



FUNDING PLAN

Navarre Beach Restoration Project



March 1, 2016

Executive Summary

In 2006 Santa Rosa County (County) completed the initial restoration of Navarre Beach via placement of almost 3 million cubic yards of sand along 4.1 miles of beach. At this time, the County has formulated a design, obtained permits, obtained competitive bids, and awarded a construction contract to provide for re-nourishment to maintain the beach and dune (Project). This document addresses potential funding sources and a proposed Municipal Services Benefit Unit (MSBU) for the Project – for which construction is expected to begin in April 2016. The Project entails placement of about 1.6 million cubic yards of sand over the 4.1 miles of shoreline restored in 2006. The Project's estimated construction cost – based on 2014 beach conditions - is \$17,361,246– including construction, contingencies, engineering, and administration. Additional costs are associated with MSBU administrative costs and future monitoring costs, which yield the total estimated present value of the Project at \$17,803,526.

Future Federal funding is possible as an “individual project authorization” via a ten step process by and between the County, the US Congress, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. However, the ten step process would likely require a minimum of 9 years – with no guarantee of federal funding for future maintenance of the Project. Federal funding is also available from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to repair specific storm damage to an “engineered beach” such as the 2006 Navarre Beach project. The County has secured a commitment of \$2,317,187 from FEMA to offset erosion due to Hurricanes Debby and Isaac.

The State of Florida funded 58% of construction costs for the 2006 initial restoration project. State funding for beach projects is awarded on a competitive basis and is limited by the appropriations of the Florida legislature. The County has applied for State funding for this Project at 50% of non-federal costs - the maximum under State rules via the State's Beach Management Funding Assistance Program (BMFAP) administered by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). The 2015 legislative session resulted in a \$2.75 million appropriation for the Project; potential additional State funding is subject to a future legislative appropriation for the Project and acceptance by the Governor.

In concert with FEMA and FDEP funding, the required local share of construction costs is \$12,491,238. Local funding options for the Project include: General Fund revenues, increasing the Transient Tax, an MSBU, a Navarre Bridge toll, and an increase of the County's sales surtax. To generate the local share of Project costs, the County Commission, at their meetings in the summer of 2014 and of February 12 and August 13, 2015 identified:

- the County's commitment to annually contribute approximately \$350,000 from the Santa Rosa County Tourist Development Council (TDC) - funded by transient taxes [This is considered a \$2.8M contribution over the eight years of the expected Project life.]
- the County's intent to contribute 50% of the local Project construction costs – after the TDC contribution, and
- an MSBU is the local funding mechanism to generate the balance of local Project costs.

The entire local share of construction costs is to be provided by the County as a loan or other funding mechanism to be repaid via the TDC funding and the MSBU. The present value of the Project construction and future monitoring costs is estimated at \$17,803,526. With contributions from FEMA, FDEP, and TDC totaling \$7,820,008, the balance of these costs to be addressed locally is \$9,983,518. The table below summarizes annual costs, the benefit zones and annual assessments under the proposed MSBU to cover the remaining 50% of local Project construction and monitoring costs after the TDC contribution by the County plus MSBU administration costs; this table is based upon updated property conditions and recreational benefits.

Benefit Zone	MSBU Annual Costs			Number of Contributors	Annual Contributions		
	Amount	% of Total	% of MSBU		Average	Maximum	Minimum
Core Area	\$479,491	16.4%	58.4%	939	\$511	\$64,002	\$243
Western Gulf-front	\$118,243	4.0%	14.4%	257	\$460	\$1,082	\$93
Non Gulf-front	\$223,502	7.6%	27.2%	1,099	\$203	\$203	\$203
Total:	\$821,236	28.0%	100%	2,295	\$358	\$64,002	\$93

Table of Contents

1.0	Project Overview.....	1
1.1	General	1
1.2	Project Purpose	2
1.3	Project Description.....	2
1.4	Project Costs	2
2.0	Project Funding Alternatives Summary	3
2.1	Federal Funding.....	3
2.2	State Funding	7
2.3	Local Funding	9
3.0	Beach Project Funding in Other Florida Communities.....	16
4.0	Selected Funding Alternative.....	16
5.0	MSBU	17
6.0	References	23

List of Tables

Table 1 – Summary of Construction Costs	3
Table 2 – 2005 MSBU Benefits by Zone	13
Table 3 – Beach Project Funding in Other Florida Communities	16
Table 4 – Funding Sources to offset Construction Costs.....	16
Table 5 - Summary of Local Funding Sources for Construction	17
Table 6 – Benefit Zones.....	17
Table 7 – Recreational Benefits Distribution	19
Table 8 – Updated Annual Benefits Distribution.....	20
Table 9—Distribution of Total Costs	20
Table 10 – Amortization of MSBU Share of Costs.....	21
Table 11 – Core Area Zone – Points System.....	22
Table 12 – Western Gulf-front Zone – Points System.....	22
Table 13- Summary of Individual Average Annual Assessments	22

1.0 Project Overview

1.1 General

This document summarizes the benefits, costs, potential and proposed funding sources, and associated proposed local assessments for the first maintenance nourishment of the Navarre Beach Restoration Project (Project) by Santa Rosa County (County). Local assessments are proposed to be made under the auspices of a Municipal Services Benefit Unit (MSBU).

The MSBU assessment methodology proposed herein is an updated version of that employed to fund the initial restoration of Navarre Beach constructed in 2006. Costs are assessed in proportion to benefits received. Benefits include storm damage reduction benefits and recreation benefits.

A Municipal Services Benefit Unit (MSBU) is proposed to be created to collect funds to the Project based on benefits received by property owners within Navarre Beach. Through the MSBU, property owners pay a share of Project costs in proportion to their benefits received. This report presents the Project benefits to specific properties in the Project area and the associated property assessments to generate the local cost of the Project as may be realized through an MSBU.

A key distinction is that in 2006, the State of Florida fully funded the eastern portion of the current Project area, which was then a State Park and is now the Santa Rosa County Navarre Beach Marine Park (County Park). The 2005 MSBU study did not include the State Park, which was subsequently added to the initial 2006 construction at the State's request.

This report and the associated MSBU assessments reflect:

- a) updated property characteristics within the MSBU boundaries;
- b) updated recreational benefits attributable to the County Park ; and
- c) expected Project costs.

As permitted by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Project is proposed to entail placement of approximately 1.6 million cubic yards of beach compatible sand with native dune vegetation to restore the beach-dune system over 4.1 miles of shoreline fronting Navarre Beach, Florida. The Project area extends from (a) the western limits of Navarre Beach abutting the Gulf Islands National Seashore – at 460 feet east of survey reference monument R-192 to (b) the County Park - at 500 feet east of R-213.5. Sand is proposed to be excavated from the offshore borrow area approximately 4 miles offshore as previously used for the 2006 initial restoration, and transported to the beach via hopper dredge, where the sand is to be hydraulically pumped to the beach via temporary pipelines placed on the Gulf bottom.

1.2 Project Purpose

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has classified Navarre Beach as "critically eroded." Santa Rosa County's Gulf of Mexico coastline is a valuable resource providing storm protection, recreation, economic value, and wildlife habitat. The purpose of the proposed Project is to:

- mitigate historic and/or future storm induced erosion impacts;
- provide an increased measure of storm protection to upland improvements;
- enhance the beach and beach access for public recreational use; and
- restore and maintain the beach for marine turtle nesting habitat, marine life, beach mice and shore birds.

1.3 Project Description

The County proposes a beach berm and dune re-nourishment project to meet the Project purpose. The proposed Project entails restoration of the following elements:

- a) a dune with a 30 foot wide dune crest at elevation of +14.2' NAVD and with water-ward and landward slopes of 1V:5H;
- b) a primary beach berm at elevation +8.7' NAVD with a seaward slope of 1V:10H; and
- c) a secondary beach berm at elevation +4.7' NAVD with a seaward slope of 1V:10H.

1.4 Project Costs

Construction costs as bid are at \$15.78 million. Table 1 summarizes costs for construction of the proposed Project – based upon the Project's Final Design and including Engineering & Administration and a 10% Contingency. These costs do not include future monitoring costs or MSBU administrative costs. Bids were obtained in December 2015.

In addition to the Project construction costs, the County is required by FDEP to monitor the Project for 7 years. Monitoring during construction and the year immediately following construction is included in the "Engineering & Administration" costs in Table 1. For the subsequent two years after construction, monitoring is estimated to cost \$110,000 per year; in the subsequent fifth and seventh years after construction, monitoring is estimated to cost \$40,000 per year. Note that in the subsequent fourth and sixth years after construction, no monitoring is required. FDEP is expected to cost-share at a rate of 50% for these monitoring costs. The present value of these monitoring costs is \$355,000.

Probable Construction Costs				
Item	Description	Quantity	Unit Price	Cost
1	Mobilization/Demobilization	1 LS	\$2,950,000 LS	\$2,950,000
2	Furnish & Install Sand	1,600,000 cy	\$7.25 /cy	\$11,600,000
3.1	Permit Compliance Including Turbidity Monitoring	1 LS	\$75,000 LS	\$75,000
3.2	Dredge Standby	15 hours	\$6,500 /hour	\$97,500
4	Beach Tilling	132 acres	\$650 /acre	\$85,800
5	Furnish & Install Native Plants	112,000 plants	\$1.00 /plant	\$112,000
Total Construction Cost:				\$14,920,300
Engineering & Administration:				\$862,651
Sub-total Cost:				\$15,782,951
Contingency:				\$1,578,295
Total Cost:				\$17,361,246

Table 1 – Summary of Construction Costs

2.0 Project Funding Alternatives Summary

Potential funding for the Project may be obtained from federal, state & local sources. This section identifies: (a) the advantages and disadvantages of each funding source, and (b) the process, schedule, and feasibility of obtaining funds from each source. Examples from other local communities are compared and contrasted for illustrative purposes.

