Overview Statement

• Federal SPP’s have a contractual life – (PCA),

• Many projects constructed in the 1970’s are rapidly approaching the ends of their 50-year “authorized” life,

• No provision exists to address the issue.
Genesis for the Talk

- City of Tybee Island, GA - Client,
- Tybee Shore Protection Project (Expiring)
- Letter received from the Savannah District, USACE regarding this issue
Factoids

- A Federally authorized project is for “life”,
- Federal funding (i.e. fiscal participation) is limited (50 years max),
- Sponsor bound by contract to continue to fund the Federal project at 100% local expense.
Prior Debate on Issue

- Howard Marlowe Newsletter of May 2006,
- Congressman Mike McIntyre (NC) attempted to address the matter via H.B. 5241 (110th Congress).
Tybee Island, GA
Federal Shore Protection Project

Authorized Limits of Project

North Groin
South Groin
Tybee Nourishment History

- 1975 – N. Federal Groin
- 1976 – Beach Fill (2.2 Mcy)
- 1985 – S. Federal Groin
- 1987 – 1st Renourishment (1.3 Mcy)
- 1993 – Failed Federal Beach Disposal
- 1999/00 – 2nd Renourishment (1.4 Mcy)
- 2008 – 3rd Renourishment (1.1 Mcy)
• Federal financial participation in periodic renourishment ends in 2024,

• Authorized until deauthorized by Congress,

• PCA dictates responsibilities.

CWYAF
Savannah District – COE Letter to Tybee Mayor dated 5 Aug 2010

• Local sponsor becomes responsible for Operations, Monitoring, Repair, Rehabilitation of Replacement (OMRROR) as long as it remains authorized.

• Extension of Federal participation for cost sharing of periodic renourishment would require Congressional Authorization.
The “Process”
Without Congressional Action

- Section 216 of the Flood Control Act would allow the Savannah District to propose an Initial Appraisal (IA) report.

- If the IA findings indicated it is advisable to modify project operation then the District could conduct a Reconnaissance Study of 905(b) analysis.
Recon Study Goals

• Determine if “problem” warrants Federal participation and a feasibility study,

• Define Federal intent consistent with D.O.A policies, costs, benefits etc. for the “alternatives”.

NAPP
Recon Study Goals

• Complete a 905(b) Analysis Recon Report,
• Prepare a Project Management Plan (PMP),
• Assess “local intent”,
• Negotiate and execute a Feasibility Study Cost Sharing Agreement.
The “Clincher”

“The new studies would define the project without condition to be the beach condition at the end of the 50-year period of cost sharing for the authorized project”

NOT GOOD …
Feasibility Study Issues

- Cost shared at 50:50 – relatively expensive,
- Implications of a “non-eroded” baseline condition,
Feasibility Study Issues

- Congressional appropriations required,
- Time to fund, time to study, review(s).
Rhetorical Question

Is this essentially a “new start” …?

… in the eyes of the COE, Congress, Administration, OMB?

Existing policy is no new starts…
Pragmatic Solution

- A best case solution is Federal legislation intended to formalize the process to re-up a project,
- It will necessitate a WRDA bill,
- A coalition of affected communities or states and strong Congressional support will be required.
Alternative Actions

• No Action – revert to pre-project conditions …,
• Construct a non-federal project … (after de-authorization)
Non-Federal S.P.P. Advantages

- Design, frequency, determination of need,
- Cost to construct less: flexibility,
- “Engineered Beach” – FEMA post-disaster funding eligibility,
Non-Federal S.P.P. Advantages

• No Congressional appropriations necessary,
• Turn around time,
• Control of your own “destiny” …
Federal S.P.P.
Advantages

• Potential cost-sharing,
• Decisions/guidance by the USCOE,
• Better prioritization in state funding programs.
Without Federal “earmarks”…

… Federal project feasibility may be a moot point …
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