

1                   A bill to be entitled  
2           An act relating to coastal management; amending s.  
3           161.101, F.S.; revising the criteria the Department of  
4           Environmental Protection must consider in determining  
5           and assigning annual funding priorities for beach  
6           management and erosion control projects; specifying  
7           tiers for such criteria; requiring tiers to be given  
8           certain weight; requiring the department to update  
9           active project lists on its website; redefining the  
10          term "significant change"; revising the department's  
11          reporting requirements; specifying allowable uses for  
12          certain surplus funds; revising the requirements for a  
13          specified summary; requiring that funding for certain  
14          projects remain available for a specified period;  
15          amending s. 161.143, F.S.; specifying the scope of  
16          certain projects; revising the list of projects  
17          included as inlet management projects; requiring that  
18          certain projects be considered separate and apart from  
19          other specified projects; revising the ranking  
20          criteria to be used by the department to establish  
21          certain funding priorities for certain inlet-caused  
22          beach erosion projects; revising provisions  
23          authorizing the department to spend certain  
24          appropriated funds for the management of inlets;  
25          deleting a provision authorizing the department to

26 | spend certain appropriated funds for specified inlet  
27 | studies; revising the required elements of the  
28 | department's report of prioritized inlet management  
29 | projects; revising the funds that the department must  
30 | make available to certain inlet management projects;  
31 | requiring the department to include specified  
32 | activities on the inlet management project list;  
33 | deleting provisions requiring the department to make  
34 | available funding for specified projects; deleting a  
35 | requirement that the Legislature designate a project  
36 | as an Inlet of the Year; requiring the department to  
37 | update and maintain a report regarding the progress of  
38 | certain inlet management projects; deleting certain  
39 | temporary provisions relating to specified  
40 | appropriations; revising the requirements for the  
41 | report; amending s. 161.161, F.S.; revising  
42 | requirements for the comprehensive long-term  
43 | management plan; requiring the plan to include a  
44 | strategic beach management plan, a critically eroded  
45 | beaches report, and a statewide long-range budget  
46 | plan; providing for the development and maintenance of  
47 | such plans; deleting a requirement that the department  
48 | submit a certain beach management plan on a certain  
49 | date each year; requiring the department to hold a  
50 | public meeting before finalization of the strategic

51 beach management plan; requiring the department to  
 52 submit a 3-year work plan and a related forecast for  
 53 the availability of funding to the Legislature;  
 54 providing effective dates.

55  
 56 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

57  
 58 Section 1. Effective July 1, 2020, subsection (14) of  
 59 section 161.101, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

60 161.101 State and local participation in authorized  
 61 projects and studies relating to beach management and erosion  
 62 control.—

63 (14) The intent of the Legislature in preserving and  
 64 protecting Florida's sandy beaches pursuant to this act is to  
 65 direct beach erosion control appropriations to the state's most  
 66 severely eroded beaches, and to prevent further adverse impact  
 67 caused by improved, modified, or altered inlets, coastal  
 68 armoring, or existing upland development. In establishing annual  
 69 project funding priorities, the department shall seek formal  
 70 input from local coastal governments, beach and general  
 71 government interest groups, and university experts. The  
 72 department shall adopt by rule a scoring system to determine  
 73 annual project funding priorities. The scoring system must  
 74 consist of the following criteria equally weighted within the  
 75 following specified tiers ~~criteria to be considered by the~~

76 ~~department in determining annual funding priorities shall~~  
77 ~~include:~~

78 (a) Tier 1 must account for 20 percent of the total score  
79 and consist of the tourism-related return on investment and the  
80 economic impact of the project. The return on investment of the  
81 project is the ratio of the tourism-related tax revenues for the  
82 most recent year to the amount of state funding requested for  
83 the proposed project. The economic impact of the project is the  
84 ratio of the tourism-related tax revenues for the most recent  
85 year to all county tax revenues for the most recent year. The  
86 department must calculate these ratios using state sales tax and  
87 tourism development tax data of the county having jurisdiction  
88 over the project area. If multiple counties have jurisdiction  
89 over the project area, the department must assess each county  
90 individually using these ratios. The department shall calculate  
91 the mean average of these ratios to determine the final overall  
92 assessment for the multicounty project ~~the severity of erosion~~  
93 ~~conditions, the threat to existing upland development, and~~  
94 ~~recreational and/or economic benefits.~~

95 (b) Tier 2 must account for 45 percent of the total score  
96 and consist of all of the following criteria:

97 1. The availability of federal matching dollars,  
98 considering federal authorization, the federal cost-share  
99 percentage, and the status of the funding award.

