 104 | 13 | 97 | 12 |
| REACH 1 a |  |  |  | 202 |  |  | $\stackrel{490}{ }$ |  | 182 |  | 180 |  | 178 |  | 171 |  | 162 |  | 152 |
| TOTAL Mid-Reach |  |  |  | 17,042 |  |  | 12,911 |  | 9,170 |  | 8,624 |  | 8,079 |  | 7,529 |  | 6,976 |  | 6,421 |

Table 7 - Projected beach capacity for with-project conditions (2010-2060). Assumes all reaches are maintained by the project


Table 8 - Projected total excess (unmet) annual beach demand, without-project.

|  |  | WITHOUT PROJECT CONDITIONS Excess Annual Demand (users/year) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User Group | Number of Days | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2060 |
| 1 | 1 | 7,637 | 13,355 | 19,006 | 24,717 | 30,411 | 36,108 |
| 2 | 11 | 64,962 | 121,992 | 178,367 | 235,342 | 292,146 | 348,984 |
| 3 | 10 | 39,397 | 85,193 | 130,471 | 176,230 | 221,855 | 267,513 |
| 4 | 7 | 13,124 | 40,733 | 68,037 | 95,629 | 123,146 | 150,685 |
| 5 | 16 | 0 | 51,030 | 103,664 | 156,854 | 209,907 | 263,011 |
| 6 | 22 | 0 | 12,471 | 71,441 | 131,028 | 190,480 | 250,003 |
| 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1,784 | 41,829 | 81,801 | 121,833 |
| 8 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31,524 |
| 9 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 365 | 125,120 | 324,773 | 572,770 | 861,630 | 1,149,745 | 1,469,660 |

Table 9 - Minimum projected total excess (unmet) annual beach demand, with-project. Assumes all project reaches are maintained by the project.

|  |  | WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS <br> Excess Annual Demand (uses/year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User Group | Number of Days | 2010 | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2060 |  |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 4,937 | 10,043 | 15,204 | 20,345 | 25,486 |  |
| 2 | 11 | 0 | 29,398 | 79,774 | 130,696 | 181,424 | 232,151 |  |
| 3 | 10 | 0 | 1,016 | 40,840 | 81,097 | 121,199 | 161,301 |  |
| 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 5,295 | 29,036 | 52,686 | 76,336 |  |
| 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,641 | 48,856 | 93,071 |  |
| 6 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16,336 |
| 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 8 | 26 | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | $\mathbf{3 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 3 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5 , 9 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0 , 6 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 4 , 5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4 , 6 8 2}$ |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Table 10 - Projected excess (unmet) annual beach demand, by reach, without-project.

|  | Excess Annual Demand (User occasions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reach | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6 0}$ |  |
| 1 | 40,884 | 105,272 | 183,956 | 273,419 | 359,493 | 451,728 |  |
| 2 | 2,893 | 7,532 | 13,329 | 20,143 | 27,029 | 34,792 |  |
| 3 | 23,919 | 64,748 | 119,516 | 189,085 | 266,751 | 362,052 |  |
| 4 | 32,132 | 80,363 | 135,641 | 193,692 | 242,534 | 286,304 |  |
| 5 | 2,078 | 4,868 | 7,535 | 9,531 | 9,935 | 8,533 |  |
| 6 | 23,215 | 61,991 | 112,793 | 175,761 | 244,004 | 326,250 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 2 5 , 1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 4 , 7 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 2 , 7 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 1 , 6 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 4 9 , 7 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 9 , 6 6 0}$ |  |

Table 11 - Minimum projected excess (unmet) annual beach demand, by reach, withproject. Assumes all project reaches are maintained by the project.

|  | Excess Annual Demand (User occasions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reach | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6 0}$ |  |
| 1 | 0 | 10,286 | 39,559 | 75,849 | 123,521 | $\mathbf{1 7 5 , 9 4 7}$ |  |
| 2 | 0 | 1,008 | 3,875 | 7,430 | 12,100 | 17,236 |  |
| 3 | 0 | 5,248 | 20,183 | 38,699 | 63,021 | 89,769 |  |
| 4 | 0 | 11,672 | 44,887 | 86,066 | 140,159 | 199,646 |  |
| 5 | 0 | 1,260 | 4,844 | 9,288 | 15,125 | 21,544 |  |
| 6 | 0 | 5,878 | 22,605 | 43,342 | 70,584 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}, 541$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 , 3 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 5 , 9 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0 , 6 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 4 , 5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 4 , 6 8 2}$ |  |

28. Recreation Benefits Computation. Excess beach use demand that is satisfied during the life of the proposed project is considered to be an incidental recreation benefit. The number of additional beach uses attributable to the project is computed as the difference between unmet demand without the project and unmet demand with the project. The project schedule of excess demand for with- and without-project conditions is attached as Appendix B, of which the first page includes a sample computation. With-project excess demand assumes all reaches will be nourished by the project. The final step in the recreational benefit analysis is to determine a willingness to pay, or assign a value to the recreational usage generated by the project.
29. Value per Visit. Several established methodologies are available for determining an appropriate dollar value per each additional beach visit. The most widely accepted method is the travel cost method (TCM). The TCM operates on the assumption that per capita beach usage decreases as a function of travel distance to the site (i.e. the out-ofpocket and opportunity costs, associated with travel, increase with distance). In short, this method involves a detailed accounting of beach participation as a function of travel distance; estimating of the opportunity cost of time associated with a recreational trip; and computing the out-of-pocket expenses related to travel. Detailed data regarding participation rates and the variation in demand for beach use with travel distance are not available for Brevard County; thus, computation of the TCM in determining an average value per beach visit was not practicable for the present study.
30. Two alternative approaches to assigning a value for a beach visit are the contingent valuation method (CVM) and the unit day value method (UDV). The CVM involves polling beach users regarding their willingness to pay. Conducting such a survey has not been conducted in this area and is not in the scope of this report. In contrast, the UDV approach is wholly subjective and requires assigning a point total to various characteristics of the project area. This method is reliant upon expert opinion of the following aspects of the project site and surrounding area: activities, facilities, relative scarcity, ease of access, and aesthetic factors. The point total attributable to a given project alternative is converted to a dollar per visit value. This dollar amount is based on
an established range and relies on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to adjust this value to the current worth ${ }^{4}$. Application of the selected value to estimated annual use over the project life, in the context of the with- and without-project framework of analysis, provides the estimate of recreation benefits. The level of expert, subjective opinion and public involvement required for a UDV analysis is not feasible for the present study ${ }^{5}$.
31. The present study relies upon an established value of a beach visit in Brevard County. The 1996 Feasibility Study of the Brevard County Shore Protection Project derived a value of $\$ 1.87$ per beach visit in 1996 dollars by considering previous TCM studies completed for surrounding counties (USACE, 1996). Given the lack of data upon which to perform a full TCM analysis and its acceptability for use in developing accepted UDV valuations, the CPI was selected over alternate means as a conservative approach to adjusting the historically published value of a beach visit to one which would reasonably reflect the cost-per-visit in year one of the project (USACE, 2005). Use of the CPI in this manner is consistent with EGM06-03. The CPI published monthly by the United States Department of Labor and Statistics (BLS) ${ }^{6}$ measures the average cost of goods and services from one time period to the next across a constant market.
32. A potential alternative to using the CPI involves adjusting the cost of a beach visit by the historic change in vehicular operating costs per mile (i.e. cost of travel). Using data gathered from the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts issued a 2004 report which cites a 90 percent increase in the average operating cost per mile of a motor vehicle between 1981 and 2001 ( 22.675 to 43.125 cents $/ \mathrm{mi})^{7}$. Over this same period, the average CPI increased by about 94.8 percent, from 90.9 in 1981 to 177.1 in 2001. Based on this data, the CPI appears to reasonably reflect changes in the operating cost of a motor vehicle and travel costs. The CPI is widely used to adjust

[^3]not only changes in the price of goods and services but also the wages and benefits for millions of Americans (i.e. opportunity cost of time). Accordingly, the 1996 value of beach visitation was adjusted to 2005 valuation by considering changes over time in the respective average annual CPI published by the BLS (2005 is the most recent annual average CPI figure available). The value of a beach visit in 2006 (present year) was then linearly extrapolated from the published CPI data (see Figure 1). It is recognized that the base year of the project is 2010; however, all economic analyses assume valuation at current (2006) levels. The analysis suggests that each beach visit attributable to the project in 2006 will be valued at $\$ 2.35$. This estimate is conservative relative to the published range of unit day values for FY2006, which places the value of each general recreation beach visit between $\$ 3.19$ and $\$ 9.57$ (USACE, 2005).
33. The resulting average cost of a beach visit is multiplied by the average annual increase in participation attributed to the project in order to determine the average recreation benefit for each year of a project's 50 -year life-cycle. From this point, the present worth of the resulting revenue stream was computed and summed resulting in the average annual equivalent benefit. An interest rate of 5.125 percent was used to convert average annual incidental benefits to present worth. Table 12 presents the results of the 50-year simulation for uniform maintenance of the current MHW position.


Figure 1 - Adjustment of the 1996 USACE beach visit valuation using the CPI.

Table 12 - Schedule of incidental benefits for uniform maintenance of existing MHWL along the Mid-Reach.
Total Average Annual Recreation Benefits

| Interest Rate: <br> Project Life (yrs): <br> Capital Recovery Factor | 5.125\% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 50 |  |  |
|  | 0.05583807 |  |  |
| Project Year | Visits Attributable to Project | Benefit (\$) | Present Valuation (\$) |
| 0 | 125,120 | 294,033 | 294,000 |
| 1 | 141,551 | 332,644 | 316,400 |
| 2 | 157,981 | 371,255 | 335,900 |
| 3 | 174,411 | 409,866 | 352,800 |
| 4 | 190,841 | 448,477 | 367,200 |
| 5 | 207,272 | 487,088 | 379,400 |
| 6 | 223,702 | 525,699 | 389,500 |
| 7 | 240,132 | 564,310 | 397,700 |
| 8 | 256,562 | 602,921 | 404,200 |
| 9 | 272,992 | 641,532 | 409,100 |
| 10 | 289,423 | 680,143 | 412,600 |
| 11 | 304,162 | 714,781 | 412,500 |
| 12 | 318,902 | 749,419 | 411,400 |
| 13 | 333,641 | 784,057 | 409,400 |
| 14 | 348,381 | 818,695 | 406,700 |
| 15 | 363,120 | 853,333 | 403,200 |
| 16 | 377,860 | 887,971 | 399,100 |
| 17 | 392,599 | 922,608 | 394,500 |
| 18 | 407,339 | 957,246 | 389,300 |
| 19 | 422,078 | 991,884 | 383,700 |
| 20 | 436,818 | 1,026,522 | 377,800 |
| 21 | 453,232 | 1,065,094 | 372,900 |
| 22 | 469,645 | 1,103,667 | 367,500 |
| 23 | 486,059 | 1,142,239 | 361,800 |
| 24 | 502,473 | 1,180,811 | 355,800 |
| 25 | 518,887 | 1,219,384 | 349,500 |
| 26 | 535,301 | 1,257,956 | 343,000 |
| 27 | 551,714 | 1,296,529 | 336,300 |
| 28 | 568,128 | 1,335,101 | 329,400 |
| 29 | 584,542 | 1,373,673 | 322,400 |
| 30 | 600,956 | 1,412,246 | 315,300 |
| 31 | 613,384 | 1,441,451 | 306,100 |
| 32 | 625,812 | 1,470,657 | 297,100 |
| 33 | 638,240 | 1,499,863 | 288,200 |
| 34 | 650,667 | 1,529,069 | 279,500 |
| 35 | 663,095 | 1,558,274 | 271,000 |
| 36 | 675,523 | 1,587,480 | 262,600 |
| 37 | 687,951 | 1,616,686 | 254,400 |
| 38 | 700,379 | 1,645,891 | 246,400 |
| 39 | 712,807 | 1,675,097 | 238,500 |
| 40 | 725,235 | 1,704,303 | 230,800 |
| 41 | 739,210 | 1,737,143 | 223,800 |
| 42 | 753,184 | 1,769,982 | 216,900 |
| 43 | 767,158 | 1,802,822 | 210,200 |
| 44 | 781,133 | 1,835,662 | 203,600 |
| 45 | 795,107 | 1,868,501 | 197,100 |
| 46 | 809,081 | 1,901,341 | 190,800 |
| 47 | 823,056 | 1,934,181 | 184,600 |
| 48 | 837,030 | 1,967,020 | 178,600 |
| 49 | 851,004 | 1,999,860 | 172,700 |
| 50 | 864,979 | 2,032,700 | 167,000 |
|  |  | TOTAL | \$ 15,659,200 |
| Annual Equivalent Benefit |  |  | \$ 874,400 |

34. The results suggest that the maximum average annual recreational benefits for any beach project along the Mid-Reach are about $\$ 874,400$. This assumes the entire MidReach is made accessible to the public (via project easements) resulting in a parking limited condition for each project reach. Projects of differing dimension (width) do not realize additional recreation benefits because access is fixed by parking limitations throughout the 50-year project life.
35. Alternatives considering construction of new coastal armor do not provide additional beach visits and can not accrue incidental benefits along armored reaches. Likewise, project alternatives which do not place beach nourishment along one or more reaches may not realize recreational benefits along unnourished reaches. In order to consider average annual incidental benefits for such alternatives, each proposed project reach was analyzed independently, per the methodology discussed above.
36. On a per-reach basis, the average annual equivalent benefits attributable to any project alternative containing beach fill are presented in Table 13. In computing the total annual recreational benefits attributable to project alternatives which either armor the coastline or do not provide sand nourishment or public beach use through easements along a specific reach, the corresponding dollar benefit listed in Table 13 must be subtracted from the total benefit established for the complete nourishment condition (\$874,300/yr).

Table 13 - Average annual equivalent incidental benefits available, by reach, for any parking limited beach project.

| Reach | Average <br> Equivalent <br> Benefit |  |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | $\$$ | 286,600 |
| 2 | $\$$ | 18,900 |
| 3 | $\$$ | 207,000 |
| 4 | $\$$ | 172,300 |
| 5 | $\$$ | 3,700 |
| 6 | $\$$ | 185,800 |
| TOTAL | $\$$ | $\mathbf{8 7 4 , 3 0 0}$ |
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## Appendix A:

Location of parking and beach access for the Brevard County Mid-Reach. The withproject $1 / 4$ mile usage radii are drawn from the northern and southern property boundaries for each access point.