2.1 Federal Funding

Federal funding for future maintenance of the Project may be obtained via U.S. Congressional appropriation in coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Mobile District. The USACE is the primary federal entity responsible for the restoration and maintenance of sandy beaches in the United States under the federal Shore Protection Program. The USACE is authorized to perform this function via congressional authorization under the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), a federal statute which can grant congressional authority for the USACE to assist states and local communities with shoreline protection. Federal funds to support projects authorized under WRDA are typically appropriated annually through the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (Congressional Research Service 2013).

Under WRDA, Congressional authorization for a beach erosion project can take two forms. First, Congress has granted the USACE general authority, under the Continuing Authorities Program (CAP), to investigate and construct certain small, one-time projects that fall within specific categories and budget limits. However, the proposed County

Project does not qualify under the CAP because its scope does not fit within any of the nine continuing authority categories. The second form of Congressional authorization under WRDA can come in the form of an "individual project authorization", whereby the USACE is directed to study, design and construct a particular project. A potential funding stream – subject to future Congressional appropriations - is established when individual project authorization is granted. In most cases, the federal commitment to maintain a beach is authorized as an "individual project authorization," which provides authorization for typically 50 years (project life) of federal participation – in partnership with the non-federal local sponsor. Projects must have three components to receive an "individual project authorization" from Congress:

1. A willing non-federal sponsor – such as a state or local government to share in the cost of the project. Note: federal assistance is limited to 65% of project construction costs – unless an increased federal share is justified (for federal lands or via a Section 111 Study to mitigate navigation impacts).
2. A clear public benefit – the restored portion must have sufficient public access and provide substantial storm damage reduction benefits to upland properties and infrastructure.
3. Economic justification – USACE must determine that benefits of the project exceed project costs.

The existing restored beach and dune provide substantial protection to upland property. It is expected that substantial storm damage reduction benefits to potentially justify a federal project for Navarre Beach might only be realized if the USACE considers the "no project" condition to be that associated with beach conditions prior to the 2006 initial restoration project; this consideration is subject to USACE discretion.

The federal Shore Protection Program is currently under review and will very likely be revised. As identified by Tab Brown, P.E. Chief, of the USACE's Planning and Policy Division at the February 2013 American Shore & Beach Preservation Association Summit, in Washington D.C.:

- A key focus for the USACE is towards "Integrated Water Resources Management – initially via the proposed \$20M "Comprehensive Approach Study", which will allow the USACE to potentially formulate a new way of doing projects – even potentially including:
 - collaboration or with support from NOAA and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA),
 - a "systems based" approach for the basin and ecosystem,
 - risk-informed decision making and communication,
 - "asset management" – indicated in the form of prioritization of projects & funding,
 - "re-purpose" of existing projects.
- "Non-federal shares are subject to sequestration"; however, it is not certain as to whether this means (a) the Project scope will be reduced, (b) the non-federal share will increase or (c) whether it means something else.

- The Corps is "looking at" 30± feasibility studies that have "been around" for 20+ years.
- It remains a "No Earmark" political environment:
 - The USACE intends to continue its focus on "3-3-3" projects that can be completed within 3 years at a federal cost under \$3M with a design document less than 3 inches thick.
 - The partial basis of decision making will be outside the Districts at Division and Headquarters – to "maximize the value to the nation" – the key to prioritization.
- 50% of U.S. infrastructure is at least 50 years old; the USACE will either "re-up authorization" or "de-commission" USACE projects.

Advantages of Federal Funding:

- Authorization of the Project as an "individual project" provides substantial savings to the County (up to 65% of Project construction costs)
- Authorization would provide long-term funding to the Project subject to Congressional appropriations for up to 50 years.
- Coordination with the USACE brings federal experience and additional expertise to the Project.

Disadvantages of Federal Funding:

- The process to obtain authorization typically takes at least 10 years and may take longer. The USACE's "3-3-3" program is aimed at reducing the length of the Feasibility Phase; however, this initiative is less than 3 years old and its effect is not yet conclusive.
- Coordination with the USACE during the Feasibility Study and after authorization of the Project requires compliance with federal rules and regulations which may be cumbersome for the County, including compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the 1983 Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Implementation Studies.
- County objectives or priorities may be difficult to assure because the County can lose autonomy by having to share control of the Project with the USACE under federal regulations.
- Federal appropriations have historically been limited by the Office of Management & Budget, the federal budget deficit, and related politics.
- Largely undeveloped areas – included in the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRA Zones), including Navarre Beach County Park – are not eligible for federal funding. This area is approximately 3,700 linear feet (or approximately 17%) of the total Project shoreline.

Process & Schedule to Obtain Federal Funds

In general, there are ten steps to obtaining individual project authorization from Congress:

1. Problem Perception – by local sponsor
2. Request for Federal Action – by local sponsor
3. Congressional Approval for Reconnaissance Study – by Congress
4. Reconnaissance Study – 1 year average duration – by the USACE
5. Authorization & Appropriation for Feasibility Study – by Congress
6. Federal Feasibility Study – 3 year average duration – by the USACE
7. Congressional Authorization – by Congress
8. Pre-Construction Engineering & Design – 2 years average duration – by the USACE
9. Congressional Appropriation – by Congress
10. Project Implementation – by the USACE

Potential Federal Funding Level: Federal funding might be obtained at the following percentages for the various stages of development of a federal project:

- 100% of reconnaissance;
- 50% of feasibility;
- 65% (maximum) of construction

Likely Timing for Federal Funding: If a federal project is pursued in early 2016, construction of the federal project might occur in 9 years, by 2025 at the soonest – including:

- 1 year to obtain Congressional Appropriation for Reconnaissance Study,
- 1 year to conclude Reconnaissance Study,
- 1 year to obtain Congressional authorization for Feasibility Study,
- 3 years to complete Feasibility Study,
- 2 years to complete Pre-Construction Engineering & Design,
- at least 1 year to obtain Congressional Authorization & Appropriation for construction.

Approximately 33% of all Reconnaissance Studies lead to Feasibility Studies and approximately half of those (16% of all Reconnaissance Studies) lead to constructed projects (Congressional Research Service, 2013). Additionally, the USACE project approval process has outpaced appropriations for approved projects to the point there are currently more than 1,000 authorized studies and construction projects, nationwide, with no Congressional appropriations to implement the projects.

For comparison, two other Florida counties are in the midst of obtaining a federal project as described below:

Walton County requested and received authorization for a federal Reconnaissance Study in the summer of 2002. The Reconnaissance Study was concluded in 2003 and the Feasibility Study began in 2004. The hurricane seasons of 2004 and 2005

“upended” the Feasibility Study to the point that the final Chief’s Report to favorably conclude the Feasibility Study wasn’t executed until July 2013. Walton County completed Pre-Construction Engineering & Design (Step 8 above) and Congressional Appropriation (Step 9); project implementation is pending.

St. Lucie County (in southeastern Florida) requested a federal Reconnaissance Study in 1998. St. Lucie County obtained Congressional approval for its Reconnaissance Study in 2001 and the Study was completed in 2004. The Feasibility Study was authorized and is currently expected to be completed by 2016 or later.

Two final points should be made about federal funding. First, it should be noted that FEMA may provide federal funds to rebuild or repair the beach following damage from a storm event, given the appropriate conditions for FEMA funding are met – for an “engineered beach” – whether or not federal funding is obtained through the USACE. Specifically, a beach, such as the 2006 Navarre Beach project, meets the appropriate conditions when, consistent with the Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR §206.226(j)(2)):

- The beach was constructed using imported sand.
- A maintenance plan was established and followed.
- The maintenance program preserves the original design.

The County has secured a commitment of \$2,317,187.24 from FEMA to offset erosion in the Project area attributable to Hurricanes Debby and Isaac. These federal FEMA funds are expected to be applied against the cost of the Project.

Second, it should be noted that the USACE is in what some call an “Evolving Demands” phase, which began in 2001 (Congressional Research Service 2013). This phase is characterized by a convergence of aging USACE infrastructure and expanded mandates, including for ecosystem restoration. This evolution’s impact on authorization of shore protection projects, such as the Navarre Beach Project, cannot be confidently predicted. Regardless, a requirement for any federal project authorization is support from a community’s Congressional delegation.

2.2 State Funding

In general, State of Florida funding for the Project may be obtained via Florida Legislature appropriation via FDEP’s Beach Erosion Control Program established in 1964; this FDEP Program coordinates with local and federal governments to achieve the protection, preservation and restoration of the coastal sandy beach resources of the State. The Program provides financial assistance for eligible Project activities, including beach restoration and nourishment, Project design, engineering studies, environmental studies, environmental & physical monitoring, inlet management planning, inlet sand transfer, dune restoration and protection activities, and other beach erosion prevention activities which are found to be consistent with the adopted State Strategic Beach Management Plan – such as for Navarre Beach. The program is authorized by Section 161.101 of Florida

Statutes (FS) and details of the program rules and regulations are prescribed by Chapter 62B-36 of Florida Administrative Code (FAC), which was recently revised and went into effect on August 5, 2013.

In general, a proposed project must compete with projects as proposed by other local governments for the limited amount of funding appropriated by the Florida Legislature. Chapter 62B-36.006, FAC, outlines criteria for the ranking of projects via points. There are twelve criteria, each with a maximum point award ranging from five to twenty points. The nine most significant criteria (i.e. worth a maximum ten to twenty points) are: severity of erosion, threat to upland structures, recreational and economic benefits, availability of federal funds, local sponsor financial and administrative commitment, previous state commitment, project performance, mitigation of inlet effects, and significance (or length).

Chapter 62B-36.007 of FAC provides the criteria to determine how much of a project may be funded by the state. The state provides financial assistance for up to 50% of eligible beach project costs – not covered by federal funding. The proportion of costs shared by the State is based on the amount of public access (or “eligible shoreline”) within the project area. Chapter 62B-36.007(1)(e), FAC, states, “The sum of the eligible shoreline lengths...is divided by the total project length to determine the percentage of the total project that is eligible for state cost sharing.” Through County beach access improvements and the acquisition of the former Navarre Beach State Park, 50% of the Project shoreline has public access per State criteria and potential State funding for the Project is estimated at 50% of eligible Project costs.