100 2. The storm damage reduction benefits of the project

101 based on the following considerations:

102 a. The current condition of the project area, including  
103 any recent storm damage impact, as a percentage of volume of  
104 sand lost since the most recent beach nourishment event or most  
105 recent beach surveys. If the project area has not been  
106 previously restored, the department must use the historical  
107 background erosion rate;

108 b. The overall potential threat to existing upland  
109 development, including public and private structures and  
110 infrastructure, based on the percentage of vulnerable shoreline  
111 that exists within the project boundaries; and

112 c. The value of upland property benefiting from the  
113 protection provided by the project and its subsequent  
114 maintenance. A property must be within one-quarter mile of the  
115 project boundaries to be considered under the criterion  
116 specified in this sub-subparagraph.

117 3. The cost-effectiveness of the project based on the  
118 yearly cost per volume per mile of proposed beach fill  
119 placement. The department shall also consider the following when  
120 assessing cost-effectiveness pursuant to this subparagraph:

121 a. The existence of projects with proposed structural or  
122 design components that could extend the beach nourishment  
123 interval;

124 b. Existing beach nourishment projects that reduce upland  
125 storm damage costs by incorporating new or enhanced dune

126 structures or new or existing dune restoration and revegetation  
 127 projects;

128 c. Proposed innovative technologies designed to reduce  
 129 project costs; and

130 d. Regional sediment management strategies and  
 131 coordination to conserve sand source resources and reduce  
 132 project costs.

133 (c) Tier 3 must account for 20 percent of the total score  
 134 and consist of all of the following criteria: ~~The extent of~~  
 135 ~~local government sponsor financial and administrative commitment~~  
 136 ~~to the project, including a long-term financial plan with a~~  
 137 ~~designated funding source or sources for initial construction~~  
 138 ~~and periodic maintenance.~~

139 1. ~~(d)~~ Previous state commitment and involvement in the  
 140 project, considering previously funded phases, the total amount  
 141 of previous state funding, and previous partial appropriations  
 142 for the proposed project.

143 2. The recreational benefits of the project based on:

144 a. The accessible beach area added by the project; and

145 b. The percentage of linear footage within the project  
 146 boundaries which is zoned:

147 (I) As recreational or open space;

148 (II) For commercial use; or

149 (III) To otherwise allow for public lodging  
 150 establishments.

151 ~~(e) The anticipated physical performance of the proposed~~  
152 ~~project, including the frequency of periodic planned~~  
153 ~~nourishment.~~

154 3.(f) The extent to which the ~~proposed~~ project mitigates  
155 the adverse impact of improved, modified, or altered inlets on  
156 adjacent beaches.

157 ~~(g) Innovative, cost-effective, and environmentally~~  
158 ~~sensitive applications to reduce erosion.~~

159 ~~(h) Projects that provide enhanced habitat within or~~  
160 ~~adjacent to designated refuges of nesting sea turtles.~~

161 ~~(i) The extent to which local or regional sponsors of~~  
162 ~~beach erosion control projects agree to coordinate the planning,~~  
163 ~~design, and construction of their projects to take advantage of~~  
164 ~~identifiable cost savings.~~

165 4.(j) The degree to which the project addresses the  
166 state's most significant beach erosion problems as a function of  
167 the linear footage of the project shoreline and the cubic yards  
168 of sand placed per mile per year.

169 (d) Tier 4 must account for 15 percent of the total score  
170 and consist of all of the following criteria:

171 1. Increased prioritization of projects that have been on  
172 the department's ranked project list for successive years and  
173 that have not previously secured state funding for project  
174 implementation.