R-1C7 \# DNR Monumnel designation and laction

$$
z=8 \text { Beach accesss poirt }
$$

$$
\text { Detto of Photograph } 612000
$$

## Appendix B:

Projected excess demand for a uniform 1-foot MHW extension along project reaches 1 though 6.

In computing excess demand, the following tables compare the available parkingconstrained beach area capacity with the demand for the user group of interest throughout the project life. A sample calculation for the Patrick AFB access point, base year 2010, user group 1, without-project condition follows:

Given User Group 1, Year 2010:
Total daily demand $=16,807$ uses/day
Number of days/year in user group $=1$ day/year
[Table 4]
PAFB Daily Area Capacity (constrained) $=864$ uses/day
[Table 4]
Total Mid-Reach Area Capacity (constrained) $=8,776$ uses $/$ day
[Table 6]

## Find, excess annual demand at PAFB access:

Percent demand allocated to PAFB access $=($ PAFB Capacity $/$ Total capacity $)$
Percent demand allocated to PAFB access: $864 / 8,776=.09845$
Daily Demand = Fraction * Total Demand
Daily Demand $=.09845$ * 16,807
Daily Demand $=1,655$ users/day
[App. B: W/O project: User Group 1]
Excess Daily Demand = Daily Demand - Daily Capacity
Excess Daily Demand $=1,655-864$
Excess Daily Demand $=791$ users/day (not shown in table)
Excess Annual Demand = Excess Daily Demand * Days/year
Excess Annual Demand = 791 users/day * 1 day/year
Excess Annual Demand $=791$ users/year
[App. B: W/O project: User Group 1]
Computation is repeated for with- and without project conditions; for each year, user group, access point or group of access points.

Without project: User Group 1, years 2010-2060:

| User Group <br> 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent of } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & 1.50 \end{aligned}$ | Number of Days 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Annual } \\ \text { Total } \\ 1.5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | $2010$ <br> Without-Project |  |  | $2020$ <br> Without-Project |  |  | $2030$ <br> Without-Project |  |  | $2040$ <br> Without-Project |  |  | $2050$ <br> Without-Project |  |  | $2060$ <br> Without-Project |  |  |
| Name | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Demand } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) |
| Patrick AFB | 1,855 | 1,012 | 843 | 2,579 | 1,012 | 1,567 | 3,393 | 1,012 | 2,381 | 4,334 | 1,012 | 3,322 | 5,423 | 1,012 | 4,411 | 6,703 | 1,012 | 5,691 |
| SE 1st St | 580 | 316 | 263 | 745 | 292 | 453 | 899 | 268 | 631 | 1,046 | 244 | 802 | 1,180 | 220 | 960 | 1,300 | 196 | 1,104 |
| Berkley | 508 | 277 | 231 | 645 | 253 | 392 | 768 | 229 | 539 | 879 | 205 | 674 | 971 | 181 | 790 | 1,041 | 157 | 884 |
| Patrick | 176 | 96 | 80 | 226 | 89 | 137 | 273 | 82 | 192 | 318 | 74 | 244 | 360 | 67 | 293 | 397 | 60 | 337 |
| REACH 6 | 3,118 | 1,701 | 1,417 | 4,195 | 1,646 | 2,549 | 5,334 | 1,591 | 3,743 | 6,578 | 1,536 | 5,042 | 7,934 | 1,481 | 6,454 | 9,441 | 1,425 | 8,016 |
| Grant | 134 | 73 | 61 | 161 | 63 | 98 | 178 | 53 | 125 | 185 | 43 | 142 | 178 | 33 | 145 | 154 | 23 | 130 |
| Park | 106 | 58 | 48 | 122 | 48 | 74 | 128 | 38 | 90 | 120 | 28 | 92 | 97 | 18 | 79 | 53 | 8 | 45 |
| Ellwood | 13 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 17 | 4 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 2 | 10 |
| Norwood | 13 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 9 | 17 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 4 | 13 | 16 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 2 | 11 |
| Cassia | 13 | 7 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 12 | 18 | 4 | 14 | 17 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 2 | 12 |
| REACH 5 | 279 | 152 | 127 | 329 | 129 | 200 | 356 | 106 | 250 | 357 | 83 | 273 | 323 | 60 | 263 | 247 | 37 | 210 |
| Pelican Beach Park | 2,231 | 1,217 | 1,014 | 2,825 | 1,109 | 1,717 | 3,352 | 1,000 | 2,352 | 3,816 | 891 | 2,925 | 4,192 | 782 | 3,409 | 4,460 | 673 | 3,786 |
| Desoto | 195 | 106 | 89 | 251 | 98 | 153 | 303 | 90 | 213 | 353 | 82 | 271 | 399 | 74 | 325 | 440 | 66 | 374 |
| Magellan | 204 | 112 | 93 | 264 | 104 | 160 | 320 | 96 | 225 | 375 | 88 | 287 | 426 | 80 | 347 | 474 | 72 | 402 |
| REACH 4b | 2,631 | 1,435 | 1,195 | 3,340 | 1,311 | 2,029 | 3,975 | 1,186 | 2,789 | 4,544 | 1,061 | 3,483 | 5,017 | 936 | 4,081 | 5,374 | 811 | 4,563 |
| Sunrise | 190 | 103 | 86 | 243 | 95 | 148 | 293 | 87 | 206 | 340 | 79 | 261 | 383 | 71 | 311 | 420 | 63 | 357 |
| Palmetto | 829 | 452 | 377 | 1,050 | 412 | 638 | 1,247 | 372 | 875 | 1,422 | 332 | 1,090 | 1,565 | 292 | 1,273 | 1,669 | 252 | 1,417 |
| Eau Gallie Ave | 156 | 85 | 71 | 196 | 77 | 119 | 231 | 69 | 162 | 261 | 61 | 200 | 284 | 53 | 231 | 298 | 45 | 253 |
| Bicentennial | 511 | 279 | 232 | 609 | 239 | 370 | 667 | 199 | 468 | 681 | 159 | 522 | 638 | 119 | 519 | 524 | 79 | 445 |
| REACH 4a | 1,685 | 919 | 766 | 2,099 | 823 | 1,275 | 2,439 | 727 | 1,711 | 2,705 | 631 | 2,073 | 2,870 | 535 | 2,334 | 2,911 | 439 | 2,471 |
| Pinetree | 37 | 20 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 31 | 68 | 20 | 48 | 87 | 20 | 66 | 108 | 20 | 88 | 113 | 17 | 96 |
| Palm Springs | 35 | 19 | 16 | 45 | 18 | 27 | 53 | 16 | 38 | 61 | 14 | 47 | 68 | 13 | 56 | 74 | 11 | 63 |
| REACH 3b | 72 | 39 | 33 | 96 | 38 | 59 | 121 | 36 | 85 | 148 | 35 | 114 | 177 | 33 | 144 | 187 | 28 | 159 |
| Atlantic | 391 | 213 | 178 | 502 | 197 | 305 | 607 | 181 | 426 | 707 | 165 | 542 | 799 | 149 | 650 | 882 | 133 | 749 |
| Millenium Park | 146 | 80 | 67 | 183 | 72 | 111 | 214 | 64 | 150 | 240 | 56 | 184 | 257 | 48 | 209 | 264 | 40 | 225 |
| Wallace | 192 | 105 | 87 | 247 | 97 | 150 | 298 | 89 | 209 | 347 | 81 | 266 | 391 | 73 | 318 | 430 | 65 | 365 |
| Eau Gallie Cswy | 2,411 | 1,316 | 1,096 | 3,353 | 1,316 | 2,037 | 4,411 | 1,316 | 3,095 | 5,635 | 1,316 | 4,319 | 7,050 | 1,316 | 5,735 | 8,714 | 1,316 | 7,398 |
| REACH 3a | 3,141 | 1,714 | 1,427 | 4,286 | 1,682 | 2,604 | 5,530 | 1,650 | 3,881 | 6,928 | 1,618 | 5,311 | 8,497 | 1,586 | 6,912 | 10,290 | 1,554 | 8,737 |
| Rasisson Suites | 199 | 108 | 90 | 261 | 102 | 159 | 323 | 96 | 227 | 387 | 90 | 297 | 453 | 84 | 368 | 520 | 78 | 441 |
| Coral Way East | 190 | 104 | 86 | 249 | 98 | 151 | 307 | 92 | 215 | 366 | 86 | 281 | 426 | 80 | 347 | 487 | 74 | 414 |
| REACH 2 | 389 | 212 | 177 | 510 | 200 | 310 | 630 | 188 | 442 | 754 | 176 | 578 | 879 | 164 | 715 | 1,007 | 152 | 855 |
| Holiday Inn South | 34 | 19 | 16 | 44 | 17 | 27 | 54 | 16 | 38 | 62 | 15 | 48 | 71 | 13 | 57 | 78 | 12 | 66 |
| Harris | 176 | 96 | 80 | 227 | 89 | 138 | 275 | 82 | 193 | 321 | 75 | 246 | 364 | 68 | 296 | 404 | 61 | 343 |
| REACH 1c | 210 | 115 | 96 | 271 | 106 | 165 | 329 | 98 | 231 | 384 | 90 | 294 | 435 | 81 | 354 | 482 | 73 | 409 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 37 | 20 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 31 | 68 | 20 | 48 | 87 | 20 | 66 | 108 | 20 | 88 | 134 | 20 | 114 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 4,875 | 2,660 | 2,215 | 6,297 | 2,471 | 3,826 | 7,650 | 2,282 | 5,368 | 8,964 | 2,093 | 6,871 | 10,204 | 1,904 | 8,300 | 11,359 | 1,715 | 9,644 |
| Beach | 17 | 9 | 8 | 23 | 9 | 14 | 28 | 8 | 20 | 33 | 8 | 25 | 39 | 7 | 31 | 44 | 7 | 37 |
| Surf Walk | 17 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 9 | 14 | 27 | 8 | 19 | 33 | 8 | 25 | 38 | 7 | 31 | 43 | 7 | 37 |
| REACH 1b | 4,947 | 2,699 | 2,248 | 6,394 | 2,509 | 3,885 | 7,774 | 2,319 | 5,455 | 9,117 | 2,129 | 6,988 | 10,389 | 1,939 | 8,450 | 11,581 | 1,748 | 9,832 |
| Poinsetta | 17 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 9 | 13 | 27 | 8 | 19 | 32 | 8 | 25 | 38 | 7 | 31 | 43 | 6 | 36 |
| Coconut | 29 | 16 | 13 | 38 | 15 | 23 | 47 | 14 | 33 | 56 | 13 | 43 | 66 | 12 | 54 | 76 | 11 | 64 |
| Terrace Shores | 223 | 121 | 101 | 309 | 121 | 188 | 407 | 121 | 286 | 499 | 117 | 383 | 587 | 110 | 478 | 679 | 103 | 577 |
| Flug | 37 | 20 | 17 | 52 | 20 | 31 | 68 | 20 | 48 | 87 | 20 | 66 | 108 | 20 | 88 | 134 | 20 | 114 |
| Franklin | 29 | 16 | 13 | 38 | 15 | 23 | 48 | 14 | 33 | 57 | 13 | 44 | 67 | 13 | 55 | 77 | 12 | 66 |
| REACH 1a | 334.4 | 182.5 | 152 | 459.3 | 180.2 | 279 | 596.7 | 178.0 | 419 | 731.8 | 170.9 | 561 | 866.1 | 161.6 | 704 | 1,009.2 | 152.4 | 857 |
| TOTAL | 16,807 | 9,170 | 7,637 | 21,979 | 8,624 | 13,355 | 27,085 | 8,079 | 19,006 | 32,246 | 7,529 | 24,717 | 37,387 | 6,976 | 30,411 | 42,528 | 6,421 | 36,108 |