Advantages of State funding:

- Cost sharing typically ranges up to 50% of the non-federal Project costs – where public access criteria are met.
- Permitting of a project may be facilitated by FDEP’s recognition of the project need reflected in State funding.
- Inclusion of the Project in the Beach Erosion Control Program (as for the Navarre Beach Project) can provide potential long-term funding.

Disadvantages of State funding:

- The Project must be implemented under the auspices of an agreement with FDEP consistent with the timing of the state’s budget and funding process.
- Legislative appropriations have given greater weight to projects with federal funding.

Process & Schedule to Obtain Funds

In general, there are five steps to obtain state cost sharing, each occurring on an annual basis:

1. Application for FDEP Erosion Control Program Funds – typically due in September prior to the Legislative session.
2. FDEP Staff Review and ranking – typically produced in December or January

3. Inclusion of project in FDEP Strategic Budget Plan – typically produced in January or February.
4. State Legislative Appropriation – typically concluded by May.
5. Final FDEP Action via Execution of a project agreement with the local sponsor (County) – typically executed before the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1st.

For this Project, the County has completed Steps 1- 4, resulting in a FY2015/16 appropriation of \$2.75 million. Approximately \$200,000 will be used for Project design and permitting; \$2.55 million will be allocated to Project construction. Step 5 will be completed in the near future.

It should be noted that the State Legislative Appropriation was not consistent with the FDEP Strategic Budget Plan. In the Strategic Budget Plan the Project ranked 18th out of 40 projects and would have required an appropriation of at least \$45 million to fund this Project and all the projects ranked higher. The total appropriation for beach projects in the FY2015/16 budget was just over \$32 million and many projects ranked above this Project were not funded. The County intends to continue applying for State funds for reimbursement of up to 50% of eligible Project construction costs.

Potential State Funding Level: Up to 50% of eligible Project costs might be obtained from the State.

Likely Timing for State Funding: \$2.55 million is dedicated for construction of this Project; additional State funding for the Project may be obtained as soon as July 2016.

2.3 Local Funding

With or without federal or state funding, a local share of Project costs is required to construct the Project. Approximately \$3.8M or \$600,000 per year (annualized) will be required from a local source of funds; this local share of costs is based upon the following assumptions:

- Federal FEMA funding is secured to offset the impacts of both Hurricanes Debby and Isaac – in the amount of \$2,317,187.
- No more State funding is secured for construction; 50% of monitoring costs is funded by the State.
- The County contributes 50% (\$3,910,112) of remaining Project costs after FEMA, State, and TDC funding – for County-owned lands consistent with the 2006 initial restoration project and the addition of benefits associated with the former state park.
- The balance of Project costs (\$3,910,111) is generated from a local funding source.

In general, local funding for the Project may be obtained via five possible revenue streams:

- County's General Fund (revenue);
- Transient Tax increase;

- Creation of a Municipal Services Benefit Unit;
- Navarre Beach Bridge toll; or
- Sales Surtax increase.

Each of the above potential local funding sources is described below:

2.3.1 General Fund

The County's operating or "general government" budget revenue has three primary sources: (a) ad valorem taxes, (b) state shared revenues, and (c) locally generated revenues (Santa Rosa County 2013). Combined, these revenue sources were projected to increase by a total of \$1.3 million dollars in FY 2013-2014 over the previous year. FY 2013-2014 was the first year property values (and subsequent ad valorem revenues) increased since 2008. FY 2013-2014 was also the first year in the past seven years that the Santa Rosa County constitutional officers requested merit and cost-of-living salary increases for their staff; however, the modest increase in expected revenues was not sufficient for the County Administrator to recommend the requested merit and cost-of-living salary increases to the County Commission. In adopting the FY 2013-2014 Budget, the County Commission chose to keep the previous year's millage rate of 6.0953. Based upon the above, the County's General Fund may be a viable source for the Project, but could be problematic due to the downward trend in ad valorem tax collections of the past years and competing County needs.

Ms. Linda Coley, President of the Navarre Beach Leaseholders and Residents Association (NBLRA), conveyed by email of December 4, 2013 that:

- Use of General Revenue is considered by the Leaseholders to be the "fairest" alternative to fund the Project.
- NBLRA members have "calculated that if you add Beach Restoration as a line item to the General Fund with a millage rate of .0003 mils for the entire county, it would produce more than 2.5 million dollars in revenue each year."
- "If this line item is preserved and the funds only used for the Beach then each citizen of the county would pay a very small amount to preserve and improve the major driver of Tourist dollars" within the County.
- "This millage rate could even be lower if used in combination with some of the other funding ideas such as Beach Toll, Parking fees, income from the Pier and TDC money."

Advantages of General Revenue

- Use of General Revenue would spread the Project costs to all County residents thereby imposing a relatively small cost upon individual property owners.
- The NBLRA has conveyed that use of General Revenue is considered by the Leaseholders to be the "fairest" alternative to fund the Project.

Disadvantages of General Revenue

- General Revenue funding for competing County needs may need to be reduced and/or the mileage rate may need to be increased.
- County property owners outside of Santa Rosa Island may object to contributing funds for the Project.

Process & Schedule for Obtaining Funds

Funding for the Project via General Revenue requires approval by the County Commission.

Potential General Revenue Funding Level: General Revenue could potentially yield all needed local funds for the Project.

Likely Timing for General Revenue Tax Funding: The County Commission will need to approve use of General Revenue in concert with formulation of the annual County budget before October 2016 in order to start collecting funds at the beginning of October 2016 – for FY 2016/17.

2.3.2 Transient Tax

Section 125.0104, FS, authorizes counties to levy a tourist development tax or a “transient tax” – commonly referred to as a “tourist tax”. Funds from this transient tax may be used for the capital construction of tourist-related facilities, tourist promotion and beach and shoreline maintenance.

Transient tax rates vary by county and depend on the county’s eligibility and will to levy particular taxes; however, the absolute maximum rate is 6% for eligible counties, levied on lodging accommodations rented for six months or less. Santa Rosa County is eligible to impose up to 5%. Since 1994, Santa Rosa County has been administering and collecting transient taxes (<http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/taxes/pdf/dr15tdt.pdf>). Historically, Santa Rosa County’s transient tax rate was set at 4% and the County has allocated the funds to other County interests.

The County Commission approved the addition of an additional 1 cent transient tax (for a total of 5 cents per dollar) to dedicate to beach maintenance. The expected revenue from the additional 1 cent transient tax is about \$350,000 per year – to yield total annual transient tax revenue at about \$1.5 million per year.

Advantages of the Transient Tax

- Use of transient tax funds for the Project would provide funding by key beneficiaries of the restored beach – tourists, who visit and stay in Navarre Beach and use the beach for recreation.

Disadvantages of the Transient Tax

- The County has maximized its current transient tax authority per Florida Statute, no other transient tax increases are available to address other future County needs that may arise.

Process & Schedule for Obtaining Funds

Funding for the Project via the transient tax will require approval by the County Commission.

Potential Transient Tax Funding Level: The 1¢ transient tax will likely yield \$350,000 per year.

Likely Timing for Transient Tax Funding: The County Commission approved the additional transient tax.

2.3.3 MSBU

Under Chapter 125.01(1)(q), FS, a county is authorized to “establish...municipal service taxing or benefit units for any part or all of the unincorporated area of the county, within which may be provided...beach erosion control...and other essential facilities and municipal services from funds derived from service charges, special assessments, or taxes within such unit only.” Municipal Service Benefit Units (MSBUs) are commonly used in Florida communities for the purpose of funding projects that have a clear benefit area.

As identified in section 1.1 above, 38% of the initial 2006 beach restoration project was funded by an MSBU which covered Navarre Beach properties.

Consistent with the initial project’s MSBU, several court rulings, and guidance from the Florida Attorney General, MSBUs have four common characteristics:

1. A MSBU is created and managed by the governing body of the county, the Board of County Commissioners. A public referendum may be employed to adopt a MSBU but is not required.
2. The boundaries of a MSBU may include all or part of the boundaries of a county or municipality.
3. The special assessments within a MSBU boundary are not required to be uniform but must be reasonably related to the benefit accruing to the property from the constructed project or service provided.
4. The governing body has broad discretion in identifying the benefits of a project and in developing a methodology to apportion the benefits and assessments among the properties in the MSBU.

MSBU creation and assessment requires identification of benefits received by properties within the MSBU boundary. Beach and dune restoration projects have historically identified two over-arching benefits to the properties within the MSBU boundaries: (1) storm damage reduction benefits; and (2) recreational benefits. Storm damage reduction (SDR) benefits result from the presence of a wider, more stable beach which is expected to reduce damages during future probable storm events; the closer a structure is to the beach, the greater storm damage reduction benefit it receives. Recreational (REC) benefits result from the availability of additional recreational space at the beach as a result of the Project. These Project benefits were previously estimated for the Project

area excluding the County Park – by benefit zones for the establishment of the 2005 MSBU to support the 2006 initial construction - as summarized in Table 2, where:

- Core Area constitutes that portion of the shoreline west of the fishing pier and dominated by high-rise and mid-rise multi-family buildings and hotels,
- Western Gulf-front constitutes that portion of the shoreline dominated by single-family homes, and
- Non Gulf-front constitutes those Santa Rosa Island properties which are not immediately adjacent to the beach.

	SDR	REC	Total
Benefit Zone	Percent	Percent	Percent
County Lands	0.0%	12.0%	10.4%
Core Area	86.7%	67.2%	69.8%
Western Gulf-front	13.3%	15.1%	14.8%
Non Gulf-front	0.0%	5.8%	5.0%
Total :	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 2 – 2005 MSBU Benefits by Zone

In 2014, the Navarre Beach Leaseholders and Residents Association (NBLRA) conducted an email survey of residents. The survey revealed that: “NO one is in favor of another MSBU for just the Leaseholders of the Beach” (NBLRA, 2013). NBLRA has identified that they “feel like it is only fair that the entire county take an equal part to fund this project.” In addition, NBLRA has identified the need for a permanent funding mechanism.

