

**Department of Parks and Recreation, Division of Boating and Waterways
Shoreline Erosion Control and Public Beach Restoration Program**

GRANT APPLICATION RANKING METHODOLOGY
Fiscal Year 2026/27 Funding

Applications submitted for funding under the Shoreline Erosion Control and Public Beach Restoration grant programs will be ranked based on the criteria below. A total of 300 points are available. Applications receiving less than 225 points will not be eligible for grant funding. This ranking methodology is based on priorities established in state statute and policy.

Project Benefits

Up to 115 points available

Erosion of shoreline areas and loss of public beaches can create immediate risks to public health and safety, low-cost recreational uses, and irreplaceable natural resources near the shoreline.

- Up to 60 points for **health and safety benefits** the project will directly provide for up to 20 years following project completion.
 - Up to 25 points if the project will protect an area where the public is at high risk during storm surges, exceptionally high tides, and strong wave activity.
 - Up to 20 points if the project will protect essential public utility infrastructure such as water lines and sewer stations and/or safety buildings such as hospitals and police stations.
 - Up to 10 points if the project will protect vital public roads from submersion and damage worse than occasional nuisance flooding.
 - Up to 5 points if the project will protect, create, or improve existing emergency access to, from, and within the shoreline area.
- Up to 40 points for **low-cost recreational benefits** the project will directly provide for up to 20 years following project completion.
 - Up to 15 points if the project will protect shoreline recreation sites that are easily accessible for low cost to other fee-based recreation activities.
 - Up to 10 points if the project will protect sites where recreational uses would be wholly or mostly lost without the project.
 - Up to 10 points if the project site's recreational benefits are unlikely to be impacted by nearby shore-altering projects.
 - Up to 5 points if construction of the project is unlikely to cause more-than-trivial negative recreation impacts near the site and downcoast.

- Up to 15 points for **environmental benefits** the project will directly provide for up to 20 years following project completion. This category is unrelated to environmental compliance, which is addressed separately below.
 - Up to 5 points if the project site is and will remain a habitat for coastal plant species.
 - Up to 5 points if the project will preserve other unique natural assets in and near the shoreline area.
 - Up to 5 points for projects that will avoid more-than-trivial negative environmental impacts near the site and downcoast.

Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

Up to 80 points available

The limited funds available to fund these programs must be used as impactfully as possible in order for DBW to effectively fulfill all of its mandates, including but not limited to these grant programs.

- 20 points if **cost contribution by local and other non-DBW state partners** is 25% of nonfederal project cost or higher.
- 20 additional points for verification **that federal and/or local cost participation** will be 65% of project cost or higher, OR 10 additional points for verification it will be 50% or higher.
- Up to 25 points for **public economic benefits resulting from this project within the next 20 years.**
 - Up to 10 points if this project will avoid displacement or loss of non-recreational assets for an economically vulnerable community.
 - Up to 5 points if this project will help a public entity avoid non-trivial future economic burdens.
 - Up to 5 points if this project will protect existing, economically productive, and publicly-owned assets.
 - Up to 5 points if this project will demonstrate an unusual coastal protection approach that could be useful at sites elsewhere in the State.
- Up to 15 points for this project being **superior to or equivalent to other potential solutions**, including no action and managed retreat.
 - Up to 5 points if the application explains convincingly that completing this project would be superior to taking no action.
 - Up to 5 points if the application explains convincingly that completing this project would be superior to implementing managed retreat at and near the project site.

- Up to 5 points if the application identifies at least one additional alternative and explains convincingly that completing this project would be a superior option.

Strategic Planning

Up to 80 points available

Erosion of shoreline areas and loss of public beaches can create long-term risks that are best dealt with strategically, on a regional basis (so a solution in one place does not cause problems elsewhere), and with a realistic understanding of future risks. DBW has long funded work of the Coastal Sediment Management Workgroup with these priorities in mind, and the Governor's Office has directed state agencies to consider sea level rise and coastal resiliency planning in investment decisions.