Without project: User Group 2, years 2010-2060:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { User Group } \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent of } \\ \text { Total } \\ 1.35 \end{gathered}$ | Number of Days 11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Annual } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & 14.8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 2010 |  |  | 2020 |  |  | $2030$ |  |  | $2040$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2050 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $2060$ |  |  |
|  | Without-Project |  |  | Without-Project |  |  | Without-Project |  |  | Without-Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |
| Name | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Demand } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Demand (Annual) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Demand } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) |
| Patrick AFB | 1,664 | 1,012 | 7,169 | 2,313 | 1,012 | 14,315 | 3,043 | 1,012 | 22,343 | 3,888 | 1,012 | 31,634 | 4,865 | 1,012 | 42,379 | 6,012 | 1,012 | 55,004 |
| SE 1st St | 520 | 316 | 2,240 | 668 | 292 | 4,134 | 807 | 268 | 5,922 | 938 | 244 | 7,635 | 1,059 | 220 | 9,223 | 1,166 | 196 | 10,666 |
| Berkley | 456 | 277 | 1,964 | 579 | 253 | 3,582 | 689 | 229 | 5,060 | 788 | 205 | 6,415 | 871 | 181 | 7,588 | 934 | 157 | 8,545 |
| Patrick | 158 | 96 | 680 | 203 | 89 | 1,255 | 245 | 82 | 1,800 | 286 | 74 | 2,323 | 323 | 67 | 2,811 | 356 | 60 | 3,257 |
| REACH 6 | 2,797 | 1,701 | 12,053 | 3,763 | 1,646 | 23,285 | 4,784 | 1,591 | 35,125 | 5,900 | 1,536 | 48,007 | 7,117 | 1,481 | 62,000 | 8,468 | 1,425 | 77,471 |
| Grant | 120 | 73 | 518 | 144 | 63 | 894 | 160 | 53 | 1,174 | 166 | 43 | 1,350 | 159 | 33 | 1,389 | 138 | 23 | 1,260 |
| Park | 95 | 58 | 411 | 110 | 48 | 680 | 114 | 38 | 840 | 108 | 28 | 877 | 87 | 18 | 756 | 48 | 8 | 438 |
| Ellwood | 11 | 7 | 49 | 13 | 6 | 83 | 15 | 5 | 107 | 15 | 4 | 121 | 14 | 3 | 120 | 11 | 2 | 101 |
| Norwood | 12 | 7 | 50 | 14 | 6 | 85 | 15 | 5 | 111 | 15 | 4 | 126 | 15 | 3 | 126 | 12 | 2 | 110 |
| Cassia | 12 | 7 | 51 | 14 | 6 | 87 | 16 | 5 | 114 | 16 | 4 | 130 | 15 | 3 | 133 | 13 | 2 | 118 |
| REACH 5 | 250 | 152 | 1,079 | 296 | 129 | 1,829 | 320 | 106 | 2,346 | 320 | 83 | 2,603 | 290 | 60 | 2,524 | 221 | 37 | 2,026 |
| Pelican Beach Park | 2,001 | 1,217 | 8,624 | 2,534 | 1,109 | 15,680 | 3,006 | 1,000 | 22,072 | 3,423 | 891 | 27,850 | 3,760 | 782 | 32,753 | 4,000 | 673 | 36,597 |
| Desoto | 175 | 106 | 754 | 225 | 98 | 1,393 | 272 | 90 | 1,998 | 317 | 82 | 2,579 | 358 | 74 | 3,120 | 395 | 66 | 3,614 |
| Magellan | 183 | 112 | 790 | 237 | 104 | 1,464 | 287 | 96 | 2,109 | 336 | 88 | 2,736 | 382 | 80 | 3,330 | 425 | 72 | 3,887 |
| REACH 4b | 2,360 | 1,435 | 10,169 | 2,996 | 1,311 | 18,538 | 3,566 | 1,186 | 26,179 | 4,076 | 1,061 | 33,164 | 4,500 | 936 | 39,202 | 4,820 | 811 | 44,098 |
| Sunrise | 170 | 103 | 733 | 218 | 95 | 1,350 | 263 | 87 | 1,930 | 305 | 79 | 2,483 | 343 | 71 | 2,991 | 377 | 63 | 3,447 |
| Palmetto | 743 | 452 | 3,203 | 942 | 412 | 5,828 | 1,119 | 372 | 8,214 | 1,276 | 332 | 10,380 | 1,404 | 292 | 12,230 | 1,497 | 252 | 13,700 |
| Eau Gallie Ave | 140 | 85 | 602 | 176 | 77 | 1,088 | 207 | 69 | 1,522 | 234 | 61 | 1,905 | 255 | 53 | 2,217 | 267 | 45 | 2,443 |
| Bicentennial | 459 | 279 | 1,977 | 546 | 239 | 3,382 | 599 | 199 | 4,395 | 611 | 159 | 4,972 | 572 | 119 | 4,986 | 470 | 79 | 4,297 |
| REACH 4a | 1,512 | 919 | 6,514 | 1,882 | 823 | 11,648 | 2,188 | 727 | 16,061 | 2,426 | 631 | 19,740 | 2,574 | 535 | 22,424 | 2,611 | 439 | 23,887 |
| Pinetree | 33 | 20 | 143 | 46 | 20 | 286 | 61 | 20 | 447 | 78 | 20 | 633 | 97 | 20 | 848 | 101 | 17 | 926 |
| Palm Springs | 31 | 19 | 136 | 40 | 18 | 248 | 48 | 16 | 352 | 55 | 14 | 449 | 61 | 13 | 534 | 66 | 11 | 606 |
| REACH 3b | 65 | 39 | 279 | 86 | 38 | 535 | 109 | 36 | 799 | 133 | 35 | 1,081 | 159 | 33 | 1,382 | 167 | 28 | 1,532 |
| Atlantic | 350 | 213 | 1,510 | 451 | 197 | 2,789 | 545 | 181 | 3,999 | 634 | 165 | 5,162 | 717 | 149 | 6,245 | 791 | 133 | 7,236 |
| Millenium Park | 131 | 80 | 566 | 164 | 72 | 1,017 | 192 | 64 | 1,411 | 215 | 56 | 1,748 | 230 | 48 | 2,007 | 237 | 40 | 2,170 |
| Wallace | 173 | 105 | 743 | 222 | 97 | 1,371 | 267 | 89 | 1,963 | 311 | 81 | 2,530 | 351 | 73 | 3,054 | 386 | 65 | 3,529 |
| Eau Gallie Cswy | 2,163 | 1,316 | 9,320 | 3,007 | 1,316 | 18,609 | 3,956 | 1,316 | 29,045 | 5,054 | 1,316 | 41,124 | 6,324 | 1,316 | 55,092 | 7,816 | 1,316 | 71,505 |
| REACH 3a | 2,817 | 1,714 | 12,140 | 3,844 | 1,682 | 23,786 | 4,960 | 1,650 | 36,419 | 6,214 | 1,618 | 50,564 | 7,622 | 1,586 | 66,399 | 9,230 | 1,554 | 84,441 |
| Rasisson Suites | 178 | 108 | 768 | 234 | 102 | 1,449 | 290 | 96 | 2,129 | 347 | 90 | 2,827 | 406 | 84 | 3,536 | 466 | 78 | 4,263 |
| Coral Way East | 170 | 104 | 734 | 223 | 98 | 1,380 | 275 | 92 | 2,022 | 329 | 86 | 2,675 | 382 | 80 | 3,332 | 437 | 74 | 3,998 |
| REACH 2 | 349 | 212 | 1,502 | 457 | 200 | 2,829 | 565 | 188 | 4,151 | 676 | 176 | 5,502 | 788 | 164 | 6,868 | 903 | 152 | 8,262 |
| Holiday Inn South | 31 | 19 | 133 | 40 | 17 | 246 | 48 | 16 | 353 | 56 | 15 | 456 | 63 | 13 | 552 | 70 | 12 | 641 |
| Harris | 158 | 96 | 680 | 203 | 89 | 1,259 | 247 | 82 | 1,810 | 288 | 75 | 2,345 | 327 | 68 | 2,848 | 362 | 61 | 3,316 |
| REACH 1c | 189 | 115 | 813 | 243 | 106 | 1,505 | 295 | 98 | 2,163 | 344 | 90 | 2,801 | 390 | 81 | 3,400 | 432 | 73 | 3,956 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 33 | 20 | 143 | 46 | 20 | 286 | 61 | 20 | 447 | 78 | 20 | 633 | 97 | 20 | 848 | 120 | 20 | 1,100 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 4,373 | 2,660 | 18,845 | 5,649 | 2,471 | 34,953 | 6,862 | 2,282 | 50,382 | 8,041 | 2,093 | 65,426 | 9,152 | 1,904 | 79,733 | 10,189 | 1,715 | 93,214 |
| Beach | 16 | 9 | 67 | 20 | 9 | 126 | 25 | 8 | 184 | 30 | 8 | 243 | 35 | 7 | 301 | 39 | 7 | 361 |
| Surf Walk | 15 | 9 | 66 | 20 | 9 | 124 | 25 | 8 | 181 | 29 | 8 | 238 | 34 | 7 | 296 | 39 | 7 | 354 |
| REACH 1b | 4,437 | 2,699 | 19,121 | 5,735 | 2,509 | 35,488 | 6,973 | 2,319 | 51,193 | 8,178 | 2,129 | 66,539 | 9,318 | 1,939 | 81,178 | 10,387 | 1,748 | 95,029 |
| Poinsetta | 15 | 9 | 65 | 20 | 9 | 123 | 24 | 8 | 179 | 29 | 8 | 236 | 34 | 7 | 293 | 38 | 6 | 350 |
| Coconut | 26 | 16 | 111 | 34 | 15 | 210 | 42 | 14 | 309 | 50 | 13 | 411 | 59 | 12 | 515 | 68 | 11 | 623 |
| Terrace Shores | 200 | 121 | 860 | 278 | 121 | 1,718 | 365 | 121 | 2,681 | 448 | 117 | 3,643 | 527 | 110 | 4,588 | 609 | 103 | 5,574 |
| Flug | 33 | 20 | 143 | 46 | 20 | 286 | 61 | 20 | 447 | 78 | 20 | 633 | 97 | 20 | 848 | 120 | 20 | 1,100 |
| Franklin | 26 | 16 | 113 | 34 | 15 | 213 | 43 | 14 | 314 | 51 | 13 | 418 | 60 | 13 | 524 | 69 | 12 | 635 |
| REACH 1a | 300.0 | 182.5 | 1,293 | 412.0 | 180.2 | 2,549 | 535.2 | 178.0 | 3,929 | 656.4 | 170.9 | 5,341 | 776.9 | 161.6 | 6,768 | 905.3 | 152.4 | 8,282 |
| TOTAL | 15,075 | 9,170 | 64,962 | 19,715 | 8,624 | 121,992 | 24,294 | 8,079 | 178,367 | 28,924 | 7,529 | 235,342 | 33,535 | 6,976 | 292,146 | 38,147 | 6,421 | 348,984 |

Without project: User Group 3, years 2010-2060:

| $\begin{gathered} \text { User Group } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | Percent of Total 1.17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number of } \\ \text { Days } \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Annual } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & 11.7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | $\begin{gathered} 2010 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2030 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2040 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2050 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2060 \\ \text { Without-Project } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  | Excess |  |  |  |
| Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Demand (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Demand <br> (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | ${ }_{\text {D }}^{\substack{\text { Demand } \\ \text { (Annual) }}}$ |
| Patrick AFB | 1,447 | 1,012 | 4,348 | 2,012 | 1,012 | 9,997 | 2,646 | 1,012 | 16,343 | 3,381 | 1,012 | 23,688 | 4,230 | 1,012 | 32,182 | 5,228 | 1,012 | 42,163 |
| SE 1st St | 452 | 316 | 1,359 | 581 | 292 | 2,887 | 701 | 268 | 4,332 | 816 | 244 | 5,717 | 921 | 220 | 7,004 | 1,014 | 196 | 8,176 |
| Berkley | 396 | 277 | 1,191 | 503 | 253 | 2,501 | 599 | 229 | 3,702 | 686 | 205 | 4,803 | 757 | 181 | 5,763 | 812 | 157 | 6,550 |
| Patrick | 137 | 96 | 412 | 176 | 89 | 876 | 213 | 82 | 1,317 | 248 | 74 | 1,740 | 281 | 67 | 2,135 | 310 | 60 | 2,497 |
| REACH 6 | 2,432 | 1,701 | 7,310 | 3,272 | 1,646 | 16,261 | 4,160 | 1,591 | 25,693 | 5,131 | 1,536 | 35,948 | 6,189 | 1,481 | 47,083 | 7,364 | 1,425 | 59,385 |
| Grant | 105 | 73 | 314 | 126 | 63 | 624 | 139 | 53 | 859 | 144 | 43 | 1,011 | 139 | 33 | 1,055 | 120 | 23 | 966 |
| Park | 83 | 58 | 249 | 96 | 48 | 475 | 100 | 38 | 615 | 94 | 28 | 657 | 75 | 18 | 574 | 42 | 8 | 336 |
| Ellwood | 10 | 7 | 29 | 12 | 6 | 58 | 13 | 5 | 78 | 13 | 4 | 90 | 12 | 3 | 91 | 10 | 2 | 77 |
| Norwood | 10 | 7 | 30 | 12 |  | 59 | 13 | 5 | 81 | 13 | 4 | 94 | 13 | 3 | 96 | 10 | 2 | 84 |
| Cassia | 10 | 7 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 61 | 14 | 5 | 84 | 14 | 4 | 98 | 13 | 3 | 101 | 11 | 2 | 91 |
| REACH 5 | 218 | 152 | 654 | 257 | 129 | 1,277 | 278 | 106 | 1,716 | 278 | 83 | 1,949 | 252 | 60 | 1,917 | 193 | 37 | 1,553 |
| Pelican Beach Park | 1,740 | 1,217 | 5,230 | 2,204 | 1,109 | 10,950 | 2,614 | 1,000 | 16,145 | 2,976 | 891 | 20,854 | 3,269 | 782 | 24,872 | 3,479 | 673 | 28,053 |
| Desoto | 152 | 106 | 458 | 196 | 98 | 973 | 237 | 90 | 1,461 | 276 | 82 | 1,931 | 311 | 74 | 2,369 | 344 | 66 | 2,771 |
| Magellan | 159 | 112 | 479 | 206 | 104 | 1,023 | 250 | 96 | 1,543 | 292 | 88 | 2,049 | 332 | 80 | 2,529 | 370 | 72 | 2,980 |
| REACH 4b | 2,052 | 1,435 | 6,167 | 2,605 | 1,311 | 12,946 | 3,101 | 1,186 | 19,149 | 3,544 | 1,061 | 24,834 | 3,913 | 936 | 29,770 | 4,192 | 811 | 33,804 |
| Sunrise | 148 | 103 | 444 | 190 | 95 | 943 | 229 | 87 | 1,412 | 265 | 79 | 1,859 | 299 | 71 | 2,271 | 328 | 63 | 2,642 |
| Palmetto | 646 | 452 | 1,942 | 819 | 412 | 4,070 | 973 | 372 | 6,008 | 1,109 | 332 | 7,773 | 1,221 | 292 | 9,288 | 1,302 | 252 | 10,501 |
| Eau Gallie Ave | 121 | 85 | 365 | 153 | 77 | 760 | 180 | 69 | 1,114 | 204 | 61 | 1,427 | 221 | 53 | 1,684 | 232 | 45 | 1,873 |
| Bicentennial | 399 | 279 | 1,199 | 475 | 239 | 2,362 | 521 | 199 | 3,215 | 531 | 159 | 3,723 | 498 | 119 | 3,786 | 408 | 79 | 3,294 |
| REACH 4a | 1,315 \| | 919 | 3,951 | 1,637 | 823 | 8,135 | 1,902 | 727 | 11,749 | 2,110 | 631 | 14,782 | 2,238 | 535 | 17,029 | 2,271 \| | 439 | 18,311 |
| Pinetree | 29 | 20 | 87 | 40 | 20 | 200 | 53 | 20 | 327 | 68 | 20 | 474 | 85 | 20 | 644 | 88 | 17 | 710 |
| Palm Springs | 27 | 19 | 82 | 35 | 18 | 173 | 42 | 16 | 258 | 48 | 14 | 336 | 53 | 13 | 406 | 58 | 11 | 465 |
| REACH 3b | 56 | 39 | 169 | 75 | 38 | 373 | 95 | 36 | 585 | 116 | 35 | 810 | 138 | 33 | 1,049 | 146 | 28 | \| 1,174 |
| Atlantic | 305 | 213 | 916 | 392 | 197 | 1,947 | 474 | 181 | 2,925 | 552 | 165 | 3,866 | 623 | 149 | 4,743 | 688 | 133 | 5,547 |
| Millenium Park | 114 | 80 | 343 | 143 | 72 | 710 | 167 | 64 | 1,032 | 187 | 56 | 1,309 | 200 | 48 | 1,524 | 206 | 40 | 1,663 |
| Wallace | 150 | 105 | 451 | 193 | 97 | 958 | 233 | 89 | 1,436 | 270 | 81 | 1,894 | 305 | 73 | 2,319 | 335 | 65 | 2,705 |
| Eau Gallie Cswy | 1,881 | 1,316 | 5,652 | 2,615 | 1,316 | 12,996 | 3,440 | 1,316 | 21,246 | 4,395 | 1,316 | 30,795 | 5,499 | 1,316 | 41,837 | 6,797 | 1,316 | 54,812 |
| REACH 3a | 2,450 | 1,714 | 7,362 | 3,343 | 1,682 | 16,611 | 4,314 | 1,650 | 26,640 | 5,404 | 1,618 | 37,864 | 6,628 | 1,586 | 50,423 | 8,026 | 1,554 | 64,728 |
| Rasisson Suites | 155 | 108 | 466 | 204 | 102 | 1,012 | 252 | 96 | 1,557 | 302 | 90 | 2,117 | 353 | 84 | 2,685 | 405 | 78 | 3,268 |
| Coral Way East | 148 | 104 | 445 | 194 | 98 | 964 | 239 | 92 | 1,479 | 286 | 86 | 2,003 | 333 | 80 | 2,530 | 380 | 74 | 3,065 |
| REACH2 | 303 | 212 | 911 | 398 | 200 | 1,976 | 492 | 188 | 3,036 | 588 | 176 | 4,120 | 686 | 164 | 5,215 | 785 | 152 | 6,333 |
| Holiday Inn South | 27 | 19 | 81 | 35 | 17 | 172 | 42 | 16 | 258 | 49 | 15 | 341 | 55 | 13 | 419 | 61 | 12 | 491 |
| Harris | 137 | 96 | 412 | 177 | 89 | 879 | 214 | 82 | 1,324 | 251 | 75 | 1,756 | 284 | 68 | 2,163 | 315 | 61 | 2,542 |
| REACH 1 c | 164 | 115 | 493 | 211 | 106 | 1,051 | 256 | 98 | 1,582 | 299 | 90 | 2,097 | 339 | 81 | 2,582 | 376 | 73 | 3,033 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 29 | 20 | 87 | 40 | 20 | 200 | 53 | 20 | 327 | 68 | 20 | 474 | 85 | 20 | 644 | 105 | 20 | 843 |
| Paradise Beach Park | 3,803 | 2,660 | 11,429 | 4,912 | 2,471 | 24,409 | 5,967 | 2,282 | 36,853 | 6,992 | 2,093 | 48,992 | 7,959 | 1,904 | 60,549 | 8,860 | 1,715 | 71,453 |
| Beach | 13 | 9 | 41 | 18 | , | 88 | 22 | 8 | 134 | 26 | 8 | 182 | 30 | 7 | 229 | 34 | 7 | 277 |
| Surf Walk | 13 | 9 | 40 | 17 | 9 | 86 | 21 | 8 | 132 | 25 | 8 | 178 | 30 | 7 | 225 | 34 | 7 | 271 |
| REACH 1b | 3,859 | 2,699 | 11,596 | 4,987 | 2,509 | 24,783 | 6,063 | 2,319 | 37,446 | 7,111 | 2,129 | 49,826 | 8,103 | 1,939 | 61,647 | 9,033 | 1,748 | 72,844 |
| Poinsetta | 13 | 9 | 40 | 17 | 9 | 86 | 21 | 8 | 131 | 25 | 8 | 177 | 29 | 7 | 223 | 33 | 6 | 268 |
| Coconut | 22 | 16 | 67 | 29 | 15 | 146 | 37 | 14 | 226 | 44 | 13 | 308 | 51 | 12 | 391 | 59 | 11 | 477 |
| Terrace Shores | 174 | 121 | 522 | 241 | 121 | 1,200 | 318 | 121 | 1,961 | 389 | 117 | 2,728 | 458 | 110 | 3,484 | 530 | 103 | 4,273 |
| Flug | 29 | 20 | 87 | 40 | 20 | 200 | 53 | 20 | 327 | 68 | 20 | 474 | 85 | 20 | 644 | 105 | 20 | 843 |
| Franklin | 23 | 16 | 68 | 30 | 15 | 149 | 37 | 14 | 229 | 45 | 13 | 313 | 52 | 13 | 398 | 60 | 12 | 487 |
| REACH 1a | 260.9 | 182.5 | 784 | 358.2 | 180.2 | 1,780 | 465.4 | 178.0 | 2,874 | 570.8 | 170.9 | 3,999 | 675.6 | 161.6 | 5,139 | 787.2 | 152.4 | 6,348 |
| TOTAL | 13,109 | 9,170 | 39,397 | 17,144 | 8,624 | 85,193 | 21,126 | 8,079 | 130,471 | 25,152 | 7,529 | 176,230 | 29,162 | 6,976 | 221,855 | 33,172 | 6,421 | 267,513 |