175 2. Environmental habitat enhancement, recognizing state or

176 federal critical habitat areas for threatened or endangered  
177 species which may be subject to extensive shoreline armoring, or  
178 recognizing areas where extensive shoreline armoring threatens  
179 the availability or quality of habitat for such species. Turtle-  
180 friendly designs, dune and vegetation projects for areas with  
181 redesigned or reduced fill templates, proposed incorporation of  
182 best management practices and adaptive management strategies to  
183 protect resources, and innovative technologies designed to  
184 benefit critical habitat preservation may also be considered.

185 3. The overall readiness of the project to proceed in a  
186 timely manner, considering the project's readiness for the  
187 construction phase of development, the status of required  
188 permits, the status of any needed easement acquisition, the  
189 availability of local funding sources, and the establishment of  
190 an erosion control line. If the department identifies specific  
191 reasonable and documented concerns that the project will not  
192 proceed in a timely manner, the department may choose not to  
193 include the project in the annual funding priorities submitted  
194 to the Legislature.

195  
196 If ~~In the event that~~ more than one project qualifies equally  
197 under the provisions of this subsection, the department shall  
198 assign funding priority to those projects shown to be most ~~that~~  
199 are ready to proceed.

200 Section 2. Subsection (20) of section 161.101, Florida

201 Statutes, is amended to read:

202 161.101 State and local participation in authorized  
 203 projects and studies relating to beach management and erosion  
 204 control.—

205 (20) The department shall maintain active project lists,  
 206 updated at least quarterly, ~~listings~~ on its website by fiscal  
 207 year in order to provide transparency regarding those projects  
 208 receiving funding and the funding amounts, and to facilitate  
 209 legislative reporting and oversight. In consideration of this  
 210 intent:

211 (a) The department shall notify the Executive Office of  
 212 the Governor and the Legislature regarding any significant  
 213 changes in the funding levels of a given project as initially  
 214 requested in the department's budget submission and subsequently  
 215 included in approved annual funding allocations. The term  
 216 "significant change" means a project-specific change or  
 217 cumulative changes that exceed the project's original allocation  
 218 by \$500,000 or that exceed those changes exceeding 25 percent of  
 219 the a project's original allocation.

220 1. Except as provided in subparagraph 2., if there is  
 221 surplus funding, the department must notify and provide  
 222 supporting justification ~~notification shall be provided~~ to the  
 223 Executive Office of the Governor and the Legislature to indicate  
 224 whether surplus ~~additional~~ dollars are intended to be used for  
 225 inlet management projects pursuant to s. 161.143 or for beach

226 restoration and beach nourishment projects, offered for  
227 reversion as part of the next appropriations process, or used  
228 for other specified priority projects on active project lists.

229 2. The department may use surplus funds for projects  
230 identified in subparagraph 1. that do not have a significant  
231 change. The department must post the uses of such funds on the  
232 project listing web page of its website. The department is not  
233 required to post any other notice or supporting justification  
234 before it uses the surplus funds for a project that does not  
235 have a significant change.

236 (b) The department shall prepare a summary of specific  
237 project activities for the current fiscal year, their funding  
238 status, and changes to annual project lists for the current and  
239 preceding fiscal year. shall be prepared by The department shall  
240 include the summary and included with the department's  
241 submission of its annual legislative budget request.

242 (c) Funding for specific projects on annual project lists  
243 approved by the Legislature must remain available for such  
244 projects for 18 months. A local project sponsor may at any time  
245 release, in whole or in part, appropriated project dollars by  
246 formal notification to the department. The department, which  
247 shall notify the Executive Office of the Governor and the  
248 Legislature of such release and. Notification must indicate in  
249 the notification how the project dollars are recommended  
250 intended to be used after such release.