- Up to 40 points for the proposed project being part of a long-term management plan to provide **erosion control benefits** for the site and/or region, and avoiding creation of new erosion problems in nearby locations.
 - Up to 10 points for projects at sites experiencing current or imminent shoreline erosion that is likely to persist without intervention. (Up to 5 points if site erosion is non-chronic, or is anticipated in the future but is not current or imminent.)
 - Up to 10 points for projects proposed under a management plan that seeks to address erosion beyond the immediate problem. (Up to 5 points if the management plan would effectively address the immediate problem but does not address the long-term issue.)
 - Up to 10 points if the project provides long-term storm surge protection for public assets. (Up to 5 points if the project will provide short-term storm surge protection for public assets.)
 - Up to 10 points if the planned erosion control method is adaptable to unknown future conditions, or if the project is a feasibility study considering solely adaptable options. (Up to 5 points if the proposed project is a feasibility study that is considering both adaptable and non-adaptable erosion control solutions.)
- Up to 40 points for the project purposefully addressing issues related to **sea level rise planning** within the littoral cell in the next 50 years.
 - Up to 10 points if there are current, documented sea level rise issues at the site that will persist without intervention. (Up to 5 points if there are imminent or forecasted sea level rise issues at the site.)
 - 10 points if the project will address anticipated sea level rise of 6 feet or more. (5 points if it will address anticipated sea level rise of 3 feet or more.)
 - Up to 10 points if the long term private benefits to be realized from sea level rise protection at this location are zero or trivial.

- Up to 10 points if the sea level rise management approach is adaptable to changing site conditions, or if this is a study where only adaptable approaches are being considered. (Up to 5 points if the project is a study that is considering both adaptable and non-adaptable approaches to sea level rise.)

Timeliness of State Participation

Up to 25 points available

If a grant award cannot be encumbered via a grant agreement in the first year it is available, or if it will not be fully utilized within four years, it is likely the requested funds are being requested prematurely, and would be better used elsewhere in the state to address other issues DBW is responsible for.

- 10 points for **public hearings** having already been conducted specific to this project, with an opportunity for public comment. (5 points if a public hearing has not yet occurred but has been scheduled for a specific date, or if a hearing has occurred but public opposition has not been adequately addressed.)
- Up to 10 points for **permitting** being complete at time of application.
 - For nonfederal construction projects only, 3 points if a Coastal Development Permit has been obtained from the appropriate authorizing body. (1.5 points if documentation confirms this process is in progress.)
 - For federal construction projects only, 3 points if a Consistency Determination from the California Coastal Commission has been obtained. (1.5 points if documentation confirms this process is in progress.)
 - 2 points if the project's Army Corps of Engineers' Clean Water Act section 404 permit and Rivers and Harbors Act section 10 permit have been obtained. (1 point if documentation confirms this process is in progress.)
 - 2 points if the project's Regional Water Quality Control Board 401 (Clean Water Act section 401 certification from the appropriate Water Board) has been obtained. (1 point if documentation confirms this process is in progress.)
 - 1 point if the project's US FWS ESA Section 7 permit has been obtained. (1 point if this process is in progress.)
 - 1 point if additional federal, regional, and state permitting for this project is either complete or unnecessary. (0.5 points if any of these are in progress.)
 - 1 point if local permitting for this project is either complete or unnecessary. (0.5 points if any of these are in progress.)
 - Feasibility studies and design studies will receive partial credit for each item above if the application acknowledges the need for each permit and includes a credible schedule for obtaining them.
- 5 points for **CEQA / NEPA** already complete at time of application, for site and project if both are separately necessary. (No partial credit available.)

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

Answer must be “Yes” to each question below.

- Is there some element of the proposed project that would protect public health and safety?
- For studies under the Public Beach Restoration Program, is the proposed study necessary to construct a specific beach restoration project?
- While private interests may incidentally benefit from the proposed project, are benefits to public interests the only reasons the applicant is requesting a grant?
- Has the applicant guaranteed it will own, control, and maintain all the property encompassing the non-State-controlled project area for at least 20 years after project completion?
- Is there public access to the shoreline area the project would protect?
- Do existing studies, reports, and/or designs suggest that the proposed project described in the grant application is feasible?
- Does the application demonstrate that the applicant considered alternatives to this project, including (for all proposals) “no project” and managed retreat, and could reasonably determine the proposed project is superior to the alternatives?
- If previous project(s) at the site failed, does this project proposal appear to address the reasons for the past failure?
- Has the applicant consulted an engineer or subject matter expert regarding the feasibility of this project?
- Is this project compatible with other known projects nearby and in the littoral cell?
- Does the application present a credible plan for fully funding this phase of the project?
- Can the project be completed by the end of the fourth year in which funding would be available?
- Does the application include a credible project schedule?
- Is the benefit and cost information credible, and does it indicate the project's 20 year benefits will exceed its 20 year costs?
- Has the applicant provided a credible plan for satisfying the relevant grant program's match requirement?
- Has the applicant either provided all necessary resolutions authorizing the application or provided a credible schedule for sending them to DBW that will meet all deadlines?
- Are the required attestation language and signature present at the end of the application?