Without project: User Group 4, years 2010-2060:


Without project: User Group 5, years 2010-2060:


Without project: User Group 6, years 2010-2060:


Without project: User Group 7, years 2010-2060:


Without project: User Group 8, years 2010-2060:


Without project: User Group 9, years 2010-2060:


With project: User Group 1, years 2010-2060:




















With project: User Group 2, years 2010-2060:
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With project: User Group 3, years 2010-2060:

| $\begin{gathered} \text { User Group } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent of } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & 1.17 \end{aligned}$ | Number of <br> Days <br> 10 | \% Annual Total 11.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR |  | $2010$ <br> With-Project |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { ith-Projec } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2030 \\ & \text { ith-Projed } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2040 \\ & \text { ith-Proje } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2050 \\ \text { ith-Proje } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2060 \\ \text { Vith-Proje } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Name | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Daily } \\ & \text { Demand } \end{aligned}$ | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | Daily Demand | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daily } \\ \text { Demand } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity | Excess Demand (Annual) |
| REACH 6 | 2,180 | 2,834 | 0 | 2,850 | 2,834 | 169 | 3,513 | 2,834 | 6,791 | 4,182 | 2,834 | 13,484 | 4,849 | 2,834 | 20,152 | 5,516 | 2,834 | 26,820 |
| REACH 5 | 467 | 607 | 0 | 611 | 607 | 36 | 753 | 607 | 1,455 | 896 | 607 | 2,889 | 1,039 | 607 | 4,318 | 1,182 | 607 | 5,747 |
| REACH 4b | 3,005 | 3,906 | 0 | 3,930 | 3,906 | 233 | 4,842 | 3,906 | 9,361 | 5,765 | 3,906 | 18,589 | 6,684 | 3,906 | 27,781 | 7,604 | 3,906 | 36,973 |
| REACH 4a | 1,323 | 1,720 | 0 | 1,731 | 1,720 | 103 | 2,133 | 1,720 | 4,123 | 2,539 | 1,720 | 8,187 | 2,944 | 1,720 | 12,235 | 3,349 | 1,720 | 16,283 |
| REACH 3b | 47 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 61 | 4 | 75 | 61 | 146 | 90 | 61 | 289 | 104 | 61 | 432 | 118 | 61 | 575 |
| REACH 3a | 1,899 | 2,469 | 0 | 2,484 | 2,469 | 147 | 3,061 | 2,469 | 5,917 | 3,644 | 2,469 | 11,750 | 4,225 | 2,469 | 17,561 | 4,806 | 2,469 | 23,371 |
| REACH 2 | 374 | 486 | 0 | 489 | 486 | 29 | 602 | 486 | 1,164 | 717 | 486 | 2,312 | 831 | 486 | 3,455 | 946 | 486 | 4,598 |
| REACH 1c | 109 | 142 | 0 | 143 | 142 | 8 | 176 | 142 | 340 | 209 | 142 | 674 | 242 | 142 | 1,008 | 276 | 142 | 1,341 |
| REACH 1b | 3,550 | 4,615 | 0 | 4,642 | 4,615 | 275 | 5,721 | 4,615 | 11,059 | 6,811 | 4,615 | 21,960 | 7,897 | 4,615 | 32,819 | 8,982 | 4,615 | 43,678 |
| REACH 1a | 156 | 202 | 0 | 204 | 202 | 12 | 251 | 202 | 485 | 299 | 202 | 963 | 346 | 202 | 1,439 | 394 | 202 | 1,916 |
| TOTAL | 13,109 | 17,042 | 0 | 17,144 | 17,042 | 1,016 | 21,126 | 17,042 | 40,840 | 25,152 | 17,042 | 81,097 | 29,162 | 17,042 | 121,199 | 33,172 | 17,042 | 161,301 |
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With project: User Group 9, years 2010-2060:

## Attachment 3

Summary Table of Preliminary Alternative Cost Estimates

Preliminary Alternative Construction Cost Estimates (from MCACES)

| Alternative | Reach | length in feet | Description | Quantity <br> (c.y.) per LF | Quantity (c.y. | Unit Price | Unit of Measure | Mob/Demob | Fill Cost | Lands | PED | Engineering Monitoring | Subtotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dune Fill | 1 | 9,599 |  | 5 | 48,000 | \$23.77 | cubic yard | \$434,012 | \$1,141,137 | \$10,000 | \$43,806 | \$26,753 | \$1,655,708 |
|  | 2 | 3,406 |  | 5 | 17,000 | \$23.66 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$402,166 | \$0 | \$15,515 | \$9,493 | \$427,173 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 |  | 5 | 32,000 | \$23.77 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$760,639 | \$0 | \$29,204 | \$17,388 | \$807,231 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 |  | 5 | 28,000 | \$23.84 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$667,596 | \$0 | \$25,553 | \$15,616 | \$708,765 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 |  | 5 | 45,000 | \$23.75 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,068,724 | \$0 | \$41,068 | \$25,164 | \$1,134,956 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 |  | 5 | 36,000 | \$23.77 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$855,675 | \$0 | \$32,854 | \$20,086 | \$908,616 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  | 206,000 |  |  | \$434,012 | \$4,895,937 | \$10,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$5,642,449 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beachface Fill | 1 | 9,599 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 138,000 | \$23.95 | cubic yard | \$434,012 | \$3,304,534 | \$5,000 | \$43,824 | \$26,753 | \$3,814,123 |
| truck haul | 2 | 3,406 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 49,000 | \$23.64 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,158,367 | \$0 | \$15,561 | \$9,493 | \$1,183,420 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 90,000 | \$23.47 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$2,112,346 | \$0 | \$28,581 | \$17,388 | \$2,158,315 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.5 | 81,000 | \$23.73 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,921,902 | \$0 | \$25,723 | \$15,616 | \$1,963,241 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 130,000 | \$23.68 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$3,078,280 | \$0 | \$41,284 | \$25,164 | \$3,144,728 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 104,000 | \$23.62 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$2,456,364 | \$0 | \$33,027 | \$20,086 | \$2,509,477 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  | 592,000 |  |  | \$434,012 | \$14,031,793 | \$5,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$14,773,305 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conventional Fill | 1 | 9,599 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 138,000 | \$19.16 | cubic yard | \$1,102,609 | \$2,643,935 | \$5,000 | \$43,824 | \$26,753 | \$3,822,121 |
| hydraulic | 2 | 3,406 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 49,000 | \$21.98 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,077,250 | \$0 | \$15,561 | \$9,493 | \$1,102,303 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 90,000 | \$18.75 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,687,904 | \$0 | \$28,581 | \$17,388 | \$1,733,873 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.5 | 81,000 | \$18.22 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,475,734 | \$0 | \$25,723 | \$15,616 | \$1,517,073 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 130,000 | \$17.79 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$2,312,635 | \$0 | \$41,284 | \$25,164 | \$2,379,083 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 | $20 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 14.4 | 104,000 | \$17.48 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,817,696 | \$0 | \$33,027 | \$20,086 | \$1,870,809 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  | 592,000 |  |  | \$1,102,609 | \$11,015,154 | \$5,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$12,425,263 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conventional Fill | 1 | 9,599 | $40 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 29.4 | 282,000 | \$18.57 | cubic yard | \$1,102,609 | \$5,236,998 | \$5,000 | \$52,857 | \$26,753 | \$6,424,217 |
|  | 2 | 3,406 | $40 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 24.4 | 83,000 | \$18.38 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$1,525,658 | \$0 | \$15,557 | \$9,493 | \$1,550,708 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 | $40 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 18.9 | 118,000 | \$18.10 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$2,135,759 | \$0 | \$22,118 | \$17,388 | \$2,175,265 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 | $40 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 22.7 | 127,000 | \$17.70 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$2,247,722 | \$0 | \$23,805 | \$15,616 | \$2,287,142 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 | $40 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 24.5 | 221,000 | \$17.34 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$3,831,469 | \$0 | \$41,424 | \$25,164 | \$3,898,057 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 | $40 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 23.9 | 172,000 | \$16.93 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$2,911,595 | \$0 | \$32,239 | \$20,086 | \$2,963,920 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  | 1,003,000 |  |  | \$1,102,609 | \$17,889,201 | \$5,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$19,299,310 |