251 Section 3. Subsections (2) through (5) of section 161.143,  
252 Florida Statutes, are amended to read:

253 161.143 Inlet management; planning, prioritizing, funding,  
254 approving, and implementing projects.—

255 (2) The department shall establish annual funding  
256 priorities for studies, activities, or other projects concerning  
257 inlet management. Such inlet management projects constitute the  
258 intended scope of this section and s. 161.142 and consist of  
259 ~~include, but are not limited to,~~ inlet sand bypassing,  
260 improvement of infrastructure to facilitate sand bypassing,  
261 modifications to channel dredging, jetty redesign, jetty repair,  
262 disposal of spoil material, and the development, revision,  
263 adoption, or implementation of an inlet management plan.  
264 Projects considered for funding pursuant to this section must be  
265 considered separate and apart from projects reviewed and  
266 prioritized in s. 161.101(14). The funding priorities  
267 established by the department under this section must be  
268 consistent with the requirements and legislative declaration in  
269 ss. 161.101(14), 161.142, and 161.161(1)(b). In establishing  
270 funding priorities under this subsection and before transmitting  
271 the annual inlet project list to the Legislature under  
272 subsection (4) ~~(5)~~, the department shall seek formal input from  
273 local coastal governments, beach and general government  
274 associations and other coastal interest groups, and university  
275 experts concerning annual funding priorities for inlet

276 management projects. In order to maximize the benefits of  
277 efforts to address the inlet-caused beach erosion problems of  
278 this state, the ranking criteria used by the department to  
279 establish funding priorities for studies, activities, or other  
280 projects concerning inlet management must include equal  
281 consideration of:

282 (a) An estimate of the annual quantity of beach-quality  
283 sand reaching the updrift boundary of the improved jetty or  
284 inlet channel.

285 (b) The severity of the erosion to the adjacent beaches  
286 caused by the inlet ~~and the extent to which the proposed project~~  
287 ~~mitigates the erosive effects of the inlet.~~

288 (c) The overall significance and anticipated success of  
289 the proposed project in mitigating the erosive effects of the  
290 inlet, balancing the sediment budget of the inlet and adjacent  
291 beaches, and addressing the sand deficit along the inlet-  
292 affected shorelines.

293 (d) The extent to which ~~existing~~ bypassing activities at  
294 an inlet would benefit from modest, cost-effective improvements  
295 when considering the volumetric increases from the proposed  
296 project, the availability of beach-quality sand currently not  
297 being bypassed to adjacent eroding beaches, and the ease with  
298 which such beach-quality sand may be obtained.

299 (e) The cost-effectiveness of sand made available by a  
300 proposed inlet management project or activity relative to other

301 sand source opportunities that would be used to address inlet-  
302 caused beach erosion ~~The interest and commitment of local~~  
303 ~~governments as demonstrated by their willingness to coordinate~~  
304 ~~the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of an inlet~~  
305 ~~management project and their financial plan for funding the~~  
306 ~~local cost share for initial construction, ongoing sand~~  
307 ~~bypassing, channel dredging, and maintenance.~~

308 (f) The existence of a proposed or recently updated ~~The~~  
309 ~~previous completion or approval of a state-sponsored inlet~~  
310 ~~management plan or a~~ local-government-sponsored inlet study  
311 addressing concerning the inlet addressed by the proposed  
312 ~~project, the ease of updating and revising any such plan or~~  
313 ~~study, and the adequacy and specificity of the plan's or study's~~  
314 ~~recommendations concerning~~ the mitigation of an inlet's erosive  
315 effects on adjacent beaches.

316 (g) The degree to which the proposed project will enhance  
317 the performance and longevity of proximate beach nourishment  
318 projects, thereby reducing the frequency of such periodic  
319 nourishment projects.

320 (h) The project-ranking criteria in s. 161.101(14) to the  
321 extent such criteria are applicable to inlet management studies,  
322 projects, and activities and are distinct from, and not  
323 duplicative of, the criteria listed in paragraphs (a)-(g).

324 (3) The department may pay from legislative appropriations  
325 up to 75 percent of the construction costs of an initial major

326 inlet management project component for the purpose of mitigating  
327 the erosive effects of the inlet to the shoreline and balancing  
328 the sediment budget. The remaining balance of such construction  
329 costs must be paid from other funding sources, such as local  
330 sponsors. All project costs not associated with an initial major  
331 inlet management project component must be shared equally by  
332 state and local sponsors in accordance with, ~~pursuant to s.~~  
333 ~~161.101 and notwithstanding s. 161.101(15),~~ pay from legislative  
334 appropriations provided for these purposes 75 percent of the  
335 total costs, or, if applicable, the nonfederal costs, of a  
336 study, activity, or other project concerning the management of  
337 an inlet. The balance must be paid by the local governments or  
338 special districts having jurisdiction over the property where  
339 the inlet is located.