Advantages of MSBU

- MSBUs are an established and legally recognized method to raise local funds for beach and dune restoration projects in Florida.
- MSBUs fairly and reasonably distribute the local costs of the Project to the real property owners specially benefitted by the Project.
- MSBUs provide a mechanism to meet specific financial needs of the Project.
- MSBUs are flexible and provide counties with discretion to tailor the MSBU to meet unique circumstances of the Project.

Disadvantages of MSBU

- MSBUs may face challenges from affected landowners who disagree with the Project or the cost apportionment methodology.

Process & Schedule for Obtaining MSBU Funds

Typically, a MSBU is initiated by a request from a group of interested residents or county staff. Timing of MSBU creation is variable and dependent on the county’s chosen path for implementation, and the desired level of public coordination associated with the Project.

Potential MSBU Funding Level: There is no legal limit. Final amount is usually designed to supplement Project funding needs to 100%, after federal, state and other sources have been exhausted.

Likely Timing for MSBU: 6 months – 1 year from implementation. Assessments typically span the Project construction life (estimated at 8 years).

2.3.4 Navarre Bridge Toll

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) constructed, maintained and collected tolls on the Navarre Bridge from 1960 to 2005. Currently the bridge is owned and maintained by the County. Preparation of the Feasibility Study for the initial project explored the possibility of adding a surcharge to the already-collected toll. At the time of the 2000 Feasibility Study, data on bridge crossings indicated that in 1999, total bridge crossings were estimated at 1,088,000. For illustrative purposes, 1 million crossings per year is assumed to be a conservative estimate. The bridge toll, discontinued in 2005, was \$0.50. Assuming a \$0.50 toll per crossing at 1 million crossings per year estimates revenues of \$500,000. However, operational expenses in 1999, according to an FDOT Toll Revenue and Operation, Maintenance and Improvement table, were \$315,899. Maintenance and improvement costs were separately listed and for the purposes of this illustration will be ignored, since the County has successfully maintained the bridge since 2005. If the FDOT operational expenses are comparable to what the County's expenses may be for operating a toll on the Navarre Bridge, annual net revenues of approximately \$184,000 may be realized via a \$0.50 toll or \$684,000 via a \$1.00 toll.

Advantages of Bridge Toll

- The County would not have to seek FDOT or Florida Legislative approval to implement the toll – as was the case until 2005.
- A bridge toll appears to obtain Project funds from a wide variety of Project beneficiaries, including residents, workers and tourists of the beach.

Disadvantages of Bridge Toll

- New facilities would need to be constructed to collect the toll.
- Toll revenues may be somewhat unreliable and discourage visitors to Navarre Beach.

Process & Schedule for Obtaining Funds

The County would need to more thoroughly explore the costs associated with construction and operation of toll facilities. If fiscally feasible, the County will need to allocate the funds for construction and operation.

Potential Bridge Toll Funding: Toll funding may range from \$184,000 (for a \$0.50 toll) to \$684,000 (for a \$1.00 toll).

Likely Timing for Bridge Toll Funding: Implementation may take 1 to 2 years.

2.3.5 Sales Tax

The State of Florida imposes a 6% sales tax and allows counties a “Local Government Infrastructure Sales Tax”, as a discretionary surtax on top of the sales tax, up to 1%, which can be implemented in 0.5% increments. Santa Rosa County currently has a 0.5% sales surtax which was established in 1998 and is set to expire in 2018 (FDOR 2013). Revenue from this 0.5% surtax is currently estimated at approximately \$6 million per year (EDR 2013). Imposition of the additional 0.5% discretionary surtax would yield an additional estimated \$6 million per year. In “Legal Advisory Opinion Number: AGO 2012-19” issued by the Florida Attorney General, beach erosion control projects were identified as projects that could qualify for use of these funds. Further, the opinion clearly states that use of the funds for this purpose would need to be authorized by a countywide referendum.

Advantages of Sales Surtax:

- The amount of funding generated by the 0.5% minimum increase would produce the greatest annual net revenue of all Local Funding options considered in the this report.

Disadvantages of Sales Surtax:

- A County-wide referendum is required to approve the increase and, if approved, collections would not likely commence until July 2017 with a full year’s funding not available until summer 2018.

Process & Schedule for Obtaining Funds

1. The County would need to get the measure approved for balloting by the next election cycle – the next General Election is scheduled for November 2016.
2. If approved by voters, the County would likely start collecting revenues in summer 2017, with a full year’s collections ready by summer 2018.

Potential Sales Surtax Funding: The 0.5% increase in sales surtax would generate approximately \$6 million/year.

Likely Timing for Sales Surtax Funding: Funding would likely be available by summer 2018.

2.2.6 Summary - Local Funding Options

The five potential local funding alternatives above include:

- County’s General Fund – viable but likely problematic
- Transient Tax Increase – estimated at \$350,000/year
- MSBU – no pre-determined level (previous MSBU generated \$7± million over 8 years)
- Navarre Bridge Toll – estimated up to \$684,00/year (assuming a \$1.00 toll)
- Sales Surtax – estimated at \$6 million/year

The County may pursue all or a combination of the above to meet the Project financial needs.

3.0 Beach Project Funding in Other Florida Communities

Table 3 summarizes funding sources for various ongoing beach nourishment projects in other Florida counties, including whether or not federal and state funding was obtained and how the local share of costs is generated (per telephone conversations with staff or documentation from each county – see Section 6.0 References).

County	Federal	State	Local
Escambia	Yes	Yes	Lease Fees
Okaloosa	No	Yes	Transient taxes & MSBU
Walton	No	Yes	Transient taxes
Bay	Yes	Yes	Transient taxes
Franklin*	No	No	none
St. Lucie	No	Yes	Ad valorem taxes & Erosion District (MSBU)
Sarasota	Yes	Yes	Transient taxes

Table 3 – Beach Project Funding in Other Florida Communities

*Franklin County residents voted down a proposed special taxing district and the Alligator Point Project was not constructed.

4.0 Selected Funding Alternative

The County proposes to employ multiple funding sources for the proposed Project. The County specifically proposes to use funds committed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) totaling \$2,317,187 to repair past storm damage to the beach and dune constructed in 2006 and \$2,552,821 remaining from the 2015 \$2.75M appropriation through the State of Florida Beach Management Funding Assistance Program (BMFAP) administered by FDEP. The local share of costs is thus at \$12,491,238 as summarized in Table 4.

Table 4 – Funding Sources to offset Construction Costs

Funding Source	Amount
FEMA	\$2,317,187
FDEP BMFAP	\$2,552,821
Local Sources	\$12,491,238
Total:	\$17,361,246

To partially address the local share of costs, the County intends to annually contribute \$350,000 from the Santa Rosa County Tourist Development Council (TDC) - funded by

transient taxes. This leaves the balance of the local share of Project construction costs at \$9,691,238 as reflected in Table 5.

Table 5 - Summary of Local Funding Sources for Construction

Local Share	\$12,491,238
Santa Rosa TDC	\$2,800,000
Local Share Balance (County & MSBU)	\$9,691,238

At their meeting on August 13, 2015, the Board of County Commissioners directed County staff to update the previous 2005 MSBU study to reflect the County and the MSBU splitting the "Local Share Balance" 50/50 and generate the necessary local share of costs to construct the Project and provide for monitoring required by FDEP. The entire local share of construction costs is expected to be provided by the County as a loan or other funding mechanism to be repaid via the TDC funding and the MSBU.

5.0 MSBU

Costs & Benefits: The cost to construct the Project is currently estimated at \$17,361,246. The present value of the Project including future monitoring costs is estimated at \$17,803,526. With contributions from FEMA, FDEP, and TDC totaling \$7,820,008, the balance of costs to be addressed locally is \$9,983,518.

The Project results in direct benefits and indirect or secondary benefits. Direct benefits are realized with construction of the Navarre Beach Project through storm damage reduction and increased recreational use of the wider beach that is created by construction of the Project. Secondary benefits are associated with the Project's stimulation of economic activity in the County. Only direct benefits are considered in the formulation of the MSBU described herein. Table 6 summarizes the Benefit Zones considered in concert with formulation of the MSBU. Individual properties in each zone receive comparable benefits based on the nature, value, and location of the improvements on the individual property within the zone.

Table 6 – Benefit Zones

Benefit Zone	Description
County Parks	County Park and all county beach-front lands
Core Area	Gulf-front properties west of the pier and south of Gulf Boulevard from 8649 Gulf Boulevard to 8227 Gulf Boulevard
Western Gulf-front	Gulf-front properties south of Gulf Boulevard from 8213 Gulf Boulevard to 7309 Gulf Boulevard
Non Gulf-front	All properties north of Gulf Boulevard

Storm damage reduction benefits entail reduction of potential damages to upland improvements during storm events due to the protective value of the restored beach. Storm damage reduction benefits are received by developed Gulf-front properties, where potential storm-erosion damage to the structures on the property is significantly reduced by the Project.

Recreation benefits correspond to the value of the increased recreational use associated with the wider, less congested, and more attractive beach constructed by the Project. Recreational benefits are realized by people over a wide geographic area, including but well beyond the Gulf-front properties in Navarre Beach. The people who use the beach for recreation directly receive these benefits. These people include (a) property owners in Navarre Beach, (b) property owners in mainland Santa Rosa County, and (c) visitors to Santa Rosa County.

In general, changes in property ownership and use warrant an update of the distribution of recreational benefits for the 2016 Navarre Beach MSBU. The following describes the updates, as developed in collaboration with Dr. William Stronge of Stronge Consulting, Inc.:

The original Navarre Beach 2005 MSBU estimated and distributed recreation benefits based on results of a beach user study conducted in 2001 during pre-restoration beach conditions, over 14 years ago. The County's acquisition of the former State park results in expansion of County-owned beachfront property within the Project Area.