| Alternative | Reach | length in feet | Description | Quantity (c.y.) per LF | Quantity (c.y. | Unit Price | Unit of Measure | Mob/Demob | Fill Cost | Lands | PED | Engineering Monitoring | Subtotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conventional Fill | 1 | 9,599 | $100 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 59.2 | 568,000 | \$18.12 | cubic yard | \$1,878,806 | \$10,292,710 | \$5,000 | \$43,782 | \$26,753 | \$12,247,051 |
|  | 2 | 3,406 | $100 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 66.6 | 227,000 | \$17.81 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$4,042,750 | \$0 | \$17,497 | \$9,493 | \$4,069,740 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 | $100 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 48.4 | 302,000 | \$17.57 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$5,307,268 | \$0 | \$23,278 | \$17,388 | \$5,347,935 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 | $100 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 56.0 | 314,000 | \$17.21 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$5,404,142 | \$0 | \$24,203 | \$15,616 | \$5,443,961 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 | $100 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 61.2 | 553,000 | \$16.88 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$9,335,437 | \$0 | \$42,626 | \$25,164 | \$9,403,227 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 | $100 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 65.9 | 475,000 | \$16.47 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$7,821,586 | \$0 | \$36,613 | \$20,086 | \$7,878,286 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  | 2,439,000 |  |  | \$1,878,806 | \$42,203,893 | \$5,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$44,390,199 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conventional Fill | 1 | 9,599 | $160 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 104.0 | 998,000 | \$17.12 | cubic yard | \$1,878,806 | \$17,080,881 | \$5,000 | \$40,806 | \$26,753 | \$19,032,245 |
|  | 2 | 3,406 | $160 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 119.2 | 406,000 | \$17.81 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$7,229,577 | \$0 | \$16,600 | \$9,493 | \$7,255,670 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 | $160 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 100.2 | 625,000 | \$17.57 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$10,978,710 | \$0 | \$25,555 | \$17,388 | \$11,021,653 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 | $160 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 103.5 | 580,000 | \$17.19 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$9,970,249 | \$0 | \$23,715 | \$15,616 | \$10,009,579 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 | $160 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 115.4 | 1,042,000 | \$16.86 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$17,568,096 | \$0 | \$42,605 | \$25,164 | \$17,635,865 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 | $160 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{MHW} \mathrm{ext}$. | 131.4 | 947,000 | \$16.43 | cubic yard | \$0 | \$15,558,854 | \$0 | \$38,720 | \$20,086 | \$15,617,661 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  | 4,598,000 |  |  | \$1,878,806 | \$78,386,367 | \$5,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$80,572,673 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revetment | 1 | 9,599 |  |  |  | \$1,982.23 | linear foot | \$0 | \$19,027,393 | \$20,000 | \$43,926 | \$26,753 | \$19,118,072 |
|  | 2 | 3,406 |  |  |  | \$2,103.23 | linear foot | \$0 | \$7,163,587 | \$0 | \$15,586 | \$9,493 | \$7,188,666 |
|  | 3 | 6,239 |  |  |  | \$1,935.87 | linear foot | \$0 | \$12,077,899 | \$0 | \$28,550 | \$17,388 | \$12,123,838 |
|  | 4 | 5,603 |  |  |  | \$2,067.74 | linear foot | \$0 | \$11,585,556 | \$0 | \$25,640 | \$15,616 | \$11,626,812 |
|  | 5 | 9,029 |  |  |  | \$1,992.13 | linear foot | \$0 | \$17,986,931 | \$0 | \$41,318 | \$25,164 | \$18,053,413 |
|  | 6 | 7,207 |  |  |  | \$1,949.58 | linear foot | \$0 | \$14,050,652 | \$0 | \$32,980 | \$20,086 | \$14,103,718 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | 41,083 |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$81,892,018 | \$20,000 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$82,214,518 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Limestone |  |  | 1 acre |  |  | \$2,143,359.00 | acre | \$267,785 | \$1,573,074 | \$0 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$2,143,359 |
| Mitigation Reef |  |  | 2 acre |  |  | \$1,774,093.00 | acre | \$267,785 | \$2,977,901 | \$0 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$3,548,186 |
|  |  |  | 5 acre |  |  | \$1,552,504.60 | acre | \$267,785 | \$7,192,238 | \$0 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$7,762,523 |
|  |  |  | 10 acre |  |  | \$1,478,661.80 | acre | \$267,785 | \$14,216,333 | \$0 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$14,786,618 |
|  |  |  | 15 acre |  |  | \$1,454,040.60 | acre | \$267,785 | \$21,240,324 | \$0 | \$188,000 | \$114,500 | \$21,810,609 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,338,925 | \$47,199,870 | \$0 | \$940,000 | \$572,500 | \$50,051,295 |
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## APPENDIX C

1. Statement of Purpose. This Real Estate Plan is for the General Reevaluation Report for the Brevard County, Florida, Mid Reach Segment Shore Protection Project. This Real Estate Plan is only for planning purposes and both the final real property acquisition lines and estimates of value are subject to change even after approval of this report.

## 2. Project Authorization.

The GRR Study was authorized under the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, Public Law 106-541, Section 418. Brevard County, Florida:

The Secretary shall prepare a general re-evaluation report on the project for shoreline protection, Brevard County, Florida, authorized by Section 101(b)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667), to determine, if the project were modified to direct the Secretary to incorporate in the project any or all of the 7.1-mile reach of the project that was deleted from the south reach of the project, as described in paragraph (5) of the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 23, 1996, whether the project as modified would be technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

## 3. Project Location and Description.

a. The Brevard County (Mid - Reach) Shore Protection Project is located on Florida's Atlantic coast. The Mid Reach consists of approximately 7.8 miles of the Brevard County shoreline, from the south end of Patrick Air Force Base to just north of Indialantic, Florida(R-75.4 - R-118.3).
b. The recommended plan consists of a dune fill and a 10foot extension of the mean high water line plus advanced nourishment to maintain that design fill volume in Reach 1 ( $\mathrm{R}-119$ to R-109), a dune fill and a 20-foot extension of the mean high water line plus advanced nourishment to maintain that design fill volume in Reaches 2 and 3 (R-109 to R-99), a dune fill and a 10foot extension of the mean high water line plus advanced nourishment to maintain that design fill volume in Reaches 4 and 5 (R-99 to R-83), and a dune fill with no added advanced
nourishment in Reach 6 (R-83 to R-75.4). Fill will be accomplished by rehabilitating the Poseidon dredged material management area (DMMA) at Port Canaveral, dredging material from Canaveral Shoals with placement into the Poseidon DMMA every 6 years, and hauling by dump truck to the Mid-Reach for placement on the beach at approximately 3 year intervals. The
renourishment volume is approximately 164,000 cubic yards. The recommended plan offers erosion protection ranging from a 5-year storm level to a 75-year storm, varying along the length of the Mid-Reach. The plan includes 3.0 acres of environmental impact to the nearshore rock resources, following minimization of the impacts as much as possible while still offering maximum storm damage reduction. Mitigation for impacts due to direct and indirect cover of the nearshore rock is included in the 3.0 acre impact, however, 1.4 acres is expected to include some temporal variation as the advanced nourishment erodes. The recommended plan includes impacts in Reaches 1 to 5 and no impact in Reach 6.
The area impacted is on the landward edge of the nearshore rock, resulting in the small width of rock impacted but over the whole length of Reach 1 to 5. The calculated impact acreage is 3.0 acres out of the total of 31.3 acres of nearshore rock in the Mid-Reach study area. The nearshore rock seaward of the fill area will not be impacted. The mitigation quantity is calculated from the UMAM ratio of 1.6 mitigation acres required for every acre of natural rock impacted, resulting in a required mitigation of 4.8 acres.

## 4. Locally Owned Land.

The local sponsors, Brevard County owns three parks within the project area and are known as Sea Gull Park, Pelican Beach Park and SPRA Park. The County also owns approximately 20 public beach access points within the area.

## 5. Government-Owned Land.

The proposed Poseidon Stockpile Site is owned by Patrick Air Force Base.

## 6. Navigational Servitude.

Although the Federal Government has the right to use navigational servitude, it was agreed that the local sponsor will obtain all permissions to use submerged lands from the State of Florida.

## 7. Real Estate Requirements.

a. Material placed upon public lands seaward of the proposed ECL will require a Consent of Use from the State of Florida. The Consent of Use basically grants the rights to place material on state-owned submerged lands in accordance with the beach nourishment plans submitted with the application for an erosion control line. Also included in this document is the use of any submerged borrow areas and/or pipeline corridors. Usually the State of Florida only gives a ten (10) year time limit for use of submerged lands.
b. Perpetual Storm Damage Reduction Easements will be required for approximately 95 acres and 198 parcels located landward of the proposed ECL. A list of parcels can be located within the Economics section of this report. The non-Federal sponsor must acquire perpetual storm damage reduction easement estate for all placement areas, dune/vegetation areas and all accesses to the beach. These properties need to be open to the public equally.
c. The borrow area, Canaveral Shoals II (CSII), is located approximately 20 miles north-northeast of the Mid Reach and 9.4 miles east of proposed Poseidon stockpile site. As the borrow area is located within the Federal Waters of the United States, the Corps of Engineers will enter into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the United States Mineral Management Service (MMS).
d. The Appraiser has determined that the value of the lands needed for easement purposes are assessed at zero. Erodable land that is to be protected by the Federal project is valued at zero as it will be enhanced post-project. Federal regulations state that "shore protection projects will generally be treated in a manner as to not allow credit for lands when the project provides direct benefits such as prevention of erosion or re-establishment of beaches".
e. The nearshore upland values are used to determine economical benefits of the project and can be found in the economics section. In accordance to the project purpose, no land will be lost with this project.
f. Staging areas have not been identified at this time, but will require a temporary work area easement if not located within the perpetual storm damage reduction easement area.
g. Permits from the Department of the Air Force will be required for the stockpile area located on Cape Canaveral Air Station. The permit will be between U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
and U.S. Air Force, Patrick Air force Base. An automatic renewal of this permit will be requested, so that it can continue for project life.

## 8. Non-Federal Operation/Maintenance Responsibilities.

The non-Federal sponsors will operate and maintain the project for the project life. Future periodic nourishments are considered construction and will be performed as part of the Federal project.

## 9. Non-Federal Authority to Participate in the Project.

a. Brevard County, Florida, is the non-Federal sponsor of the project and is a political subdivision of the State of Florida as provided by Article 8, Section 1 of the Florida Constitution.
b. Counties of Florida are empowered by Florida Statutes 125.001 to "Establish and administer programs of ...flood and beach erosion control..." By Chapter 127, counties are empowered to exercise eminent domain powers for any county purpose except certain restrictions apply on recreational projects.
10. Minerals.

There are no known minerals of value in the project area.
11. Hazardous and Toxic Wastes (HTW).

There have been no hazardous or toxic wastes identified within the project area.
12. Relocation Assistance Payments (Public Law 91-646).

No persons or business will require relocation.
13. Structures and Facilities.

There are no structures and facilities to be damaged as part of the Federal project.
14. Summary of Real Estate Costs.
a. Lands:

Lands: 0
Improvements: 0
Severance Damages: 0

| Minerals: | 0 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Lands and Damages | $\$$ | 0 |
| Acquisition/Administrative |  | 10,000 |
| Federal | 60,000 |  |
| Non-Federal | 0 |  |
| Public Law 91-646 |  |  |
| Contingencies (25\%) | 17,500 |  |
| Total Real Estate Cost | $\$ 87,500$ |  |

(NOTE: We anticipate a temporary staging area will be needed, but has not been identified at this time. If this area is located outside the project footprint a gross appraisal will be required.)

## 15. Real Estate Acquisition Schedule.

The Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) will be fully executed on October 10, 2010 with advertisement on April 4, 2011. If the local sponsor acquires the land prior to the fully executed PPA, they may be at risk to receive crediting for administrative costs (scheduled dates as of October 2008).

At this time landowners have not been contacted in the area, however it is expected for this project to be supported by many and not supported by others. Patrick Air Force Base supports the project.

If the non-Federal sponsor cannot acquire LERRD required for the project in a timely fashion or has difficulty in acquiring the required estate, the non-Federal sponsor can request in writing that the Government acquire LERRD on its behalf. In such event, the decision to acquire LERRD on behalf of the non-Federal sponsor lies within the sole discretion of the Government.

NOTE: The above statement is added to the report to receive the approval authority to acquire such necessary LERRD's by condemnation for the non-Federal sponsor if it requests the Federal Government to do so. The local sponsor was able to acquire parcels by condemnation for another reach, but State Court only allowed a 50 year easement. Due to Corps of Engineers requiring perpetual the County may request we condemn.

## 16. Standard Estates to be Acquired.

See Real Estate Requirements for what lands need what estate.

## PERPETUAL BEACH STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION EASEMENT

A perpetual and assignable easement and right-of-way in, on, over and across (the land described in Schedule A) (Tracts No. ), for use by the Project Sponsor, its representatives, agents, contractors and assigns, to construct; preserve; patrol; operate; maintain; repair; rehabilitate; and replace; a public beach (a dune system) and other erosion control and storm damage reduction measures together with appurtenances thereto, including the right to deposit sand; to accomplish any alterations of contours on said land; to construct berms (and dunes); to nourish and renourish periodically; to move, store and remove equipment and supplies; to erect and remove temporary structures; and to perform any other work necessary and incident to the construction, periodic renourishment and maintenance of the Brevard County, Florida, Mid Reach Segment, together with the right of public use and access; (to plant vegetation on said dunes and berms; to erect, maintain and remove silt screens and snow fences; to facilitate preservation of dunes and vegetation through the limitation of access to dune areas; ) to trim, cut, fell, and remove from said land all trees, underbrush, debris, obstructions, and any other vegetation, structures and obstacles within the limits of the easement (except $\qquad$ ); (reserving, however, to the grantor(s), (his) (her) (its) (their) (heirs), successors and assigns, the right to construct dune overwalk structures in accordance with any applicable Federal, State or local laws or regulations, provided that such structures shall not violate the integrity of the dune in shape, dimension or function, and that prior approval of the plans and specifications for such structures is obtained from the (designated representative of the Project Sponsor) and provided further that such structures are subordinate to the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and replacement of the project; and further) reserving to the grantor(s), (his) (her) (its) (their) (heirs), successors and assigns all such rights and privileges as may be used and enjoyed without interfering with or abridging the rights and easements hereby acquired; subject however to existing easements for public roads and highways, public utilities, railroads and pipelines.

## TEMPORARY WORK AREA EASEMENT

A temporary easement and right-of-way in, on, over and across (the land described in Schedule A) (Tracts Nos. ___ and ___), for a period not to exceed $\qquad$ beginning with date
possession of the land is granted to the Project Sponsor, for use by the United States, its representatives, agents, and contractors as a (borrow area) (work area), including the right to (borrow and/or deposit fill, spoil and waste material thereon) (move, store and remove equipment and supplies), and erect and remove temporary structures on the land and to perform any other work necessary and incident to the construction of the Brevard County, Florida, Project, Mid Reach Segment together with the right to trim, cut, fell and remove therefrom all trees, underbrush, obstructions, and any other vegetation, structures, or obstacles within the limits of the right-of-way; reserving, however, to the landowners, their heirs and assigns, all such rights and privileges as may be used without interfering with or abridging the rights and easement hereby acquired; subject, however, to existing easements for public roads and highways, public utilities, railroads and pipelines

## 17. Map.

A real estate map and parcel list of the proposed project area is included with this appendix as Enclosures 1 \& 2.

