

G STREET EROSION CONTROL DESIGN WORKSHOP SUMMARY
10/27/2017 8 AM – 1 PM CEDAR KEY COMMUNITY CENTER

This workshop was the second in a series of workshops about coastal erosion in Cedar Key hosted by the University of Florida. The goal of the workshop series was to introduce property owners to various concepts regarding erosion in Cedar Key's Daughtry Bayou, including the history of erosion, impacts of erosion, and potential ways to mitigate erosion. The objectives of the meeting series were as follows:

Workshop 1: Coastal Erosion Visioning Workshop, 3/3/2017

- Discuss erosion history in the area and preferences for shoreline uses
- Learn more about and compare various options for erosion control
- Narrow down a range of acceptable project types that promise to preserve the shoreline at G Street and Airport Rd. locations, according to preferred uses.

Workshop 2: G Street Design Workshop, 10/27/2017

- Review workshop 1 process & outcomes
- Answer questions that stakeholders raised at workshop 1
- Present designs based on preferences from workshop 1, discuss specifics for further refinement
- Come to agreement on best design option for follow up funding & implementation at G Street

Workshop 3: Airport Rd. Design Workshop, 11/3/2017

- Review workshop 1 process & outcomes
- Answer questions that stakeholders raised at workshop 1
- Present designs based on preferences from workshop 1, discuss specifics for further refinement
- Come to agreement on best design option for follow up funding & implementation at Airport Rd.

The G Street Design Workshop was attended by 19 participants and 4 project team members for a total of 23 attendees. Property owners were well represented at the workshop, with 10 of the 19 participants owning property on G Street. The rest of the participants were either residents of adjacent roads, City officials, or residents of Cedar Key (but not on an adjacent road). There was no county representative at this meeting but they were invited/aware.

Project team members in attendance:

Savanna Barry – UF IFAS Nature Coast Biological Station

Mark Clark – UF IFAS Soil and Water Science Department

Wendy-Lin Bartels – Florida Natural Resources Leadership Institute

Marc Minno – Suwannee River Water Management District

Workshop Agenda:

G-STREET DESIGN WORKSHOP	
STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON OPTIONS FOR EROSION CONTROL IN CEDAR KEY	
8am – 1pm, Oct 27 th 2017 , Cedar Key Community Center, 809 6 th Street Local Contact = Savanna Barry, UF/IFAS Extension Sea Grant Cell: 804-305-6014	
AGENDA	
8:00	Coffee & Registration
8:00 – 8:10	WELCOME, REVIEW OF OBJECTIVES & AGENDA
8:10 – 8:30	LOOKING BACK: WORKSHOP 1
8:30 – 8:50	FEEDBACK ON REQUEST FOR CONTEXT INFORMATION
8:50 – 10:00	DESIGN OPTION PRESENTATIONS
10:00 – 10:15	BREAK
10:15 – 11:15	DESIGN OPTION RANKING DISCUSSION
11:15 – 11:45	REFINEMENT & OPTION SELECTION
11:45 – 12:00	NEXT STEPS, CLOSURE & EVALUATION
12:00 – 1:00	LUNCH

The workshop began with a review of the agenda and objectives for workshop 2 to orient participants to the goals for the meeting. There was a show of hands to determine who was new to the process and who had been involved in previous workshops in the series. About 30% of people raised their hands to indicate they were new to the process.

Those in the group that were part of Workshop 1 were asked to share what they remembered from the March meeting. The group remembered that history was covered, both with the aerial images of erosion over time on G Street and the timeline of everyone’s experiences on Cedar Key’s shorelines. The timeline was up on the wall and people especially remembered stories about playing on the G Street beach with family. Participants remembered the golf cart field trip and the stops along the way including riprap, city beach, and Joe Rains. The group remembered the graphic/cartoons of the the project types and the voting results. This discussion reminded attendees of the stakeholder preferences revealed in Workshop 1. For G Street, stakeholders voted nourishment + stabilization and vegetation + breakwater as their top choices, with vegetation with edge/sill voted as a slightly favorable option.

