

INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENT
FOR THE COASTAL EROSION PLANNING & RESPONSE ACT (CEPRA)
CYCLE 6 PROJECT GOAL SUMMARY APPLICATION FORM

This document is a supplement to the Project Goal Summary application (PGS) and provides an overview of the CEPRA program funding application process, general instructions for completing a PGS application, and guidance on how the application will be evaluated for consideration.

Applicants seeking expense reimbursement funding eligibility for a structure relocation or demolition project should use the Structure Relocation/Demolition Expense Reimbursement Application. This application form is posted below the PGS form on the CEPRA web page at: www.glo.state.tx.us/coastal/erosion.html

A potential project partner seeking funds from the Coastal Erosion Response Account for funding in the Cycle 6 biennium (FY2010 – 2011) must submit PGS applications to the Texas General Land Office (GLO) **no later than 5:00 p.m., July 1, 2009.** The GLO may, at its discretion, accept a project goal summary that will address an emergency situation after this deadline.

The PGS application is a fill-in form in MS Word format available through download from the GLO website (www.glo.state.tx.us/coastal/erosion.html). The application may be filled out directly and submitted to the GLO along with attachments/supporting documentation electronically, or in hardcopy format by mail or fax, as follows:

By Email attachment to:
coastalprojects@glo.state.tx.us

By postal mail to:
Texas General Land Office
Coastal Resources Program
Attn.: Thomas Durnin
P.O. Box 12873
Austin, TX 78711-2873

By Fax to:
(512) 475-0680 Attn.: Thomas Durnin

General Overview

- All PGS applications are evaluated in a two-stage process established by state administrative rule (see Texas Administrative Code Title 31, Part 1, Chapter 15, Sub-Chapter B, §15.41: [http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.viewtac](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.viewtac)).

The first stage is an evaluation using general criteria to establish a relative rank for the proposed project followed by a second stage evaluation using priority criteria that further ranks the proposed project against the State's erosion response priorities. The evaluation process will produce a list of recommended priority projects to the Land Commissioner accompanied by a list of alternative projects that may be implemented within the

biennium if additional funding becomes available from co-sponsors or through possible budget reallocations. The Land Commissioner makes the final selection on priority projects.

- State law requires that, wherever practicable, projects funded from the coastal erosion response account provide for the placement of material dredged in constructing and maintaining navigation inlets and channels of the state on eroding beaches or for the restoration of eroding wetlands.
- The cost-sharing match requirements for potential project partners are determined by project type as under Texas Natural Resources Code Section 33.603 (e-h) (www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us) as follows:

Project Type	Minimum Partner Match Required
Beach Nourishment (Gulf and bay)	25%
Dune Restoration	25%
Shoreline Protection	40%
Habitat Restoration	40%
Demonstration Project	40%
Erosion Studies	40%
Beneficial Use of Dredged Material:	
Beach Nourishment	25%
Habitat Restoration	40%
Shoreline Debris Removal	determined by Land Commissioner
Structure Relocation or Removal	determined by Land Commissioner

Required Application Information

The PGS application form is divided into several sections. Please fill out each blank in the sections completely and accurately as possible to enhance the application’s evaluation process:

Applicant Information

This section requests basic information about the applicant including the date of application submittal, proposed project title, applicant’s point of contact and the authorizing official.

Project Type

This section is a checklist for the applicant to indicate the type of project proposed. Check all categories that apply as some projects may contain multiple components. For Beach Nourishment and Dune Restoration projects, provide additional information in the appropriate boxes along with descriptive information regarding the sand source availability and probable costs, if known.

Project Length

This section requests information about the size of the proposed project.

Project Location

This section requests information about the geographic location of the proposed project along with the appropriate State and Federal Legislative Districts.

Erosion Rate at Project Location

This section requests information about the rate of erosion in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Funding Summary

This section is a quick summary of the proposed project funding breakdown, including the amount of CEPRA funds being sought and a breakdown of the partner's match funding outlining both federal and non-federal sources. Ensure that the quantities provided here comply with the Minimum Partner Match Required indicated in the General Overview. The amount of partner match funds plus CEPRA funding request must equal the total project cost.