## 18. Chart of Accounts.

| 01 | Lands and Damages | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01B00 | Acquisition/Administrative |  |
|  | Federal | $\$ 10,000$ |
|  | Non-Federal | $\$ 60,000$ |

Total Real Estate Total w/o cont.
Total Real Estate Contingencies (25\%)
\$ 70,000

Total Real Estate Costs
\$ 17,500
\$ 87,500

## Enclosure 1

Site Name
Street Number

REACH 6

Pineda Phase
Pineda Phase II
Pineda Phase III
Oceanus I
Oceanus III
Sandpiper Towers I
Flores de Playa
Ocean Residence North
Opal Seas
Park - State of FL
Sea Gull Park - Brevard County
Silver Sands I
Silver Sands II
Sea Breakers
Horizon II
Horizon I
Horizon III
Horizon IV
SPRA Park - Brevard County
Las Brisas I
Las Brisas II
Monaco Condo
Monaco Condo
Monaco Condo
Monaco Condo
TIITF - State of FL
City of Satellite Beach
Brevard County
Brevard County
City of Satellite Beach

REACH 5

City of Satellite Beach
TIITF - State of FL
New House
Vacant
Majesty Palm Condo
Vacant
Paradise Beach Club
Oceana Beach Club
New House

| 101 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00011$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 155 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00013$ |
| 175 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00015$ |
| 199 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00004$ |
| 199 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00004$ |
| 205 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00772$ |
| 245 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00751$ |
| 261 Ocean Residence Ct | $26372379-00001$ |
| 275 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00752$ |
| 285 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00753$ |
|  | $26372300-00754$ |
| 295 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00755$ |
| 297 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00756$ |
| 307 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00769$ |
| 401 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00781$ |
| 403 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00779$ |
| 405 Hwy A1A | $26372300-00783$ |
| 407 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00004$ |
| 501 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00005$ |
| 537 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00004$ |
| 553 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00008$ |
| 571 Hwy A1A | $26372602-00000$ |
| 579 Hwy A1A | $26372602-00000$ |
| 14 | $26372603-00000$ |
| 815 Hwy A1A | $26372603-00000$ |
| North part of parcel | $26372600-00025$ |
|  | $26372600-00010$ |
|  | $26372600-00026$ |
|  | $26372600-00751$ |
|  | $26372600-00750$ |


| South Part of Parcel | $26372600-00750$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $26372600-00763$ |
| 905 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00762$ |
|  | $26372600-00760$ |
| 925 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00761$ |
| 951 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00759$ |
| 975 Hwy A1A | $26372600-00753$ |
| 1035 Hwy A1A | $26373500-00003$ |
| 1055 Hwy A1A | $26373500-00012$ |

Drug Store
The Oceans
The Buccaneer Club I
The Buccaneer Club II
The Buccaneer Condo Apts
Seamark
Las Olas
House
Park Avenue
House
Sand Castle Condo
Sand Castle - pool
New Construction
City of Satellite Beach
La Colonnade Condo
La Playa East - pool,
La Playa East Condo
TIITF - State of FL
Misty Shore
Summer Cove
Reflections
City of Satellite Beach
Emerald Shores
Sea Villa
East Wind II
East Wind I
Brevard County
Brevard County - Pelican Beach
Park

| 1077 Hwy A1A | $26373500-00007$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1085 Hwy A1A | $26373500-00004$ |
| 1125 Hwy A1A | $26373501-00001$ |
| 1125 Hwy A1A | $26373501-00001$ |
| 1175 Hwy A1A | $26373501-00006$ |
| 1195 Hwy A1A | $26373501-00006$ |
| 1215 Hwy A1A | $26373500-00763$ |
| 10 Park Ave | $26373578-0000 A 0-$ |

Public R.O.W.

| 5 Park Ave | 26373578-0000B0- 0001 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1273 Hwy A1A | 26373500-00801 |
|  | 26373500-00758 |
|  | 26373500-00756 |
| easement? | $263735 E A-00001$ |
| 1303 Hwy A1A | 263735EA-0000A-1 |
|  | 263735EA-0000A-4 |
| 1343 Hwy A1A | 263735EA-0000A-5 |
|  | 263735EA-0000A-7 |
| 1369 Hwy A1A | 263736EA-0000A-9 |
| 1385 Hwy A1A | 263736EB-0000C-1 |
| 1395 Hwy A1A | 263736EB-0000C.A-0 |
| public access | 263736EB-0000C.3-0 |
| 1405 Hwy A1A | $2737011 \mathrm{~A}-00201$ |
| 1425 Hwy A1A | 27370100-00264A-0 |
| 1455 Hwy A1A | 27370100-00335.6-0 |
| 1465 Hwy A1A | 27370100-00333.0-0 |
| 1495 Hwy A1A | 27370100-00258.1-0 |
| 1525 Hwy A1A | 27370100-00258.0 |

REACH 4

Brevard County - Pelican Beach
Park
Brevard County
Brevard County
City of Satellite Beach
City of Satellite Beach
Ocean Royale
Magnolia Ave
House
House
House
Townhouse
Townhouse
Townhouse
House
House

| 1525 Hwy A1A | $27370100-00258.0$ |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | $27370100-00270$ |
|  | $27370100-00268$ |
|  | $27370100-00265$ |
| 1595 Hwy A1A | $27370100-00272$ |
| public R.O.W. | $27370100-00275 . A-0$ |
| 610 Ocean Street |  |
| 620 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-1$ |
| 626 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-3$ |
| 630 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-4$ |
| 632 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-5$ |
| 634 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-5.01$ |
| 638 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-6$ |
| 640 Ocean Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-7$ |


| House  <br> Magellan Ave 648 Ocean Street <br> public R.O.W.  | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~A}-11$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| House | 1655 Hwy A1A | $27370150-00001.0-1$ |
| House |  | $27370150-00001.0-1$ |
| House | 1683 Hwy A1A | $27370150-00001.0-6$ |
| House | 1687 Hwy A1A | $27370150-00001.0-8$ |
| City of Satellite Beach | public R.O.W. | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{~B} .0-11$ |
| Sunrise Ave |  | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{C}-1$ |
| City of Satellite Beach | 715 Beach Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{C}-5$ |
| House | 721 Beach Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{C}-6$ |
| House | 725 Beach Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{C}-8$ |
| House | 735 Beach Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{C}-10$ |
| House | 745 Beach Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{C}-11$ |
| House | public R.O.W. |  |
| Palmetto Ave |  | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{D}-1$ |
| City of Satellite Beach | 785 Shell Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{D}-2$ |
| City of Satellite Beach | 789 Shell Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{D}-6$ |
| House | 795 Shell Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{D}-8$ |
| House | 797 Shell Street | $27370150-0000 \mathrm{D}-10$ |
| House | public R.O.W. |  |
| House | 1791 Hwy A1A |  |
| Volunteer Way | 1791 Hwy A1A | $27371232-00000-1$ |
| Lantana Condo | 1791 Hwy A1A | $27371232-00000-1$ |
| Lantana Condo | 1791 Hwy A1A | $27371232-00000-1$ |
| Lantana Condo | Bicentennial Park | $27371232-00000-1$ |
| Lantana Condo | Bicentennial Park | $27371200-00260$ |
| City of Indian Harbour Beach |  |  |

REACH 3
Ocean Dunes Drive
Aloha Condo
SatCom Direct
The Christal II
The Christal I
Seashore Estates I
Seashore Estates Access
TIITF - State of FL
Golden Palm
Serena Shores II
Serena Shores I
Indian Harbour Bch Club
Somerset Condo
Somerset Condo
Somerset Condo
Somerset Condo
Oceanique Condo II
public R.O.W.
1891 Hwy A1A
1901 Hwy A1A
1907 Hwy A1A
1919 Hwy A1A
1923 Hwy A1A
1923 Hwy A1A

1941 Hwy A1A
2025 Hwy A1A
2035 Hwy A1A
2055 Hwy A1A
2065 Hwy A1A
2065 Hwy A1A
2065 Hwy A1A
2065 Hwy A1A
2105 Hwy A1A

27371227-0000B-1
27371227-0000B-6
27371227-0000B-7
27371227-0000B-11
27871227-0000B-15.01
27871227-0000B-19.01
27371200-00585
27371200-00500.9-
0201
27371200-00586A
27371200-00500A
27371200-00501.1
2737121B-00000-1
2737121B-00000-1
2737121B-00000-1
2737121B-00000-1
27371200-00516.M

Oceanique Condo pool
Oceanique Condo I
City of Indian Harbour Beach
City of Indian Harbour Beach
Gardenia Condo
Ocean Walk Condo
Brevard County Community Center
Wallace Ave
TIITF - State of FL
Eau Gallie Blvd
TIITF - State of FL
REACH 2
Melbourne Ocean Club Condo
Brevard County
Vacant
Hilton Hotel
Villa Riviera
Coral Palms
Club Residence
Sandy Kaye
Silver Palms
Beach Access
Vacant
Vacant
Ocean Sands N
Ocean Sands S
Holiday Inn

REACH 1
Brevard County
TIITF - State of FL
TIITF - State of FL
Brevard County
Brevard County
Brevard County
House
House
House
House
House
House
House
House
House
House

2105 Hwy A1A
2105 Hwy A1A
Millenium Park
Millenium Park
2195 Hwy A1A
2225 Hwy A1A
2289 Hwy A1A
public R.O.W.
Canova Beach Park
Canova Beach Park
Canova Beach Park - 3299 Hwy A1A 27371302-00001-1

| 3101 N. Hwy A1A | $27371302-00001-12$ |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | $27371375-00001-2.01$ |
| 3003 N. Hwy A1A | $27371375-0001-3$ |
| 2925 N. Hwy A1A | $27371300-00753$ |
| 2875 N. Hwy A1A | $27371376-00000-1.01$ |
| 2855 N. Hwy A1A | $27371376-0000-4.01$ |
| 2835 N. Hwy A1A | $2737137800-0000154.1$ |
| 2805 N. Hwy A1A | $2737131 A-00201$ |
| easement | $27371300-00755.1$ |
|  | $27371300-00755.0$ |
| 2727 N. Hwy A1A | $27371300-00789$ |
| 2725 N. Hwy A1A | $27371300-00792$ |
| 2605 N. Hwy A1A | $27371300-00759$ |

beach access 27372400-00056
27372400-00005
27372400-00037
27372400-00009
27372400-00010
27372400-00011.1
27372475-00001-1
27372475-00001-2
27372475-00001-3
27372475-00001-4
27372475-00001-5
27372475-00001-6
27372475-00001-7
27372475-00001-8
27372475-00001-9
27372475-00001-10

| House | 2075 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| House | 2065 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-12 |
| House | 2055 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-13 |
| House | 2045 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-14 |
| beach access |  |  |
| House | 2035 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-15 |
| House | 2025 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-16 |
| House | 2015 N. Hwy A1A | 27372475-00001-17 |
| House | 2005 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-1 |
| Vacant |  | 27372484-0000A-2 |
| House | 1965 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-3 |
| House | 1955 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-4 |
| House | 1945 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-5 |
| beach access |  |  |
| House | 1935 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-6 |
| House | 1925 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-7 |
| House | 1915 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-8 |
| House | 1905 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-9 |
| House | 1885 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-10 |
| House | 1875 N. Hwy A1A | 27372484-0000A-11 |
| The Barringer Condo I | 1835 N. Hwy A1A | 27372490-00000-1 |
| The Barringer II | 1845 N. Hwy A1A | 27372491-00000-1 |
| Casa Blanca Inn | 1805 N. Hwy A1A | 273725EV-00000-1 |
| Bella Vista | 1755 N. Hwy A1A | 27372513-00000-1 |
| Apartments | 1745 N. Hwy A1A | 273725EV-00000-4 |
| Blue Seas Apts. | 1725 N. Hwy A1A | 273830EV-00000-5 |
|  |  | 273830EN-00000- |
| Ocean Park Condo | 1665 N. Hwy A1A | 16.01 |
|  |  | 273830EN-00000- |
| Brevard County | access | 16.02 |
| Vacant |  | 273830EN-00000-15 |
| Sea Pearl Condo | 1575 N. Hwy A1A | 27383027-00000-1 |
|  |  | 273830EN-00000- |
| Brevard County | access | 12.01 |
|  |  | 273830EN-00000- |
| Outrigger | 1555 N. Hwy A1A | 11.01 |
| Majestic Shores | 1525 N. Hwy A1A | 27383026-00000-1 |
| Brevard County | access |  |
| Claridge Condo | 1515 N. Hwy A1A | 273830EN-00000-7 |
| Royal Palms | 1505 N. Hwy A1A | 2738301A-00201 |
| Vacant |  | 273830EN-00000-4 |
| Brevard County | access |  |
| The Dunes | 1415 N. Hwy A1A | 273830EN-00000-1 |
| Jade Palm | 1345 N. Hwy A1A | 27383052-00000-1 |
| Brevard County | access |  |
| House | 1315 N. Hwy A1A | 27383050-00000-28 |
| House | 1245 N. Hwy A1A | 27383050-00000-29 |
| House | 1235 N. Hwy A1A | 27383050-00000-31 |
| Brevard County | access |  |
| House | 1225 N. Hwy A1A | 27383050-00000-32 |


| House | 1215 N. Hwy A1A | $27383050-00000-33$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Coral Reef Condo | 1177 N. Hwy A1A | $27383050-00000-34$ |
| House | 1163 N. Hwy A1A | $27383050-00000-36$ |
| TIITF - State of FL | 1137 N. Hwy A1A | $273830 \mathrm{EW}-000 \mathrm{~A}-15$ |
| Brevard County | access |  |
| House | 1135 N. Hwy A1A | $273830 E W-000 \mathrm{~A}-14$ |

## Enclosure 2



olsen associates, ine.

olsen associates, inc.




olsen associates, inc



olsen associates, inc.

Appendix D<br>Public Use Determination and Cost Allocation<br>Brevard County, Florida Shore Protection Project

Mid-Reach Segment

## INTRODUCTION

1. Federal participation in shore protection projects is limited to shorelines open to public use. Guidance is provided in ER 1105-2-100 wherein user fees, parking, access, beach use by private organizations, and public shores with limitations are addressed (E-24.d). Federal participation is further defined by project purpose, either hurricane and storm damage reduction or recreation, and by shoreline ownership. Shoreline ownership is separated into lands that are Federally owned, publicly and privately owned, and privately owned with limited use, as shown in Table 1. More specific guidance is provided in ER 1165-2-130 on what constitutes sufficient parking.

Table 1: Shore Ownership and Levels of Federal Participation

| Shore Ownership and Project <br> Purpose or Benefits | Maximum Level of <br> Federal Participation <br> in Initial Construction | Maximum Level of <br> Federal Participation <br> in OMRR\&R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. Federally Owned |  |  |
| HSDR on Developed Lands | $100 \%$ |  |
| HSDR on Undeveloped Lands | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Recreation (Separable costs) | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
|  |  | $100 \%$ |
| II. Publicly and Privately Owned <br> (public benefits) |  |  |
| HSDR on Developed Lands | $65 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| HSDR on Undeveloped Lands |  | $0 \%$ |
| Public Lands | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Private Lands | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Recreation (Separable costs) | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| III. Privately Owned (limited use) |  | $0 \%$ |
| HSDR on Developed Lands | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| HSDR on Undeveloped Lands | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Recreation (Separable costs) | $0 \%$ | 0 |

## THE BASIC METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

2. In order to evaluate the Brevard County Mid-Reach study area, available information was gathered from existing reports, aerial photography, Brevard County sources and field reconnaissance. The public use of the shoreline was addressed first to determine the level of Federal participation, then secondly the shoreline ownership. Each of the major areas of study is discussed in the following paragraphs.