340 ~~(4) Using the legislative appropriation to the statewide~~  
341 ~~beach management support category of the department's fixed~~  
342 ~~capital outlay funding request, the department may employ~~  
343 ~~university based or other contractual sources and pay 100~~  
344 ~~percent of the costs of studies that are consistent with the~~  
345 ~~legislative declaration in s. 161.142 and that:~~

346 ~~(a) Determine, calculate, refine, and achieve general~~  
347 ~~consensus regarding net annual sediment transport volumes to be~~  
348 ~~used for the purpose of planning and prioritizing inlet~~  
349 ~~management projects; and~~

350 ~~(b) Appropriate, assign, and apportion responsibilities~~

351 ~~between inlet beneficiaries for the erosion caused by a~~  
352 ~~particular inlet on adjacent beaches.~~

353 ~~(4)-(5)~~ The department shall annually provide an inlet  
354 management project list, in priority order, to the Legislature  
355 as part of the department's budget request. ~~The list must~~  
356 ~~include studies, projects, or other activities that address the~~  
357 ~~management of at least 10 separate inlets and that are ranked~~  
358 ~~according to the criteria established under subsection (2).~~

359 (a) The department shall designate for ~~make available~~ at  
360 ~~least 10 percent of the total amount that the Legislature~~  
361 ~~appropriates in each fiscal year for statewide beach management~~  
362 ~~for the three highest-ranked projects on the current year's~~  
363 ~~inlet management project list,~~ in priority order, an amount that  
364 is at least equal to the greater of:

365 1. Ten percent of the total amount that the Legislature  
366 appropriates in the fiscal year for statewide beach management;  
367 or

368 2. The percentage of inlet management funding requests  
369 from local sponsors as a proportion of the total amount of  
370 statewide beach management dollars requested in a given year.

371 (b) The department shall include inlet monitoring  
372 activities ranked on the inlet management project list as one  
373 aggregated subcategory on the overall inlet management project  
374 list ~~make available at least 50 percent of the funds~~  
375 ~~appropriated for the feasibility and design category in the~~

376 ~~department's fixed capital outlay funding request for projects~~  
377 ~~on the current year's inlet management project list which~~  
378 ~~involve the study for, or design or development of, an inlet~~  
379 ~~management project.~~

380 ~~(c) The department shall make available all statewide~~  
381 ~~beach management funds that remain unencumbered or are allocated~~  
382 ~~to non-project specific activities for projects on legislatively~~  
383 ~~approved inlet management project lists. Funding for local-~~  
384 ~~government-specific projects on annual project lists approved by~~  
385 ~~the Legislature must remain available for such purposes for a~~  
386 ~~period of 18 months pursuant to s. 216.301(2) (a). Based on an~~  
387 ~~assessment and the department's determination that a project~~  
388 ~~will not be ready to proceed during this 18-month period, such~~  
389 ~~funds shall be used for inlet management projects on~~  
390 ~~legislatively approved lists.~~

391 ~~(5) (d) The Legislature shall designate one of the three~~  
392 ~~highest projects on the inlet management project list in any~~  
393 ~~year as the Inlet of the Year. The department shall update and~~  
394 ~~maintain an annual annually report on its website ~~to the~~~~  
395 ~~Legislature concerning the extent to which each inlet project~~  
396 ~~designated by the Legislature as Inlet of the Year has succeeded~~  
397 ~~in balancing the sediment budget of the inlet and adjacent~~  
398 ~~beaches and in, mitigating the inlet's erosive effects on~~  
399 ~~adjacent beaches. The report must estimate the quantity of~~  
400 ~~sediment bypassed, transferred, and transferring or otherwise~~

401 placed ~~placing beach-quality sand~~ on adjacent eroding beaches,  
402 or in such beaches' nearshore area, for the purpose of  
403 offsetting the erosive effects of inlets on the beaches of this  
404 state.