The County's acquisition of the former Navarre Beach State Park adds approximately 0.5 miles of Gulf-Front property within the Project area, increasing the project length from 3.6 to 4.1 miles. An increase in recreational benefits is expected to be proportional to the increase in shoreline length; total annual recreational benefits are now estimated at \$5,508,785 per year [= \$4,836,982*(4.1/3.6)]. It is estimated that most of these benefits will go to island visitors - many who are resident in other parts of Santa Rosa County. It is assumed that this additional recreational benefit accrues to the County.

Recreational benefits within the Core, Western Gulf-front, and Non Gulf-front benefit zones total \$4,257,936 annually, based upon prior beach-user surveys. Within each zone recreational benefits are proportional to the number of units within that zone and the property values of those units. The beach is an amenity and Gulf-front properties with greater access to the beach have higher values than those non Gulf-front properties with less access. Parcels within the Non-Gulf-Front zone are expected to have a lower recreational value than the two gulf-front zones, due to the additional travel for users to reach the beach and the associated less frequent use of the beach by these parcels. This difference in recreational benefit value is equivalent to the ratio of average per parcel property values between the Non-Gulf-Front zone and the gulf-front zones. The average per parcel property

value in the Non-Gulf-front zone is 51.37% of the average per parcel property value in the gulf-front zones, based on an analysis of 2015 data. Therefore, the recreational value of a Non-Gulf-front unit is equivalent to 51.37% of a gulf-front unit. The distribution of recreational benefits to the benefit zones is thereby refined to be on the basis of units within the zone, with the Non Gulf-front units factored at 51.37% of the units within the Western Gulf-front and Core benefit zones. Table 7 identifies the distribution of recreational benefits.

Table 7 – Updated Recreational Benefits Distribution

Benefit Zone	# of units		Factored # of units		Recreation Benefits
					(excluding County & based on Factored Units)
County Parks	N/A		N/A		
Core Area	939	40.9%	939	53.3%	\$2,270,336
Western Gulf Front	257	11.2%	257	14.6%	\$621,381
Non Gulf-front	1,099	47.9%	564.5	32.1%	\$1,366,219
Total Units	2,295	100.0%	1,760.5	100.0%	\$4,257,936

Overall, 20.0% percent of the benefits are received by users of County lands that provide beach access including the County Park at the east end of the Project and other beach access sites that front the Gulf. The Project will not provide any significant storm damage prevention benefit to the County Park or County lands. About 46.7% of the benefits of the Project go to the “Core Area” which predominantly contains high-density-residential and commercial buildings. These buildings obtain the overwhelming share of the storm damage prevention benefits (86.7%) as well as just less than one-half of the recreational benefits of the Project (41.2%). The Gulf-front properties on the western portion of the Project are largely single-family residences. These properties receive 11.6% of the benefits of the Project, including 13.3% of the Storm Damage Reduction Benefits and 11.3% of the Recreation Benefits. Finally, the properties in Navarre Beach that are not on the Gulf are expected to receive only recreational benefits which amount to 21.8% of the total Project benefits.

Based on the recreational benefits of County lands within the Project area including the County Park, the updated distribution of local benefits is summarized in Table 8. Additional recreation benefits are updated based on the added beach width within the former state park; these benefits are attributable to visitors and are a County benefit.

Table 8 – Updated Annual Benefits Distribution

Benefit Zone	Storm Damage Reduction Benefits		Recreation Benefits		Total Benefits		
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	% in MSBU
County Parks	\$0	0.0%	\$1,250,849	22.7%	\$1,250,849	20.0%	N/A
Core Area	\$658,216	86.7%	\$2,270,336	41.2%	\$2,928,552	46.7%	58.4%
Western Gulf-front	\$100,788	13.3%	\$621,381	11.3%	\$722,169	11.5%	14.4%
Non Gulf-front	\$0	0.0%	\$1,366,219	24.8%	\$1,366,219	21.8%	27.2%
Total:	\$759,004	100%	\$5,508,785	100%	\$6,267,789	100%	100%

Based on the above:

- The Project would annually generate about \$6.3 million in direct benefits over the 8-year economic life of the Project. About 87.9% of these benefits are associated with increased recreational value. About 12.1% of these benefits are associated with reduction in storm damages due to the protection provided by the restored beach.
- The County's share is 20.0% of local benefits and costs; however, per the August 13, 2015 Board of County Commissioners meeting, the County will pay 50% (\$4,991,759) of the local costs – after the TDC contribution.
- The remaining balance of 50.0% of local costs (\$4,991,759) is to be addressed via the MSBU.
- Table 9 summarizes the distribution of all costs (construction, monitoring & MSBU administration) for the Project.

Table 9—Distribution of Total Costs

Funding Source	Share of Total Cost	
	Amount	Percent
State, Federal & TDC Grant	\$7,820,008	43.9%
County	\$4,991,759	28.0%
MSBU	\$4,991,759	28.0%
Total	\$17,803,526	100.0%

Table 10 summarizes the amortization of the MSBU share of costs. An annual cost of \$821,235.67 is required to be generated by the MSBU.

Table 10 – Amortization of MSBU Share of Costs

Year	Construction Costs	Monitoring Costs	Present Worth
1	\$4,889,259	\$0	\$4,889,259
2		\$0	\$0
3		\$30,934	\$27,500
4		\$0	\$0
5		\$12,167	\$10,000
6		\$0	\$0
8		\$13,686	\$10,000
Total Present Worth:			\$4,936,759.16
Annual Amortized Project Costs:			\$733,246.13
MSBU & Tax Collector Admin. Fees:			\$87,989.54
Total Annual Cost:			\$821,235.67

Points System: Under the MSBU, individual gulf-front property owners would be assessed based on a points system that scores a property based on three property factors:

- (1) the number of dwelling units on the property (existing or with active permit),
- (2) the acreage of the property, and
- (3) the beach frontage of the property.

Based on these property factors, the property is assigned points as reflected in Tables 11 and 12. The points for all properties within a gulf-front benefit zone are totaled. An individual property's assessment is based on the percentage of total points that property generates.

For example, a single-family home within the Western Gulf-front benefit zone on a 0.5 acre lot with 100 feet of frontage, would receive 1 point for the dwelling unit (i.e., the single-family home), 10 points for the 0.5 acres (at the rate of 1 point per 0.05 acres) and 20 points for the 100 feet of gulf frontage (at the rate of 1 point per 5 linear feet). This property would be assigned 31 points. If all the properties within the Western Gulf-front benefit zone generated a total of 1,000 points, this property would be assessed for 3.1% (i.e., 31 points/1,000 points) of the Project costs allocated to the Western Gulf-front benefit zone. Tables 11 and 12 outline the points system for the two gulf-front benefit zones.

Table 11 – Core Area Zone – Points System

Core Area Zone Point Scoring	
Property Factor	One Point per
Dwelling Units	1 Unit
Acreage	0.10 Acres
Front Footage	10 Feet

Table 12 – Western Gulf-front Zone – Points System

Western Gulf-front Zone Point Scoring	
Property Factor	One Point per
Dwelling Units	1 Unit
Acreage	0.05 Acres
Front Footage	5 Feet

MSBU Assessments: The MSBU property assessments presented herein are intended to be sufficient to generate the local share of costs to construct the Navarre Beach Restoration Project. Enactment of the MSBU requires that the Board of County Commissioners officially authorize or establish an MSBU through enactment of an authorizing ordinance pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 125.01, Florida Statutes.

A recreational benefits distribution based on the number of units in a zone and with the Non-Gulf-front zone adjusted, results in the following distribution of total benefits within the proposed MSBU with the corresponding maximum and minimum assessments. Table 12 summarizes (a) the average annual assessments for each property owner (Contributor) within a benefit zone, and (b) the maximum and minimum assessments per Contributor in each benefit zone. Note that: (a) all non-Gulf-front properties would be assessed at \$203 per year as identified in Table 13; and (b) final assessments may change if additional funding is obtained and/or actual Project costs vary from estimated costs.

Table 13- Summary of Individual Average Annual Assessments

Benefit Zone	MSBU Annual Costs			Number of Contributors	Annual Contributions		
	Amount	% of Total	% of MSBU		Average	Maximum	Minimum
Core Area	\$479,491	16.4%	58.4%	939	\$511	\$64,002	\$243
Western Gulf-front	\$118,243	4.0%	14.4%	257	\$460	\$1,082	\$93
Non Gulf-front	\$223,502	7.6%	27.2%	1,099	\$203	\$203	\$203
Total:	\$821,236	28.0%	100%	2,295	\$358	\$64,002	\$93

Attached are tables (dated March 1, 2016) summarizing the individual property assessments including:

- Core Area Assessments
- Western Gulf-front Assessments.