## USER FEES

3. Reasonable user fees are acceptable for beach recreation use when used to offset the local share of project costs. Field reconnaissance of the study area did not find any user fees in order to access the study area.

## PARKING

4. Lack of sufficient parking facilities for the general public (including nonresident users) located reasonably near and accessible to the project beaches may constitute a restriction on public access and use. Parking on a free or reasonable basis must be within a reasonable walking distance of a pedestrian access to the beach. Public transportation may also be used to augment parking facilities provided there is supporting evidence that the public transportation system is adequate for the needs of beach users. Specific guidance from ER 1165-2-130 states that "parking should be sufficient to accommodate the lesser of the peak hour demand or the beach capacity" (par. h(2)).
5. Parking was verified by field visit on October 19, 2005. Aerial photos were consulted for possible access points and field verified. The number of parking spaces were estimated as closely as possible. The parking areas noted during the field visit are listed in Table 2 for a total of 830 spaces.
6. Public transportation routes were noted during the field visit. Discussion with Brevard County yielded publicly available information on bus routes adjacent to the project area. The parking analysis includes a reduction in users to account for users that arrive via public transportation or other means.
7. The amount of parking was analyzed compared to user demand and beach capacity. Information for this analysis was found in the report completed by Olsen Associates, Inc. titled "Brevard County, Florida, Federal Shore Protection Project, Mid-Reach, Economic Analysis of Incidental Project Benefits, June 22, 2006" (Economics Appendix). The analysis provided estimates of beach user demand in the Mid-Reach at the projected end of construction in 2010 at 15,075 visits per day for the use category that includes peak weekend days that account for $88.3 \%$ of
peak demand. To compute the number of parking spaces required to bring that number of people to the beach, some additional factors come into play. Notional visitors are those that access the beach on foot, on bike, or are dropped off by cars or city buses. Following the analysis used in the incidental benefit calculations, a notional factor is used, equating to $60.5 \%$ of beach users that do not use parking and $39.5 \%$ of users that depend on parking. The number of people traveling by car is further reduced by assuming four people ride in each car and each space can be used twice per pay, thus each parking space provides daily capacity for eight users per day. This results in the need for 744 spaces in 2010 in order to meet demand, as shown in Table 3.

Table 2: Parking Spaces of Brevard County Mid-Reach

| Park Name | Nearest Cross <br> Street | Nearest DEP <br> Monument | Number of <br> Spaces |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Patrick AFB | State Hwy 404 | $\mathrm{R}-75$ | 50 |
| Sea Gull Park | 1st | $\mathrm{R}-78$ | 20 |
| SPRA Park | Berkeley Rd | $\mathrm{R}-80$ | 50 |
|  | Patrick Road | $\mathrm{R}-82$ | 20 |
|  | Grant Ave | halfway R-87 to R-88 | 23 |
|  | Park | $\mathrm{R}-89$ | 4 |
|  | Royal Palm | $\mathrm{R}-93$ | 170 |
|  | Desoto - Magnolia | $\mathrm{R}-95$ | 11 |
|  | Magellan | $\mathrm{R}-95$ | 12 |
|  | Sunrise | $\mathrm{R}-96$ | 12 |
|  | Palmetto | $\mathrm{R}-97$ | 25 |
|  | Volunteer Way | $\mathrm{R}-97$ | 6 |
|  | Ocean Dunes | $\mathrm{R}-99$ | 42 |
|  | Palm Springs | $\mathrm{R}-101$ | 2 |
|  | Atlantic | $\mathrm{R}-102$ | 12 |
|  | Golden Beach | $\mathrm{R}-103$ | 25 |
|  | Wallace | $\mathrm{R}-104$ | 20 |
|  | Eau Gallie | $\mathrm{R}-105$ | 65 |
|  | Millenium Park | $\mathrm{R}-106$ | 18 |
|  | Coral Way | $\mathrm{R}-108$ | 6 |
|  | Canova Beach Past | $\mathrm{R}-109$ | 6 |
|  | R-111 | 225 |  |
|  | Parris | $\mathrm{R}-116$ | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Paradise |  |  |
|  |  |  | 830 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 3: User Demand Parking Spaces

| Year | User <br> Demand <br> (persons) | 39.5\% that Park <br> (persons) | Number of parking spaces <br> (8 users per space) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 15,075 | 5,955 | 744 |

8. Although the user demand is calculated independent of construction of a shore protection project, the parameter of beach capacity is dependent on the shore protection alternative recommended for construction. The incidental benefit analysis included the suite of alternatives under consideration. For this verification of public use, only the NED plan is described. For the NED plan of beachface fill with a 10foot mean high water extension in Reaches 1 and 5, a 20-foot mean high water extension in Reach 2, a 30-foot mean high water extension in Reach 3, and a dune fill in Reaches 4 and 6, the calculated beach area is 4,083,290 square feet. This value accounts for the dry beach area between the vegetation line and the mean high water line for the length of the Mid-Reach, unconstrained by beach access. Beach capacity is then calculated assuming each person needs 100 square feet of space, resulting in a total number of possible persons at 40,833, as shown in Table 4. To compute the number of parking spaces required to bring that number of people to the beach, the notional visitor percentage and number of persons per space are applied. Notional visitors are those that access the beach on foot, on bike, or are dropped off by cars or city buses. Following the analysis used in the incidental benefit calculations, a notional factor is used, equating to $60.5 \%$ of beach users that do not use parking and $39.5 \%$ of users that depend on parking. Using the same percentages, $39.5 \%$ of the total beach users of 40,833 equals 16,129 people traveling by car. The number of people traveling by car is further reduced by assuming four people ride in each car and each space can be used twice per pay, thus each parking space provides daily capacity for eight users per day. Dividing 16,129 people by 8 equals 2,016 parking spaces that must be provided.

Table 4: Beach Capacity

| Reach | Average <br> Beach <br> Width <br> (feet) | Reach <br> Length <br> (feet) | With Project <br> Beach Area <br> (sqft) | Beach <br> Capacity <br> (persons) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 115 | 9,599 | $1,103,885$ | 11,039 |
| 2 | 126 | 3,406 | 429,156 | 4,292 |
| 3 | 122 | 6,239 | 761,158 | 7,612 |
| 4 | 92 | 5,603 | 515,476 | 5,155 |
| 5 | 78 | 9,029 | 704,262 | 7,043 |
| 6 | 79 | 7,207 | 569,353 | 5,694 |
| Sum |  | 41,083 | $4,083,290$ | 40,833 |

9. The total number of required parking spaces is the lesser of that required to meet peak hour demand or beach capacity per current policy guidance. At the time of construction in 2010, the lesser of peak hour demand and beach capacity is 744 spaces. The current number of parking spaces of 830 meets the current demand.

## ACCESS

10. Reasonable public access rights of way must be provided approximately every one-half mile or less along the beach. For purposes of this study, such accesses will be considered pedestrian accesses with either parking or a bus stop. Parking and access points are shown on the drawings in Figures 1 to 11. The majority of the Mid-Reach included in the recommended plan is open and accessible to the public with only 3,985 feet in four segments out of 41,083 feet that are not open. This length is incidental to the whole project and cannot be avoided without jeopardizing the integrity of the recommended plan or incurring extra costs. An adjustment is included in the cost allocation to remove that portion from Federal participation.
11. Public transportation is provided by the Space Coast Area Transit (SCAT), a department under the Brevard County Board of County Commissioners. In addition to fixed route buses, SCAT offers services tailored to elderly and special needs riders. All buses are equipped with wheelchair lifts and allow bicycles, surfboards, and other beach equipment. Reservations on special buses are available for curb to curb service for special needs individuals. Public outreach is a regular part of service, through the use of television, radio and newspaper advertising. The normal fare per ride throughout the system is $\$ 1.25$, with reduced rates for senior citizens, disabled, veterans, and students. The beach trolley route is shown in Figure 12. The beach trolley stops at transfer points to other buses whereby riders from farther away would be able to access the beach.

## BEACH USE BY PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

12. Federal aid to private shores owned by beach clubs and hotels which limit beach use to members or guests is contrary to the intent of Public Law 84-826. The State of Florida Coastal Zone Management Program establishes State ownership of lands seaward of the mean high water line. For new construction of beach nourishment projects, the existing mean high water line is renamed the erosion control line (ECL) at the time of initial construction. Any new lands created by the project seaward of the ECL are state owned lands. Public use of state owned lands is assured by the maintenance of regular pedestrian access points to the beach. Public use of the lands between the dune or seawall and the ECL is included as a provision of the easements required from private landowners prior to construction.

## PUBLIC SHORES WITH LIMITATIONS

13. Publicly owned beaches, which limit use to residents of the community or a group of communities, are not considered to be open to the general public and are treated as private beaches. The ability of the public to use the beach is inherent to the other portions of this study such as user fees, pedestrian access, parking and beach ownership. No restrictions to use by the general public were found in addition to the other portions of this study.

## PROJECT PURPOSE

14. Shore protection projects are formulated to provide hurricane and storm damage reduction. Incidental recreation benefits may be included in the benefit calculations, but may be not more than fifty percent of the total benefits required for justification. Any separable costs for recreation features are paid at 100\% nonFederal cost.

## SHORE OWNERSHIP

15. The amount of Federal participation in the costs of construction and OMRR\&R of the shore protection project are determined by the shoreline ownership. The oceanfront parcels are divided between Federally owned, privately owned, and publicly owned. Whether the parcel has been developed or not is also needed information. The Brevard County tax appraisers database was reviewed for each parcel of oceanfront property within the study area. The most recent information available was dated 2005. Undeveloped property was verified by field reconnaissance.

## COST SHARING

16. The public use determination, project purpose and shore ownership are combined in Table 5 according to the parameters shown in Table 1. A detailed parcel by parcel account is included in the attachment. The length of shoreline corresponds with that of the recommended plan which includes Reaches 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 . From this determination, the Federal share of construction costs for the Brevard County Mid-Reach project recommended plan is 54.0\%.

Table 5: Brevard County Mid-Reach Cost Sharing Percentage

| Shore Ownership and Project Purpose (as defined in ER 1105-2-100, Table E-22) | Maximum Level of Federal Participation in Construction Costs | Shoreline <br> Length (feet) | Federal Participation (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Federally Owned | 100\% | 0 | 0 |
| II. Publically and Privately Owned, Protection Results in Public Benefits |  |  |  |
| A. Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction on Developed Lands | 65\% | 26,834 | 17,469 |
| B. Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction on Undeveloped Lands |  |  |  |
| (1) Public Lands | 50\% | 4,415 | 2,208 |
| (2) Private Lands | 0\% | 815 | 0 |
| C. Separable Recreation | 50\% | 5,034 | 2,521 |
| III. Privately Owned, Use Limited to Private Interests |  |  |  |
| A. Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction on Developed Lands | 0\% | 3,695 | 0 |
| B. Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction on Undeveloped Lands | 0\% | 85 | 0 |
| C. Separable Recreation | 0\% | 205 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Distance | 41,083 | 22,198 |
| Federal share $=22,198$ divided by 41,083 $=$ |  |  | 54.0\% |

Attachments

Brevard County, Florida, R75-78


Figure 1: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R75-78

Brevard County, Florida, R78-82


Figure 2: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R78-82

Brevard County, Florida, R82-86


Figure 3: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R82-86

Brevard County, Florida, R86-91


Figure 4: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R86-91
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Brevard County, Florida, R91-95


Figure 5: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R91-95

Brevard County, Florida, R95-99


Figure 6: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R95-99

Brevard County, Florida, R99-103


Figure 7: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R99-103

Brevard County, Florida, R103-107


Figure 8: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R103-107

Brevard County, Florida, R107-111


Figure 9: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R107-111

Brevard County, Florida, R111-115


Figure 10: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R111-115

Brevard County, Florida, R115-119


Figure 11: Brevard Mid-Reach Parking and Access, R115-119


Figure 12: Space Coast Area Transit Bus Route

Table 6: Brevard Mid-Reach Public Access and Ownership


Table 6: Brevard Mid-Reach Public Access and Ownership (cont.)