405 Section 4. Effective July 1, 2020, subsections (2) through  
406 (7) of section 161.161, Florida Statutes, are renumbered as  
407 subsections (3) through (8), respectively, subsection (1) and  
408 present subsection (2) are amended, and a new subsection (2) is  
409 added to that section, to read:

410 161.161 Procedure for approval of projects.—

411 (1) The department shall develop and maintain a  
412 comprehensive long-term beach management plan for the  
413 restoration and maintenance of the state's critically eroded  
414 beaches fronting the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, and Straits  
415 of Florida. In developing and maintaining this ~~the beach~~  
416 ~~management plan,~~ the department shall:

417 (a) Address long-term solutions to the problem of  
418 critically eroded beaches in this state.

419 (b) Evaluate each improved, modified, or altered inlet and  
420 determine whether the inlet is a significant cause of beach  
421 erosion. With respect to each inlet determined to be a  
422 significant cause of beach erosion, the plan shall include:

423 ~~1.~~ the extent to which such inlet causes beach erosion and  
424 recommendations to mitigate the erosive impact of the inlet,  
425 including, but not limited to, ~~recommendations regarding inlet~~

426 sediment bypassing; improvement of infrastructure to facilitate  
427 sand bypassing; modifications to channel dredging, jetty design,  
428 and disposal of spoil material; establishment of feeder beaches;  
429 and beach restoration and beach nourishment; ~~and~~

430 ~~2. Cost estimates necessary to take inlet corrective~~  
431 ~~measures and recommendations regarding cost sharing among the~~  
432 ~~beneficiaries of such inlet.~~

433 (c) Evaluate ~~Design~~ criteria for beach restoration and  
434 beach nourishment projects, including, but not limited to, ~~÷~~

435 ~~1. dune elevation and width and revegetation and~~  
436 ~~stabilization requirements; and~~

437 ~~2. beach profiles~~ profile.

438 (d) Consider ~~Evaluate~~ the establishment of regional  
439 sediment management alternatives for one or more individual  
440 beach and inlet sand bypassing projects ~~feeder beaches~~ as an  
441 alternative to ~~direct~~ beach restoration when appropriate and  
442 cost-effective, and recommend the location of such regional  
443 sediment management alternatives ~~feeder beaches~~ and the source  
444 of beach-compatible sand.

445 (e) Identify causes of shoreline erosion and change,  
446 determine ~~calculate~~ erosion rates, and maintain an updated list  
447 of critically eroded sandy beaches based on data, analyses, and  
448 investigations of shoreline conditions ~~and project long-term~~  
449 ~~erosion for all major beach and dune systems by surveys and~~  
450 ~~profiles.~~

451           (f) ~~Identify shoreline development and degree of density~~  
452 ~~and~~ Assess impacts of development and coastal protection  
453 ~~shoreline protective~~ structures on shoreline change and erosion.

454           (g) Identify short-term and long-term economic costs and  
455 benefits of beaches to the state and individual beach  
456 communities, ~~including recreational value to user groups, tax~~  
457 ~~base, revenues generated, and beach acquisition and maintenance~~  
458 ~~costs.~~

459           (h) Study dune and vegetation conditions, identify  
460 existing beach projects without dune features or with dunes  
461 without adequate elevations, and encourage dune restoration and  
462 revegetation to be incorporated as part of storm damage recovery  
463 projects or future dune maintenance events.

464           (i) Identify beach areas used by marine turtles and  
465 develop strategies for protection of the turtles and their nests  
466 and nesting locations.

467           (j) Identify alternative management responses to preserve  
468 undeveloped beach and dune systems and, to restore damaged beach  
469 and dune systems. In identifying such management responses, the  
470 department shall consider, at a minimum, and to prevent  
471 ~~inappropriate development and redevelopment on migrating~~  
472 ~~beaches, and consider~~ beach restoration and nourishment,  
473 armoring, relocation ~~and abandonment~~, dune and vegetation  
474 restoration, and acquisition.

475           (k) Document procedures and policies for preparing post-

476 storm damage assessments and corresponding recovery plans,  
477 including repair cost estimates ~~Establish criteria, including~~  
478 ~~costs and specific implementation actions, for alternative~~  
479 ~~management techniques.~~

480 (1) Identify and assess ~~Select and recommend~~ appropriate  
481 management measures for all of the state's critically eroded  
482 sandy beaches in a beach management program.