6.0 References

- Armbruster, Lisa – Sustainable Beaches, LLC for Bay County (November 5, 2013). Interview by P. Gattis – Coastal Tech [Telephone Conference Report]. Vero Beach, FL.
- Chabaut, Lindey – City of Destin (November 5, 2013). Interview by P. Gattis – Coastal Tech [Telephone Conference Report]. Vero Beach, FL.
- Coastal Tech, 2012a. “Navarre Beach Berm and Dune Restoration Project: Monitoring Report – 2012 – Beach Fill Performance.” Vero Beach, FL.
- Coastal Tech, 2012b. “St. Lucie County South County Beach & Dune Restoration Project Local Funding Plan.” Vero Beach, FL.
- Congressional Research Service, 2013. “Army Corps of Engineers: Water Resource Authorizations, Appropriations, and Activities.” Washington, DC.
- Currington, Mark – Franklin County (November 5, 2013). Interview by P. Gattis – Coastal Tech [Telephone Conference Report]. Vero Beach, FL.
- Day, Tim – Escambia County (November 5, 2013). Interview by P. Gattis – Coastal Tech [Telephone Conference Report]. Vero Beach, FL.
- Emergency Management and Assistance, 2002. 44 Code of Federal Regulations §206.226
- Florida Attorney General, 2012. “Advisory Legal Opinion; Number: AGO 2012-19; Subject: Infrastructure surtax, beach erosion projects/studies.” Tallahassee, FL. (http://myfloridalegal.com/_85256236006EB5E1.nsf/0/3CDE67BCBEAE476685257A0E006B2D58?Open&Highlight=0,212,055)
- Florida Department of Revenue, 2013. “Discretionary Sales Surtax Information.” Tallahassee, FL. (<http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/forms/2014/dr15dss.pdf>)
- National Environmental Policy Act, 1969. 40 Code of Federal Regulations §4331 et seq.
- Navarre Beach Leaseholders & Residents Association (NBLRA), 2013. “November Presidents Report.” Navarre Beach, FL.
- Navarre Beach Leaseholders & Residents Association (NBLRA) email, from Ms. Linda Coley, President of NBLRA, December 4, 2013, Navarre Beach, FL.
- Office of Economic and Demographic Research/Florida Department of Revenue, 2013. “Local Discretionary Sales Surtax: Revenue Estimates for the Local Fiscal Year

Ending September 30, 2014." Tallahassee, FL
(<http://www.edr.state.fl.us/Content/local-government/data/county-municipal/LDSS13-14.pdf>)

Pickel, Brad – Seahaven Consulting for Walton County (November 15, 2013). Interview by J. Sellers – Coastal Tech [Telephone Conference Report]. Vero Beach, FL.

Santa Rosa County, 2013. "FY 2013-2014 Santa Rosa County Recommended Budget." Milton, FL.

Sarasota County Tax Collector, 2013. "Tourist Development Tax." Sarasota County, FL.
(http://www.sarasotataxcollector.com/TOURIST_PAGES/TDT_home.htm#HowTaxUsed)

Water Resources Council, 1983. "Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Implementation Studies." Washington, DC.

Parcel Identification	Situs	Property	Type	FACTOR 1		FACTOR 2		FACTOR 3		DEFAULT*	
				# Units	Points	Lot Size	Points	FF of Beach	Points	VALUE	Points
SINGLE FAMILY / VACANT											
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0050	8255 Gulf Blvd Court	Queenan Reginald A	Vacant	0	0	0.12	1.17	0	0	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0060	8265 Gllf Blvd Court	Johnston Ian & Lori E	Single Family	1	1	0.09	0.90	0	0	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0070	8267 Gulf Blvd Court	Kavanaugh Paul & Jennifer R	Single Family	1	1	0.11	1.14	0	0	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0010	8263 Gulf Blvd Court	Rau Sheshagiri V & Rau Kanan S	Single Family	1	1	0.25	2.50	50	5	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0020	8261 Gulf Blvd Court	Platinum Colleagues LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.24	2.40	50	5	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0030	8259 Gulf Blvd Court	Boyce John A	Vacant	0	0	0.25	2.50	50	5	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9340-00000-0040	8257 Gulf Blvd Court	Bryant Florida Real Estate Holdings LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.25	2.50	50	5	N/A	0
COMMERCIAL											
28-2S-26-0000-00200-0000	8649 Gulf Blvd	The Palms of Navarre LLC	Restaurant	N/A	0	1.61	16.10	0	0	1	1
28-2S-26-0000-01200-0000	Gulf Blvd	Cohen Investments LLC	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	0.99	9.90	0	0	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0010	8535 Gulf Blvd	1000 Highway 98 East Corp	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	0.93	9.25	0	0	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0110	8479 Gulf Blvd	Navarre Santa Rosa Inc	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	0.58	5.80	0	0	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0130	8469 Gulf Blvd	Black Euby & Deborah J	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	0.69	6.90	0	0	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0131	8471 Gulf Blvd	Patel Chirag S	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	0.98	9.80	100	10	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0320	Gulf Blvd	A M F I Investments Corp	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	1.42	14.20	100	10	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0200	8375 Gulf Blvd	TTN INC*** (Springhill Suites Marriott ~ anticipated 10/2016)	Vacant Commercial	161	161	8.84	88.38	560.48	56.048	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0250	8375 Gulf Blvd	HOLI CORP***	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	11.25	112.48	703.48	70.348	1	1
28-2S-26-9160-00000-0140	8459 Gulf Blvd	Beach Condo Owners Association	Vacant Commercial	N/A	0	1.52	15.20	97.5	9.75	1	1
CONDO / DWELLABLE UNITS											
28-2S-26-9030-00E00-0000	8515 Gulf Blvd	Beach Colony Resort East	Condo	75	75	3.04	30.43	200	20	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9032-00W00-AREA	8501 Gulf Blvd	Beach Colony West COA & Beach Colony East COA	Common Area	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9032-00W00-0000	8501 Gulf Blvd	Beach Colony Resort West	Condo	113	113	3.04	30.43	200	20	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9032-00W00-AREA	8501 Gulf Blvd	Beach Colony West COA & Beach Colony East COA	Common Area	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9420-00000-0000	8227 Gulf Blvd	Viewpoint Condominiums	Condo	8	8	0.64	6.42	150	15	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9099-00000-0000	8477 Gulf Blvd	Caribbean Resort Condominiums	Condo	54	54	2.12	21.24	141.98	14.198	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9100-00000-0000	8245 Gulf Blvd	Emerald Surf Condominiums	Condo	45	45	1.50	15.04	300	30	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9365-00000-0000	8573 Gulf Blvd	Summerwinds West	Condo	56	56	2.44	24.40	148	14.8	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9375-00000-0000	8575 Gulf Blvd	Summerwinds Condominiums	Condo	61	61	2.26	22.55	140	14	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9370-00000-0000	8577 Gulf Blvd	The Inn at Summerwinds	Condo	69	69	2.45	24.52	88.4	8.84	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9060-00000-0000	8425 Gulf Blvd	Beachview Condominiums	Condo	46	46	3.71	37.10	250	25	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9300-00000-0000	8443 Gulf Blvd	Sugar Beach Townhomes	Townhomes	48	48	3.92	39.23	250	25	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9070-00000-0000	8269 Gulf Blvd	Belle Mer Condominiums	Condo	58	58	2.66	26.61	216.69	21.669	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9245-00000-0000	8499 Gulf Blvd	The Pearl of Navarre Beach Condominiums	Condo	102	102	3.33	33.26	256	25.6	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9220-00000-0000	8271 Gulf Blvd	Navarre Towers Condominiums	Condo	84	84	4.66	46.56	392	39.2	N/A	0
28-2S-26-9170-00000-0000	8525 Gulf Blvd	Navarre Beach Regency Condominiums	Condo	103	103	5.00	50.04	403	40.3	N/A	0

TOTAL POINTS	Percentage	Assessment ***	Per Unit
1.17	0.05%	\$ 243.48	N/A
1.90	0.08%	\$ 396.84	N/A
2.14	0.09%	\$ 447.65	N/A
8.50	0.37%	\$ 1,775.35	N/A
7.40	0.32%	\$ 1,545.60	N/A
7.50	0.33%	\$ 1,566.49	N/A
8.50	0.37%	\$ 1,775.35	N/A
17.10	0.74%	\$ 3,571.59	N/A
10.90	0.47%	\$ 2,275.82	N/A
10.25	0.45%	\$ 2,140.87	N/A
6.80	0.30%	\$ 1,420.28	N/A
7.90	0.34%	\$ 1,650.04	N/A
20.80	0.91%	\$ 4,344.40	N/A
25.20	1.10%	\$ 5,263.19	N/A
306.43	13.35%	\$ 64,002.15	N/A
183.83	8.01%	\$ 38,395.27	N/A
25.95	1.13%	\$ 5,420.05	N/A
125.43	5.46%	\$26,197.96	\$ 349.31
0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$ -
163.43	7.12%	\$34,134.84	\$ 302.08
0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$ -
29.42	1.28%	\$6,144.19	\$ 768.02
89.44	3.90%	\$18,680.49	\$ 345.93
90.04	3.92%	\$18,805.80	\$ 417.91
95.20	4.15%	\$19,883.97	\$ 355.07
97.55	4.25%	\$20,375.64	\$ 334.03
102.36	4.46%	\$21,379.44	\$ 309.85
108.10	4.71%	\$22,578.33	\$ 490.83
112.23	4.89%	\$23,441.36	\$ 488.36
106.28	4.63%	\$22,198.40	\$ 382.73
160.86	7.01%	\$33,597.22	\$ 329.38
169.76	7.39%	\$35,457.58	\$ 422.11
193.34	8.42%	\$40,380.95	\$ 392.05