| Parcel Number <br> (A) | Lot Width (Feet) <br> (B) |  | Shoreline Description <br> (C) | Within Project Limits <br> (D) | Within $1 / 4$ Mile of Access (E) | Shore Ownership and Project Purpose (F) | Level of Federal Participation (G) | Federal <br> Participation <br> Times Lot <br> Width <br> (H) | Number of Parking Spaces (I) | $\underset{(\mathrm{J})}{\mathrm{DEP} \text { Monument }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2737011A-00201 | 305 | Condo | Emerald Shores, 1405 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 198 |  |  |
| 27370100-00264A-0 | 130 | Condo | Sea Villa, 1425 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 85 |  | R-92 |
| 27370100-00335.6-0 | 265 | Condo | East Wind II, 1455 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 172 |  |  |
| 27370100-00333.0-0 | 360 | Condo | East Wind I, 1465 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 234 |  |  |
| 27370100-00258.1-0 | 50 | Public Park | Brevard County, 1495 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 25 | 20 |  |
| 27370100-00258.0 | 300 | Public Park | Brevard County - Pelican Beach Pa | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 150 | 75 | R-93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27370100-00258.0 | 635 | Public Park | Brevard County - Pelican Beach Pé | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 318 | 75 | R-93 |
| 27370100-00270 | 100 | Public Park | Brevard County | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 50 |  |  |
| 27370100-00268 | 200 | Public Park | Brevard County | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 100 |  |  |
| 27370100-00265 | 150 | Public Park | City of Satellite Beach | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 75 |  | R-94 |
| 27370100-00272 | 150 | Public Park | City of Satellite Beach | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 75 |  |  |
| 27370100-00275.A-0 | 190 | Condo | Ocean Royale, 1595 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 124 |  |  |
|  | 50 | Public R.O.W. | Magnolia Ave | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 33 | 11 |  |
| 27370150-0000A-1 | 115 | House | 610 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 75 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-3 | 50 | House | 620 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 33 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-4 | 60 | House | 626 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 39 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-5 | 30 | Townhouse | 630 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 20 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-5.01 | 30 | Townhouse | 632 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 20 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-6 | 30 | Townhouse | 634 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 20 |  | R-95 |
| 27370150-0000A-7 | 110 | House | 638 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 72 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-9 | 108 | House | 640 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 70 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000A-11 | 110 | House | 648 Ocean Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 72 |  |  |
|  | 50 | Public R.O.W. | Magellan Ave | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 33 | 12 |  |
| 27370150-00001.0-1 | 120 | House | 1655 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 78 |  |  |
| 27370150-00001.0-3.01 | 130 | House |  | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 85 |  |  |
| 27370150-00001.0-6 | 105 | House | 1683 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 68 |  |  |
| 27370150-00001.0-8 | 105 | House | 1687 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 68 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000B.0-11 | 145 | Public Park | City of Satellite Beach | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 73 |  | R-96 |
|  | 40 | Public R.O.W. | Sunrise Ave | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 26 | 12 |  |
| 27370150-0000C-1 | 205 | Public Park | City of Satellite Beach | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 103 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000C-5 | 80 | House | 715 Beach Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000C-6 | 80 | House | 721 Beach Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000C-8 | 80 | House | 725 Beach Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000C-10 | 90 | House | 735 Beach Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 59 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000C-11 | 70 | House | 745 Beach Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 46 |  |  |
|  | 55 | Public R.O.W. | Palmetto Ave | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 36 | 25 |  |
| 27370150-0000D-1 | 35 | Public Park | City of Satellite Beach | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 18 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000D-2 | 235 | Public Park | City of Satellite Beach | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 118 |  | R-97 |
| 27370150-0000D-6 | 80 | House | 785 Shell Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000D-8 | 105 | House | 789 Shell Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 68 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000D-10 | 50 | House | 795 Shell Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 33 |  |  |
| 27370150-0000D-11 | 105 | House | 797 Shell Street | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 68 |  |  |
|  | 25 | Public R.O.W. | Volunteer Way | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 16 | 6 |  |
| 27371232-00000-1 | 310 | Condo | Lantana, 1791 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 202 |  |  |
| 27371232-00000-1 | 310 | Condo | Lantana, 1791 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 202 |  | R-98 |
| 27371232-00000-1 | 300 | Condo | Lantana, 1791 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 195 |  |  |
| 27371232-00000-1 | 365 | Condo | Lantana, 1791 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 237 |  |  |
| 27371200-00260 | 100 | Public Park | City of Indian Harbour Bch, Bicents | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 50 | 20 |  |
| 27371227-0000A-1 | 110 | Public Park | City of Indian Harbour Bch, Bicents | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 55 | 22 | R-99 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40 | Public R.O.W. | Ocean Dunes Drive | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 26 |  | R-99 |
| 27371227-0000B-1 | 130 | Condo | Aloha Condo, 1891 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 85 |  |  |
| 27371227-0000B-6 | 80 | Commercial | SatCom Direct, 1901 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27371227-0000B-7 | 305 | Condo | The Christal II, 1907 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 198 |  |  |
| 27371227-0000B-11 | 285 | Condo | The Christal I, 1919 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 185 |  |  |
| 27871227-0000B-15.01 | 410 | Condo | Seashore Estates I, 1923 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 267 |  | R-100 |
| 27871227-0000B-19.01 | 15 | Condo | Seashore Estates Access, 1923 H | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 10 |  |  |
| 27371200-00585 | 90 | Public Park | TIITF - State of FL | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 45 |  |  |
| 27371200-00500.9-0201 | 350 | Condo | Golden Palm, 1941 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 228 |  |  |
| 27371200-00586A | 200 | Condo | Serena Shores II, 2025 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 130 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Palm Springs access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 | 2 |  |
| 27371200-00500A | 195 | Condo | Serena Shores I, 2035 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 127 |  | R-101 |
| 27371200-00501.1 | 260 | Condo | Indian Harbour Bch Club, 2055 Hw | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 169 |  |  |
| 2737121B-00000-1 | 210 | Condo | Somerset Condo, 2065 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 137 |  |  |
| 2737121B-00000-1 | 260 | Condo | Somerset Condo, 2065 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 169 |  |  |
| 2737121B-00000-1 | 240 | Condo | Somerset Condo, 2065 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 156 |  | R-102 |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Atlantic Rd access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 | 12 |  |
| 2737121B-00000-1 | 240 | Condo | Somerset Condo, 2065 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 156 |  |  |
| 27371200-00516.M | 150 | Condo | Oceanique II, 2105 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 98 |  |  |

Table 6: Brevard Mid-Reach Public Access and Ownership (cont.)

| Parcel Number (A) | Lot Width (Feet) <br> (B) |  | Shoreline Description <br> (C) | Within Project Limits (D) | Within $1 / 4$ Mile of Access (E) | Shore Ownership and Project Purpose (F) | Level of Federal Participation <br> (G) | Federal Participation Times Lot Width (H) | Number <br> of Parking Spaces (I) | $\underset{(\mathrm{J})}{\text { DEP Monument }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27371200-00516 | 160 | Condo | Oceanique pool, 2105 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 104 |  |  |
| 27371200-00516.A | 170 | Condo | Oceanique I, 2105 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 111 |  |  |
| 27371200-00587 | 240 | Public Park | City of Indian Harbour Bch, Millenii | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 120 | 25 | R-103 |
| 27371200-00584 | 10 | Public Park | City of Indian Harbour Bch, Millenid | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 |  |  |
| 27371300-00001.1-1 | 200 | Condo | Gardenia, 2195 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 130 |  |  |
| 27371300-00006 | 415 | Condo | Ocean Walk, 2225 Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 270 |  |  |
| 27371300-00003 | 465 | Brevard Count | y Community Center, 2289 Hwy A1, | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 302 |  | R-104 |
|  | 60 | Public R.O.W. | Wallace Ave | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 39 | 20 |  |
| 27371301-00001 | 320 | Public Park | \|TIITF - State of FL, Canova Beach| | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 160 |  |  |
|  | 100 | Public R.O.W. | Eau Gallie Blvd, Canova Beach Pá | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 65 | 65 |  |
| 27371302-00001-1 | 620 | Public Park | TIIIT - State of FL, Canova Beach | Y | Y | II.B.(1) | 50\% | 310 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27371302-00001-12 | 575 | Condo | Melbourne Ocean Club, 3101 N. H | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 374 |  | R-105.5 |
| 27371375-00001-2.01 | 50 | Public Park | Brevard County | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 25 | 18 | R-106 |
| 27371375-0001-3 | 130 | Undeveloped | Vacant | Y | Y | II.B.(2) | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27371300-00753 | 600 | Commercial | Hilton Hotel, 3003 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 390 |  |  |
| 27371376-00000-1.01 | 275 | Condo | Villa Riviera, 2925 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 179 |  | R-107 |
| 27371376-0000-4.01 | 190 | Condo | Coral Palms, 2875 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 124 |  |  |
| 27371300-00754.1 | 125 | Condo | Club Residence, 2855 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 81 |  |  |
| 27371378-00001-2.01 | 180 | Condo | Sandy Kaye, 2835 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 117 |  |  |
| 2737131A-00201 | 190 | Condo | Silver Palms, 2805 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 124 |  |  |
|  | 20 | Public Park | Coral Way Beach Access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 10 | 6 |  |
| 27371300-00755.1 | 100 | Undeveloped | Vacant | Y | Y | II.B.(2) | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27371300-00755.0 | 100 | Undeveloped | Vacant | Y | Y | II.B.(2) | 0\% | 0 |  | R-108 |
| 27371300-00789 | 210 | Condo | Ocean Sands N, 2727 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 137 |  |  |
| 27371300-00792 | 210 | Condo | Ocean Sands S, 2725 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 137 |  |  |
| 27371300-00759 | 450 | Commercial | Holiday Inn, 2605 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 293 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REACH 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27371300-00759 | 175 | Commercial | Holiday Inn cont., 2605 N. Hwy A1 | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 114 |  | R-109 |
| 27372400-00056 | 20 | Public Park | Brevard County | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 10 |  |  |
| 27372400-00005 | 610 | Public Park | TIITF - State of FL | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 305 | 6 |  |
| 27372400-00037 | 325 | Public Park | TIITF - State of FL | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 163 |  |  |
| 27372400-00009 | 200 | Public Park | Brevard County, Paradise Beach P | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 100 |  | R-110 |
| 27372400-00010 | 100 | Public Park | Brevard County, Paradise Beach P | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 50 |  |  |
| 27372400-00011.1 | 1004 | Public Park | Brevard County, Paradise Beach P | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 502 | 225 | R-111 |
| 27372475-00001-1 | 25 | House | 2175 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 16 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-2 | 75 | House | 2165 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-3 | 75 | House | 2155 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-4 | 75 | House | 2145 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-5 | 80 | House | 2135 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-6 | 80 | House | 2125 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-7 | 75 | House | 2115 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-8 | 75 | House | 2105 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-9 | 75 | House | 2095 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  | R-112 |
| 27372475-00001-10 | 80 | House | 2085 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-11 | 75 | House | 2075 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-12 | 75 | House | 2065 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-13 | 75 | House | 2055 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 49 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-14 | 80 | House | 2045 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 52 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | beach access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-15 | 100 | House | 2035 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 65 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-16 | 100 | House | 2025 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 65 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-17 | 90 | House | 2015 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 59 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-17 | 10 | House | 2015 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372475-00001-17 | 35 | House | 2015 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-1 | 30 | House | 2005 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-2 | 85 | Undeveloped | Vacant | Y | N | III.B. | 0\% | 0 |  | R-113 |
| 27372484-0000A-3 | 75 | House | 1965 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-4 | 110 | House | 1955 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-5 | 95 | House | 1945 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | beach access | Y | N | III.C. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-6 | 100 | House | 1935 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-7 | 100 | House | 1925 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-8 | 100 | House | 1915 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-9 | 100 | House | 1905 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-10 | 100 | House | 1885 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372484-0000A-11 | 80 | House | 1875 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  | R-114 |
| 27372490-00000-1 | 150 | Condo | The Barringer Condo I, 1835 N. HW | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372491-00000-1 | 105 | Condo | The Barringer II, 1845 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27372491-00000-1 | 50 | Condo | The Barringer II, 1845 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 33 |  |  |
| $273725 E V-00000-1$ | 175 | Condo | Casa Blanca Inn, 1805 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 114 |  |  |
| 27372513-00000-1 | 145 | Condo | Bella Vista, 1755 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 94 |  |  |

Table 6: Brevard Mid-Reach Public Access and Ownership (cont.)

| Parcel Number (A) | Lot Width (Feet) (B) |  | Shoreline Description <br> (C) | Within Project Limits <br> (D) | Within $1 / 4$ Mile of Access (E) | Shore Ownership and Project Purpose <br> (F) | Level of Federal Participation (G) | Federal Participation Times Lot Width (H) | Number of Parking Spaces (I) | $\underset{(\mathrm{J})}{\text { DEP Monument }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 273830EN-00000-16.01 | 750 | Condo | Ocean Park Condo, 1665 N. Hwy A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 488 |  | R-115 |
| 273830EN-00000-16.02 | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 | 6 |  |
| 273830EN-00000-15 | 140 | Undeveloped | Vacant | Y | Y | II.B.(2) | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383027-00000-1 | 200 | Condo | Sea Pearl Condo, 1575 N. Hwy A1, | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 130 |  | R-116 |
| 273830EN-00000-12.01 | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 |  |  |
| 273830EN-00000-11.01 | 190 | Condo | Outrigger, 1555 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 124 |  |  |
| 27383026-00000-1 | 305 | Condo | Majestic Shores, 1525 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 198 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 |  |  |
| 273830EN-00000-7 | 100 | Condo | Claridge Condo, 1515 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 65 |  |  |
| 2738301A-00201 | 190 | Condo | Royal Palms, 1505 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 124 |  |  |
| 273830EN-00000-4 | 110 | Undeveloped | Vacant | Y | Y | II.B.(2) | 0\% | 0 |  | R-117 |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | Y | II.C. | 50\% | 5 |  |  |
| 273830EN-00000-1 | 55 | Condo | The Dunes, 1415 N. Hwy A1A | Y | Y | II.A. | 65\% | 36 |  |  |
| 273830EN-00000-1 | 285 | Condo | The Dunes, 1415 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383052-00000-1 | 370 | Condo | Jade Palm, 1345 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | N | III.C. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383050-00000-28 | 105 | House | 1315 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383050-00000-29 | 190 | House | 1245 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  | R-118 |
| 27383050-00000-31 | 120 | House | 1235 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | N | III.C. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383050-00000-32 | 95 | House | 1225 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383050-00000-33 | 95 | House | 1215 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383050-00000-34 | 200 | Condo | Coral Reef Condo, 1177 N. Hwy A1 | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 27383050-00000-36 | 105 | House | 1163 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 273830EW-000A-15 | 135 | Public Park | TIITF - State of FL, 1137 N. Hwy A. | Y | N | III.C. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | 10 | Public Park | Brevard County, access | Y | N | III.C. | 0\% | 0 |  |  |
| 273830EW-000A-14 | 180 | House | 1135 N. Hwy A1A | Y | N | III.A. | 0\% | 0 |  | R-119 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sum of Length | 41,083 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22,198 |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Broward County, Florida, Shore Protection Project Segments II and III, General Reevaluation Report Appendixes A through G, prepared by Coastal Planning \& Engineering, Inc/ Olsen Associates, June 2003.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Visit Florida is the official tourism and marketing corporation of the State of Florida. Due to a recent change in the manner of estimating tourist visits, records of visitation are comparable only as far back as 1999.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Beach area was computed as the product of alongshore length and cross-shore beach width. Beach width was computed from the most recent available surveys and includes the dry beach between +11 ft , NGVD and the MHW shoreline.
    ${ }^{3}$ Brevard County has over 5,400 public parking spaces, suggesting that non Mid-Reach parking spaces can support over 43,200 persons per day (not including notional access).

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ USACE Economic Guidance Memorandum, 06-03, Unit Day Values for Recreation, Fiscal Year 2006. (EGM06-03) states, "Values provided for FY 2006 may be used to convert points to a UDV dollar amount...The table [valuation] was adjusted from Table K-3-1, Federal Register Vol. 44, No. 242, p.72962, December 4, 1979, using the CPI factor."
    ${ }^{5}$ USACE Economic Guidance Memorandum, 03-04, Unit Day Values for Recreation, Fiscal Year 2003. (EGM03-04) states, "...public involvement should occur in the value determination process."
    ${ }^{6}$ Online at http://www.bls.gov
    ${ }^{7} \mathrm{http}: / /$ www.window.state.tx.us/specialrpt/mileage/\#fnB9