Sources of Match Funding

This section is a table for the applicant to list the sources of all the funding that comprises the partner match. Do not include the CEPRA request for funding in this table. There are columns to indicate whether the source is a cash contribution or an in-kind contribution. Additional columns are provided to indicate whether the specific funding source is committed for the Cycle 6 biennium and if there are any funding restraints or timelines to consider.

Beach Access and Use Plan Eligibility

This section is to determine if the local government jurisdiction in which the proposed project or study area will be located has a plan in place, pursuant to Texas Natural Resources Code §33.605(b)(6).

Hazard Mitigation Eligibility

This section is to provide information about the proposed project's location within a coastal area that may be operating under a FEMA Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Project Description

This section is to provide a narrative description of the proposed project and should address all five project aspects laid out under this section of the application. There is no limitation on the length of the proposed project description, but the applicant is encouraged to be concise and specific in the presentation of the proposed project description.

Project Benefits

This section requests specific information about the proposed project's benefits to public safety and access, public and private resources, the state's natural resources, whether the proposed project incorporates beneficial use of dredged material from navigation channels and how project costs relate to project benefits.

Project Permitting

This section is for listing any known Federal, State, and local permits that may need to be obtained for the proposed project. Blanks are provided to elaborate on any known permitting issues that may need to be addressed during project implementation and

whether the proposed project is compliant with the local government's beach and dune plan, floodplain administration and beach access.

Project Phasing and Timeline

This section requests information that will be used to evaluate the feasibility of the project proposed for implementation within the Cycle 6 biennium and post-implementation maintenance. If the proposed project will be implemented in phases, describe the phases and approximate timelines for each.

Attachments/Supporting Documentation

This section directs the applicant to enclose documentation supporting the application, especially:

Project Location Map

The applicant should provide a map of the proposed project location

Letters of Support

While not required, applicants are strongly encouraged to provide copies of any letters of support from co-sponsors, elected officials, affected jurisdictions, and other stakeholders with an interest in the proposed project as an attachment to the application.

General Criteria for Evaluation of a PGS Application

In accordance with Texas Administrative Code §15.41, the GLO will conduct an initial evaluation of all projects proposed through submission of a PGS application form using the following general criteria for initial ranking of the project:

1. The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the proposed project;
2. The economic impacts of erosion in the area of the proposed project;
3. The effects and benefits of the proposed project on public access, infrastructure or resources threatened by erosion;
4. The effects and benefits of the proposed project on natural resources threatened by erosion;
5. The effects and benefits of the proposed project on private infrastructure and property threatened by erosion;
6. If the proposed project is to be located within the jurisdiction of a local government that administers a beach/dune program, whether the local government is adequately administering its duties under the Open Beaches Act (Texas Natural Resources Code, Chapter 61) and the Dune Protection Act (Texas Natural Resources Code, Chapter 63);
7. Whether the proposed project will provide for the beneficial use of dredged material from the construction and maintenance of navigation inlets and channels of the state;
8. Whether a binding commitment to fund all or a portion of a given proposed project, dependent on project type, has been offered or received, and a description of potential co-sponsors and associated funding.

Priority Criteria for Evaluation of a PGS Application

Following the initial evaluation, in accordance with Texas Administrative Code §15.41, the GLO will conduct a secondary evaluation of the PGS application using the following priority criteria:

1. The relative severity of erosion in the area of the proposed project;
2. Whether the proposed project will address an emergency erosion situation in the area;
3. The needs in other critical coastal erosion areas;
4. Whether the proposed project will maximize leveraging of federal and local financial participation;
5. Whether participation by private beneficiaries of the proposed project is maximized;
6. Whether the proposed project achieves efficiencies and economies of scale;
7. Whether funding the proposed project will contribute to a balance in the geographic distribution of benefits for coastal erosion response projects in Texas that are proposed or have received funding from the coastal erosion response account;
8. The economic benefits to the state relative to the state cost of the proposed project;
9. The relationship of the proposed project cost to the funds available in the Coastal Erosion Response Account.