483 ~~(m) Establish a list of beach restoration and beach~~  
484 ~~nourishment projects, arranged in order of priority, and the~~  
485 ~~funding levels needed for such projects.~~

486 (2) The comprehensive long-term management plan developed  
487 and maintained by the department pursuant to subsection (1) must  
488 include, at a minimum, a strategic beach management plan, a  
489 critically eroded beaches report, and a statewide long-range  
490 budget plan. The long-range budget plan must include a 3-year  
491 work plan for beach restoration, beach nourishment, and inlet  
492 management projects that lists planned projects for each of the  
493 3 fiscal years addressed in the work plan.

494 (a) The strategic beach management plan must identify and  
495 recommend appropriate measures for all of the state's critically  
496 eroded sandy beaches and may incorporate plans ~~be~~ prepared at  
497 the regional level, taking into account ~~based upon~~ areas of  
498 greatest need and probable federal and local funding. Upon  
499 approval in accordance with this section, such regional plans,  
500 along with the 3-year work plan identified in subparagraph

501 (c)1., must shall be components of the statewide beach  
502 management plan and shall serve as the basis for state funding  
503 decisions upon approval in accordance with chapter 86-138, Laws  
504 of Florida. Before finalizing the strategic beach management  
505 plan In accordance with a schedule established for the  
506 submission of regional plans by the department, any completed  
507 plan must be submitted to the secretary of the department for  
508 approval no later than March 1 of each year. These regional  
509 plans shall include, but shall not be limited to,  
510 recommendations of appropriate funding mechanisms for  
511 implementing projects in the beach management plan, giving  
512 consideration to the use of single-county and multicounty taxing  
513 districts or other revenue generation measures by state and  
514 local governments and the private sector. Prior to presenting  
515 the plan to the secretary of the department, the department  
516 shall hold a public meeting in the region areas for which the  
517 plan is prepared or hold a publicly noticed webinar. The plan  
518 submission schedule shall be submitted to the secretary for  
519 approval. Any revisions to such schedule must be approved in  
520 like manner.

521 (b) The critically eroded beaches report must be developed  
522 and maintained based primarily on the requirements specified in  
523 paragraph (1) (e).

524 (c) The statewide long-range budget plan must include at  
525 least 5 years of planned beach restoration, beach nourishment,

526 and inlet management project funding needs as identified, and  
527 subsequently refined, by local government sponsors. This plan  
528 must consist of two components:

529 1. A 3-year work plan that identifies beach restoration,  
530 beach nourishment, and inlet management projects viable for  
531 implementation during the next 3 fiscal years, as determined by  
532 available cost-sharing, local sponsor support, regulatory  
533 considerations, and the ability of the project to proceed as  
534 scheduled. The 3-year work plan must, for each fiscal year,  
535 identify proposed projects and their current development status,  
536 listing them in priority order based on the applicable criteria  
537 established in ss. 161.101(14) and 161.143(2). Specific funding  
538 requests and criteria ranking, pursuant to ss. 161.101(14) and  
539 161.143(2), may be modified as warranted in each successive  
540 fiscal year, and such modifications must be documented and  
541 submitted to the Legislature with each 3-year work plan. Year  
542 one projects shall consist of those projects identified for  
543 funding consideration in the ensuing fiscal year.

544 2. A long-range plan that identifies projects for  
545 inclusion in the fourth and fifth ensuing fiscal years. These  
546 projects may be presented by region and do not need to be  
547 presented in priority order; however, the department should  
548 identify issues that may prevent successful completion of such  
549 projects and recommend solutions that would allow the projects  
550 to progress into the 3-year work plan.

551            (3)-(2) ~~Annually,~~ The secretary shall present the 3-year  
552 work plan to the Legislature annually. The work plan must be  
553 accompanied by a 3-year financial forecast for the availability  
554 of funding for the projects ~~recommendations for funding beach~~  
555 ~~erosion control projects prioritized according to the criteria~~  
556 ~~established in s. 161.101(14).~~

557            Section 5. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this  
558 act, this act shall take effect July 1, 2019.