PARCEL ID	SITUS	OWNERNAME	TYPE	FACTOR 1		FACTOR 2		FACTOR 3	
				# UNITS	PTS	ACRE	PTS	FF	PTS
282S269180001000010	8219 Gulf Blvd	Catanzaro Antonio J & Tracey	Vacant	0	0	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000020	8211 Gulf Blvd	Buechler Philip A & Cheri	Vacant	0	0	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000030	8195 Gulf Blvd	Stearman Gary E Trustee	Vacant	0	0	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000040	8185 Gulf Blvd	Lewis Tandy G & Emily Randolph	Single Family	1	1	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000056	8183 Gulf Blvd	Banks Marilyn S as Trustee	SF TOWN	1	1	0.065	1.3	22	4.4
282S269180001000050	8181 Gulf Blvd	Blisson Jeannie Collins	SF TOWN	1	1	0.038	0.76	13	2.6
282S269180001000055	8179 Gulf Blvd	Delcavo Joseph W & Kathleen F	SF TOWN	1	1	0.038	0.76	13	2.6
282S269180001000054	8177 Gulf Blvd	Knight Jucith C & Solem Duane L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.038	0.76	13	2.6
282S269180001000053	8175 Gulf Blvd	Dohman Richard & Mary Trustees	SF TOWN	1	1	0.038	0.76	13	2.6
282S269180001000052	8173 Gulf Blvd	Savoie Terri L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.038	0.76	13	2.6
282S269180001000051	8171 Gulf Blvd	Fritz Bea M	SF TOWN	1	1	0.068	1.36	23	4.6
282S269180001000060	8169 Gulf Blvd	Conquistador Inc	Vacant	0	0	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000070	8163 Gulf Blvd	Gilbert William E & Virginia L	Vacant	0	0	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000080	8155 Gulf Blvd	Cavanaugh Thomas R Trustee	Single Family	1	1	0.328	6.56	110	22
282S269180001000090	8149 Gulf Blvd	Hillsdale Beach Two LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180001000100	8143 Gulf Blvd	Gibson Pasco	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180001000110	8135 Gulf Blvd	Rapier Marianne H	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180001000120	8129 Gulf Blvd	Spain Hazel H as Trustee & Spain W Randal	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180001000130	8123 Gulf Blvd	Fortune Jennifer & Fortune Mark A	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000010	8109 Gulf Blvd	Manning Properties LTD	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000020	8101 Gulf Blvd	Aref Bizhan	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000030	8085 Gulf Blvd	Macla LTD II	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000040	8079 Gulf Blvd	Turner Roberta M as Trustee	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000050	8071 Gulf Blvd	Hering Steve & B Ann	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000060	8065 Gulf Blvd	Phillips Bruce M & Ivy	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000070	8057 Gulf Blvd	First City Holdings LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000080	8051 Gulf Blvd	Alleman Mark James & Karen Hall	Vacant	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000090	8045 Gulf Blvd	L Russell Realty LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000103	8041 Gulf Blvd	Tullier John D & Nadine R	SF TOWN	1	1	0.090	1.8	30	6
282S269180002000100	8039 Gulf Blvd	Lavine Constance F as Trustee	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180002000102	8037 Gulf Blvd	Johnson Keith N & Jane E	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180002000101	8035 Gulf Blvd	Hibbeler Jeffrey & Aurora	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180002000110	8031 Gulf Blvd	McClintock Royce	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000120	8029 Gulf Blvd	Eliilo Investments LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000130	8017 Gulf Blvd	Elliott Properties LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000140	8011 Gulf Blvd	Luckie / Birmingham Inc	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000150	8005 Gulf Blvd	201 Miracle FWB LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180002000160	7991 Gulf Blvd	John Adams LP	Single Family	1	1	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269380000000000	7979 Gulf Blvd	Sundunes Condominiums	Condo	34	34	0.600	12	200	40
282S269180003000010		Navarre Sands Homeowners	Common	0	0	0.000	0	0	0
282S269180003000011	7965 Gulf Blvd	Tujague Jennifer L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000012	7961 Gulf Blvd	7961 Gulf Boulevard LLC	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000013	7959 Gulf Blvd	Geiss Heinz P & Virginia Louise	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000014	7957 Gulf Blvd	Slaughter William S & Christel	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6

TOTAL POINTS	PERCENT	ASSESSMENT	EACH
28.56	0.88%	\$ 1,045.60	N/A
28.56	0.88%	\$ 1,045.60	N/A
28.56	0.88%	\$ 1,045.60	N/A
29.56	0.92%	\$ 1,082.21	N/A
6.7	0.21%	\$ 245.29	N/A
4.36	0.13%	\$ 159.62	N/A
4.36	0.13%	\$ 159.62	N/A
4.36	0.13%	\$ 159.62	N/A
4.36	0.13%	\$ 159.62	N/A
4.36	0.13%	\$ 159.62	N/A
6.96	0.22%	\$ 254.81	N/A
28.56	0.88%	\$ 1,045.60	N/A
28.56	0.88%	\$ 1,045.60	N/A
29.56	0.92%	\$ 1,082.21	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
8.8	0.27%	\$ 322.17	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
26.96	0.83%	\$ 987.03	N/A
86	2.66%	\$ 3,148.53	\$ 92.60
0	0.00%	\$ -	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A

282S269180003000020	7955 Gulf Blvd	Cook Rusty S	SF TOWN	1	1	0.086	1.72	29	5.8
282S269180003000021	7953 Gulf Blvd	Woods Mikeal S & Woods Barbara R	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180003000022	7951 Gulf Blvd	Osbon Sue B	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180003000023	7949 Gulf Blvd	Sandy Feet Too LLC	SF TOWN	1	1	0.086	1.72	29	5.8
282S269180003000031	7945 Gulf Blvd A	James R Adams Family Limited Partnership	SF TOWN	1	1	0.110	2.2	37	7.4
282S269180003000032	7945 Gulf Blvd B	Brandt Harold D & laurie W	SF TOWN	1	1	0.077	1.54	26	5.2
282S269180003000030	7945 Gulf Blvd C	Bouch Gary W & Emma L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.110	2.2	37	7.4
282S269180003000040	7943 Gulf Blvd	Tucker Marlene J	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180003000041	7941 Gulf Blvd	Slye Robert W III	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000042	7939 Gulf Blvd	Jones Stephen W & Diana D	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000043	7937 Gulf Blvd	Bradshaw John C & Deborah L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180003000050	7935 Gulf Blvd	Johnson Glenn P & Pam J	Vacant	0	0	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000051	7933 Gulf Blvd	Ohlsson Cherie	Vacant	0	0	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000052	7931 Gulf Blvd	Ohlsson Cherie	Vacant	0	0	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000053	7929 Gulf Blvd	Ohlsson Cherie	Vacant	0	0	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000060	7927 Gulf Blvd	AL-FLA-KY INC	Vacant	0	0	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180003000062	7925 Gulf Blvd	The Whole Brood LLC	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000061	7923 Gulf Blvd	Sky Properties LLC	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000072	7921 Gulf Blvd	O'Clair-Clark Heatherann M	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000071	7919 Gulf Blvd	AL-FLA-KY INC	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000070	7917 Gulf Blvd	Couch John V & Carla D	Vacant	0	0	0.150	3	50	10
282S269180003000081	7913 Gulf Blvd A	Ortenzi Lisa & Russo Rosemarie	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180003000083	7913 Gulf Blvd B	Ortenzi Lisa	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000080	7913 Gulf Blvd C	Ortenzi Lisa	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000082	7913 Gulf Blvd D	Saia Roy K & Madie F	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180003000090	7907 Gulf Blvd	Steiner Donald R & Agnes T	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000092	7905 Gulf Blvd	McKown Joel Evan & Carol Day	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000093	7903 Gulf Blvd	Kilpatrick James & Melissa et al	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180003000091	7901 Gulf Blvd	TJ and Sons Investments LLC	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000101	7895 Gulf Blvd	Brown Margaret Brooks et al	Vacant	0	0	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180003000100	7893 Gulf Blvd	Power Rachel Ann	Single Family	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269280000000110	7885 Gulf Blvd	Sandollar Condominiums	Condo	12	12	0.310	6.2	90	18
282S269180003000120	7877 Gulf Blvd 1	Varadi John M & Lillian	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180003000121	7877 Gulf Blvd 2	Clark William D Jr	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000122	7877 Gulf Blvd 3	Pedersen Eric N & Deborah	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000123	7877 Gulf Blvd 4	Spinks Charles T	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180003000133	7871 Gulf Blvd A	Patrick Florida Property LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180003000132	7871 Gulf Blvd B	Douglass James Stuart Jr et al	Vacant	0	0	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000131	7871 Gulf Blvd C	Salsun Enterprise LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180003000130	7871 Gulf Blvd D	Pedersen Eric N & Deborah	Vacant	0	0	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180004000010	7859 Gulf Blvd	Stringer Brian J & Bobbi	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180004000011	7857 Gulf Blvd	Provias Frankie et al	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180004000012	7855 Gulf Blvd	Savoie Terri L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180004000013	7853 Gulf Blvd	Brazelton Randall L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180004000022	7849 Gulf Blvd	Revere Jon J & Revere Yulhader C	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180004000021	7847 Gulf Blvd	Crouch Robert E & Mary Ann	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180004000023	7845 Gulf Blvd	Rusboldt Mark K & Marcia L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2

8.52	0.26%	\$ 311.92	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
8.52	0.26%	\$ 311.92	N/A
10.6	0.33%	\$ 388.07	N/A
7.74	0.24%	\$ 283.37	N/A
10.6	0.33%	\$ 388.07	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
7.78	0.24%	\$ 284.83	N/A
5.18	0.16%	\$ 189.64	N/A
5.18	0.16%	\$ 189.64	N/A
7.78	0.24%	\$ 284.83	N/A
12.98	0.40%	\$ 475.21	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
13	0.40%	\$ 475.94	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
12.98	0.40%	\$ 475.21	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
36.2	1.12%	\$ 1,325.31	\$ 110.44
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
7.78	0.24%	\$ 284.83	N/A
4.92	0.15%	\$ 180.13	N/A
4.92	0.15%	\$ 180.13	N/A
8.04	0.25%	\$ 294.35	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A

