Milwaukee County Parks

- Coastal Asset Inventory
- Coastline Management Guidelines





December 2020

Grant Funding - WI Coastal Management Program Grant

- File 19-342 authorized grant funding
 - Coastal Asset Inventory
 - Coastal Management Guidelines

- Protect Milwaukee County's financial investment in County-owned assets within the Lake Michigan Coastline Management Zone.
- Protect the ecology, resources, and natural character of County-owned lands within the Lake Michigan Coastline Management Zone.
- Provide efficiency and consistency when reviewing proposals for a scope of work to be completed within the Lake Michigan Coastline Management Zone.

Asset Inventory

- 477 Assets inventoried.
- 13% of assets identified were classified as being in poor condition.
- 22% assets were deemed highly vulnerable.
- The assets with the highest risk were the beaches, groins, and parking lots.
- Different infiltration basins, revetments, and parking lots in the vicinity of McKinley Marina all appeared in the top 40 most at risk.
- The total Milwaukee County coastal asset valuation is estimated at \$2,927,425,276 with approximately 50% of the cost attributed to bluff stabilization needs.

Milwaukee County Coastal Resources Inventory



Prepared by

Milwaukee County, Environmental Services Unit

In Partnership with Wisconsin Coastal Management Program and GZA Environmental, Inc.

Milwaukee County Project 5741-19805 Coastal Resilience Grant No. 017.CR08



OCTOBER 7, 2020

FINAL

Asset Inventory Evaluations

Asset Type	Sub Asset Type	Number of Assets	Value Type	Value Cost	Value Source		Sub Asset Valuation Total			
Athletic Courts	Stand-alone volleyball courts	1	Replacement	\$5,000/each	Capital Planning Bluffs:		\$5,000			
	Tennis Courts Track	1	Replacement Replacement	\$115k/each \$100k/each	Vulnerability Assessment:					
Athletic Fields	Soccer Multi-Use	4	Replacement Replacement	\$1,800/each \$1,800/each	Metric Distance from Shore	High <100 f	t	Medium 100-350 ft	Low >350 ft	Weight 25%
	Archery	1	Replacement	\$1,800/each	Shoreline Protection	Rated None	Poor or	Rated Fair	Rated Good	25%
					Recession Sum (5 years) ⁴	>1 ft		0.5-1 ft	< 0.5ft	30%
(A) Can dition Malue of (D) Mula analylity Malue - Desilion of Dating			Change in Soil Volume	>7,500 ft ³ 0 – 7		0 – 7,500 ft ³	<0 ft ³	20%		
(A) Condition value x (B) vulnerability value = Resiliency Rating Table 8. Vulnerability Me						ics for B	luffs.			
 Where (A) and (B) are the weighting factors with high and poor scoring a 1, m and low and good scoring a 3. NA conditions were considered a 3 for resilient Assets were grouped into three levels of priority, based on risk score: High Priority: Risk score below 4.5 					medium or fair scoring a ncy calculations.	a 2,	, Shoreline Recession & Bluff Failure Coastal Flooding Shore Protection Damage Beach Loss Beach Impairment Port, Harbor, & Marina Damage			High Moderate Moderate Moderate High Moderate
 Iviedium Priority: Risk score between 4.5 and 6.74 Lower Priority: Risk score 6.75 and above. 							Port, Harbor,	Moderate		

Asset Inventory Evaluation

Milwaukee County Coastal Resources Inventory - October 2020 APPENDIX IV – ASSET LIST BY RISK

	Туре	Location	Condition	Condition	VulnerabilityScore	Vulnerability	Risk	Risk	2020Cost
1	Beach	Big Bay	1	Poor	1	High	1	High	\$ 1,121,285
2	Groin	Warnimont Park	1	Poor	1	High	1	High	\$ 454,883
3	Groin	Warnimont Park	1	Poor	1	High	1	High	\$ 343,651
4	Revetment	McKinley Marina	1	Poor	1	High	1	High	\$ 175,375
5	Parking Lot	Bradford Beach	1	Poor	1.25	High	1.25	High	\$ 6,185,435
6	Breakwater	South Shore Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 2,990,000
7	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
8	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
9	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
10	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
11	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
12	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
13	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
14	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
15	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
16	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
17	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
18	Groin	Sheridan Park	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 55,000
		War Memorial and Art							
19	Revetment	Center	1	Poor	1.5	High	1.5	High	\$ 83,000