After going over Workshop 1, Mark addressed the questions from last time about mangroves and let the group know that we are discussing potential permit options with DEP about managing mangroves in a special way in the footprint of a living shoreline project. The project

team was not able to give a definitive answer about where this exemption might go and, even if the exception were to be granted, it is unclear who would perform such maintenance. Then, Savanna covered some basic information about beach access laws. We covered that the public is allowed to access the land below the high tide line as long as they cross to that point at a public point. We also covered the fact that property owners are protected from liability if someone accesses their land for recreational purposes as long as they are not charging for access (explained by [Florida's Landowner Liability Law](#) (Fla. Stat. § 375.251)). There are many more details that can be explored at: <http://www.flseagrant.org/wateraccess/beaches/>. We also had a legal expert (Staff Attorney at the UF Law Conservation Clinic, Justin Caron) in attendance to listen and research any additional legal questions that might arise during the workshop or after (during permitting, etc.).

After some discussion/questions about access and mangrove issues, the workshop moved into the next segment where the project team presented the draft designs for G Street. Before the presentation, Wendy-Lin split the room into groups based on the use they identify with most closely (e.g., homeowner, fishing, kayaking, walking/biking). Participants were asked to grade each design from the perspective of the user-group they had chosen. Each design was presented and Mark made some comments regarding the function of each project element. Participants wrote down their grades (based on their use) and then Mark presented the “expert scorecard” for each design. The scorecard showed the grades for categories such as environmental services (habitat, wave dissipation, carbon sequestration, and water quality), longevity, cost (construction and maintenance), and likelihood of obtaining external funding. (See Appendix for copies of the design options and scorecards).

After all of the designs were presented, participants broke out into small groups to discuss and refine their grade. The goal was to have each user group present a final grade on each design that would be added to the scorecard to give a complete picture of stakeholder preferences. After the discussion, the groups came back together to report out to everyone about what they had discussed and decided.

Each group presented their grades and we began a discussion to try to figure out what factored into the decisions to grade some options low based on certain uses – the goal of this section of the discussion was to figure out where the designs could be refined to better suit needs/desires of the homeowners and other users.

Discussion points included:

- Issues with potential for mangroves to establish if vegetation is planted
 - o Main worry from property owners in town that mangroves will block access to shoreline, block view, and create a maintenance issue/cost to trimming them
 - o Reiterated that you could collect the seeds from an area if you wanted to prevent anything from taking root – but this is a lot of work
- Many liked the cost-effectiveness of options 1 and 2
- Desire for safe/designated access point to shoreline

- Designated kayak launch on the city parcel - designated paths vital/important part of design
- Some in the group felt oysters posed serious safety concerns for tourists, especially kayakers and swimmers.
 - Ideas to mitigate this concern included
 - Markers
 - Relaying oyster clumps
 - Building oyster reef sections out of blocks that would not tumble around as easily
- A few ideas for the “potato head” beach:
 - Take Jetty from #3 and put it on #1
 - Take most of veg out from #3 (anything past the dock)
 - Do a phased project where you start with #1 and then add some groins from #2 2 or 3 years down the road if erosion too fast
- But landowners really concerned about land preservation/maintaining land and mangrove height/establishment
- In all, most agreed that landowners must make the final call since they have to sign off, regardless of use impacts.

CONCLUSION

At the end of the meeting, it was fairly clear that most, especially land owners, would be happy with a combination of project option #1 and #2, either in tandem or in a phased approach, depending on funding and final sign-off. There was a dissenting opinion that felt a hardened solution like riprap or seawall were needed to protect the road. These concern were regarded as important by several people. Most landowners pushed back against it but others felt a hardened solution would be the one most likely to allow continued operation of their dock. Overall, everyone could at least agree that they would not block a combo of #1/#2, as long as certain assurances could be provided in the engineering phase – reaching the working definition of consensus we have been using in this process.

The overall conclusions of the meeting were:

- 1) We needed to keep moving forward (i.e., “Do nothing” is not acceptable)
- 2) Property owners will hear from Savanna and Mark about next steps
- 3) Several felt that continuing to meet is important
- 4) Savanna will work on getting a website up as soon as possible - resource for updates and information