282S269180004000020	7843 Gulf Blvd	Thykeson Clint & Carolyn	SF TOWN	1	1	0.077	1.54	26	5.2
282S269180004000031	7841 Gulf Blvd	Martin David B & Liza Ann	SF TOWN	1	1	0.077	1.54	26	5.2
282S269180004000033	7839 Gulf Blvd	Whiteley Christopher H & Amy D	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180004000030	7837 Gulf Blvd	Hudgens Edna E as Trustee	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180004000032	7835 Gulf Blvd	Evans Edmond M & Patricia A	SF TOWN	1	1	0.095	1.9	32	6.4
282S269180004000040	7831 Gulf Blvd	Sand Key LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180004000053	7829 Gulf Blvd	Harris James M III et al	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180004000051	7827 Gulf Blvd	Lake Connie S	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180004000052	7825 Gulf Blvd	Harrell John J & Rebecca S	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8
282S269180004000050	7823 Gulf Blvd	Shuler Gary M & Theresa G	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	31	6.2
282S269180004000060	7819 Gulf Blvd	Sexton Joyce Fay et al	Single Family	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000061	7817 Gulf Blvd	Lamp LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000071	7815 Gulf Blvd	Ernest Malcom Gene & Barbara	Single Family	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000070	7811 Gulf Blvd	Sexton Kathy & Rusher Kelly	Vacant	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000080	7807 Gulf Blvd	Scott Elizabeth Golden Trustee	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180004000081	7805 Gulf Blvd	Jurney Louis	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180004000082	7803 Gulf Blvd	Knott-Craig Christopher J	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180004000083	7801 Gulf Blvd	Myers Joseph W & Rose W	SF TOWN	1	1	0.080	1.6	27	5.4
282S269180004000090	7797 Gulf Blvd	Luckie Robert E III et al	Vacant	0	0	0.080	1.6	27	5.4
282S269180004000091	7795 Gulf Blvd	Cicio Howard R et al	Vacant	0	0	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180004000093	7793 Gulf Blvd	Davidson Kelvin Roy	Single Family	1	1	0.155	3.1	52	10.4
282S269180004000100	7789 Gulf Blvd	Patel Miten	Vacant	0	0	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000101	7785 Gulf Blvd	Patel Miten	Vacant	0	0	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000110	7783 Gulf Blvd	Russell Judith	Vacant	0	0	0.298	5.96	100	20
282S269180004000120	7781 Gulf Blvd	Darling Valerie C Revocable Trust	Single Family	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000121	7779 Gulf Blvd	Carlton Daniel J Sr & Emma R	Single Family	1	1	0.149	2.98	50	10
282S269180004000130	7775 Gulf Blvd	Hanneke Phillip J & Laurel L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180004000132	7773 Gulf Blvd	Desylva Michael J & Julie R	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180004000133	7769 Gulf Blvd	Coward James M III & Sheila L	SF TOWN	1	1	0.059	1.18	20	4
282S269180004000131	7765 Gulf Blvd	Russell Annette B as Trustee	SF TOWN	1	1	0.089	1.78	30	6
282S269180050000010	7761 Gulf Blvd	Marini Andrew & Carlson Gary S	Single Family	1	1	0.080	1.6	23	4.6
282S269180050000014	7761 Gulf Blvd	Marini Andrew & Carlson Gary S	Vacant	0	0	0.070	1.4	16	3.2
282S269180050000012	7757 Gulf Blvd	Clark Carl W & Holly A	SF TOWN	1	1	0.040	0.8	16	3.2
282S269180050000013	7755 Gulf Blvd	Ferguson Dixie N	SF TOWN	1	1	0.091	1.82	39	7.8
282S269180050000024	7751 Gulf Blvd	Joseph Conrad & Evaline J	SF TOWN	1	1	0.090	1.8	30	6
282S269180050000025	7749 Gulf Blvd	Redmann Ronald Jr et al	SF TOWN	1	1	0.060	1.2	18	3.6
282S269180050000023	7747 Gulf Blvd	Fox Herbert Trustee	SF TOWN	2	2	0.140	2.8	47	9.4
282S269180050000030	7739 Gulf Blvd	Douglas McVay Amy	Vacant	0	0	0.083	1.66	28	5.6
282S269180050000031	7737 Gulf Blvd	Lee Gary E	Vacant	0	0	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180050000032	7735 Gulf Blvd	Lee Robert E	Vacant	0	0	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180050000033	7733 Gulf Blvd	Lee Robert E	Vacant	0	0	0.074	1.48	25	5
282S269180050000040	7727 Gulf Blvd	Hood A Preston as Trustee	SF TOWN	1	1	0.074	1.48	25	5
282S269180050000041	7727 Gulf Blvd	Hood A Preston	Vacant	0	0	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180050000042	7723 Gulf Blvd	Hood A Preston	SF TOWN	1	1	0.062	1.24	21	4.2
282S269180050000043	7723 Gulf Blvd	Hood A Preston as Trustee	Vacant	0	0	0.083	1.66	28	5.6
282S269180050000052	7721 Gulf Blvd	Moore Brenton B & Cheryl P	SF TOWN	1	1	0.086	1.72	29	5.8
282S269180050000051	7719 Gulf Blvd	Pitts David	SF TOWN	1	1	0.056	1.12	19	3.8

7.74	0.24%	\$ 283.37	N/A
7.74	0.24%	\$ 283.37	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
9.3	0.29%	\$ 340.48	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A
9.04	0.28%	\$ 330.96	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
8	0.25%	\$ 292.89	N/A
7	0.22%	\$ 256.28	N/A
5.44	0.17%	\$ 199.16	N/A
14.5	0.45%	\$ 530.86	N/A
12.98	0.40%	\$ 475.21	N/A
12.98	0.40%	\$ 475.21	N/A
25.96	0.80%	\$ 950.42	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
13.98	0.43%	\$ 511.82	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
6.18	0.19%	\$ 226.25	N/A
8.78	0.27%	\$ 321.44	N/A
7.2	0.22%	\$ 263.60	N/A
4.6	0.14%	\$ 168.41	N/A
5	0.15%	\$ 183.05	N/A
10.62	0.33%	\$ 388.81	N/A
8.8	0.27%	\$ 322.17	N/A
5.8	0.18%	\$ 212.34	N/A
14.2	0.44%	\$ 519.87	N/A
7.26	0.22%	\$ 265.79	N/A
5.44	0.17%	\$ 199.16	N/A
5.44	0.17%	\$ 199.16	N/A
6.48	0.20%	\$ 237.24	N/A
7.48	0.23%	\$ 273.85	N/A
5.44	0.17%	\$ 199.16	N/A
6.44	0.20%	\$ 235.77	N/A
7.26	0.22%	\$ 265.79	N/A
8.52	0.26%	\$ 311.92	N/A
5.92	0.18%	\$ 216.74	N/A

282S269180049000140	7479 Gulf Blvd	John Adams LP	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000150	7473 Gulf Blvd	Colon Corporation	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000160	7467 Gulf Blvd	Junes Dunes Navarre LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000170	7459 Gulf Blvd	Sobieski Cynthia M	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000180	7453 Gulf Blvd	Shafer Todd J & Angie Marie	Vacant	0	0	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000190	7447 Gulf Blvd	Moore Brenton B & Cheryl P	Vacant	0	0	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000200	7439 Gulf Blvd	Hollingsworth Holdings LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000210	7433 Gulf Blvd	King Nancy Carole	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180049000220	7427 Gulf Blvd	Olfson Herbert B & Leah	Single Family	1	1	0.289	5.78	97	19.4
282S269180048000010	7411 Gulf Blvd	Dillon Betty R	Vacant	0	0	0.283	5.66	95	19
282S269180048000020	7405 Gulf Blvd	Golden Daniel Marcus	Single Family	1	1	0.283	5.66	95	19
282S269180048000030	7387 Gulf Blvd	Eddins Mark & Angela	Single Family	1	1	0.283	5.66	95	19
282S269180048000040	7381 Gulf Blvd	Dowling N Mitchell Jr	Single Family	1	1	0.283	5.66	95	19
282S269180048000050	7373 Gulf Blvd	LRB Properties of Florida LLC	Single Family	1	1	0.283	5.66	95	19
282S269180048000060	7369 Gulf Blvd	BHT Investments Inc	Vacant	0	0	0.285	5.7	95	19
282S269180048000070	7363 Gulf Blvd	Ellis Robert S et al	Vacant	0	0	0.292	5.84	95	19
282S269180048000080	7357 Gulf Blvd	Turner Gary & Staci	Vacant	0	0	0.296	5.92	95	19
282S269180048000094	7355 Gulf Blvd	Oliver Hugh E & Jane	SF TOWN	1	1	0.091	1.82	29	5.8
282S269180048000093	7353 Gulf Blvd	Thrasher Derek L & Thrasher Brandon D	SF TOWN	1	1	0.060	1.2	19	3.8
282S269180048000090	7351 Gulf Blvd	Johnson John T & Karen	SF TOWN	1	1	0.060	1.2	19	3.8
282S269180048000091	7349 Gulf Blvd	Dubble Roger L & Luanne W	SF TOWN	1	1	0.092	1.84	29	5.8
282S269180048000100	7345 Gulf Blvd	McKenzie Dan & Martha	Vacant	0	0	0.309	6.18	95	19
282S269180048000110	7339 Gulf Blvd	Donnie McRae Enterprises LLC	Vacant	0	0	0.316	6.32	95	19
282S269180048000120	7333 Gulf Blvd	Turner Gary & Staci	Single Family	1	1	0.320	6.4	95	19
282S269180048000130	7327 Gulf Blvd	Laughlin Patrick L	Vacant	0	0	0.324	6.48	95	19
282S269180048000140	7321 Gulf Blvd	Wolfe Stephen G & Brenda L	Vacant	0	0	0.329	6.58	95	19
282S269180048000150	7315 Gulf Blvd	Turner Gary & Staci	Single Family	1	1	0.329	6.58	95	19
282S269180048000160	7307 Gulf Blvd	Cooper Max D & Cooper Rosalie L	Vacant	0	0	0.377	7.54	106	21.2

26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
25.18	0.78%	\$ 921.86	N/A
25.18	0.78%	\$ 921.86	N/A
26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
26.18	0.81%	\$ 958.47	N/A
24.66	0.76%	\$ 902.82	N/A
25.66	0.79%	\$ 939.43	N/A
25.66	0.79%	\$ 939.43	N/A
25.66	0.79%	\$ 939.43	N/A
25.66	0.79%	\$ 939.43	N/A
24.7	0.76%	\$ 904.29	N/A
24.84	0.77%	\$ 909.41	N/A
24.92	0.77%	\$ 912.34	N/A
8.62	0.27%	\$ 315.58	N/A
6	0.19%	\$ 219.66	N/A
6	0.19%	\$ 219.66	N/A
8.64	0.27%	\$ 316.32	N/A
25.18	0.78%	\$ 921.86	N/A
25.32	0.78%	\$ 926.98	N/A
26.4	0.82%	\$ 966.52	N/A
25.48	0.79%	\$ 932.84	N/A
25.58	0.79%	\$ 936.50	N/A
26.58	0.82%	\$ 973.11	N/A
28.74	0.89%	\$ 1,052.19	N/A