GIS Web App Data Tool

	A C Saarch	0 - 1	
Constal Consta	Search.	·	U X X V
Eile Edit View Exercise Tools Help			
The Lon view ravontes roots help			x
🔶 🔆 Earm not found 🚇 Hamilton COVID Data Das 🚽 🖉 Community Project Requests 🖾 MCLIO Man 🦚 SharePoint 🗐 County of Milwaukee Home 🦇 Projects 😫 Home - Dronbox	Shared with m	e - OpeDrive 👋 🦾 Home 👻 🚍 Print 💌 Safety 💌 Tools	s 🕶 🙆 Help
		Ratings County Assets	, C
		Layers	¢ ⇒
		🕨 🗹 🛛 Bluffs Total Risk Rating	***
		Bluff Condition Rating	•••
Lake Park		▶ 🗹 Bluff Vulnerability rating	•••
		▶ 🗹 Bluffs - 2015	•••
		▶ 🗹 Shoreline Protection Device	***
The stand and the stand of the		▶	•••
TANK STAND DISSI 100		Reference Data	C
Bradford Beach		Layers	Q.⊒.
		▶	
A A STATION AND		▶ 🛃 Bluff Crest Line - SEWRPC Coastal Management Zon	e ***
		▶ 🗹 Bluff Toe Line - SEWRPC Coastal Management Zone	•••
		▶ 🗹 Bluff Crest line	•••
		▶ 🗹 Bluff Toe line	
County of Milwaukee, Esri, HERE Milwaukee County Land Information O		▶ □ Shoreline	*** 、

Coastline Management Guidelines Applicability

• Reference tool as the County considers conducting work or evaluates proposals for work that could impact bluff slope stability:

Construction of infrastructure, occupiable buildings, and other facilities

Landscape management, such as landscape restoration, removal and/or pruning of vegetation, including invasive species

>Maintenance of existing infrastructure

Shore protection modifications and structures

History of Coastline Damages

- Past declared storm disasters in 2008, 2010, and 2020.
- Continuous coastline impacts cause degradation to bluffs.







Coastline Management Zone (CMZ)

- Based on recommendations for bluff setbacks published by the University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Institute in 2008.
- **Projected 6o-year bluff recession distance from the current bluff toe** (calculated using a minimum recession rate of one foot per year unless information revealed during the site analysis necessitates using a greater recession rate per year)
- **Future stable slope distance** (calculated from the existing bluff toe to the future stable bluff crest using the ratio of a one-foot vertical rise to a 2.5-foot horizontal run)
- Setback distance of 100 (provides for uncertainties related to future recession rates, stable slope angles, the effect of nearby shore protection structures, fluctuations in Lake Michigan water levels, and other factors)

Figure 3.1 Coastline Management Zone: 2020



Source: University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Program and SEWRPC





Map 2.x Bluff Crest and Bluff Toe Along the Milwaukee County Coastline



Review by Project Type

Submittals to be prepared by third parties (and their consultants) for County staff review.

Infrastructure & Buildings

- A proposal prepared by a Professional Engineer (P.E.) or Registered Architect (R.A.)
- Stormwater management
 - Direct away from the bluff
 - Low-impact development (LID)
 - Maintain existing stormwater drainage patterns and protect tributary ravines.

Landscape Management

- A proposal prepared by a Landscape Architect, and stability analysis performed by a Professional Engineer (P.E.)
 - Vegetation Inventory
 - Describe the vegetation to be removed and the means of removal
 - Identify replacement vegetation
 - Proposals related to viewshed management should account for the need to retain and maintain bluff vegetation in a variety of heights to promote bluff stability.

Shore Protection & Structures

- A proposal prepared by a Professional Engineer (P.E.)
 - A site investigation of slope stability, lakeshore erosion, and near-shore bathymetry
 - A plan for ensuring adequate quality control of materials used in the designed structure; and
 - Adequate monitoring and maintenance plans, as determined by Milwaukee County.

Bluff or Shoreline Modification

- A proposal prepared by a Professional Engineer (P.E.)
 - A slope stability analysis
 - A no adverse impacts (NAI) analysis stamped by a PE
 - A landscape management plan
 - Adequate monitoring and maintenance plans
 - A statement from the P.E. establishing that the proposed scope of work will not decrease the stability of the bluff area.

Questions

Final Guideline Documents Planned for January 2021





Cupertino Pier - Image Captured May 2018, Source: MCLIO

South Shore Breakwater - Image Captured May 2018, Source: MCLIO



Cupertino Pier Debris - Image Captured January 2020, Source: MCOEM



South Shore Breakwater Damage - Image Captured January 2020, Source: MCOEM