

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

TASK FORCE MEETING

March 15, 1995

MINUTES

I INTRODUCTION

Colonel Kenneth Clow, representing the Secretary of the Army, convened the eighteenth meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 9:45 a.m. on March 15, 1995, in the District Assembly Room of the Corps of Engineers headquarters in New Orleans. The agenda is attached as enclosure 1. The Task Force was created by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA), which was signed into law (PL 101-646, Title III) by President Bush on November 29, 1990.

II ATTENDEES

The Attendance Record for the Task Force meeting is attached as enclosure 2. Listed below are the six Task Force members. With the exception of Mr. Gohmert, who was represented by Mr. Bennet Landreneau, all were in attendance.

Dr. Len Bahr, State of Louisiana
Mr. Russell Rhoades, Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. David Frugé, U.S. Department of the Interior (Acting)
Mr. Donald Gohmert, U.S. Department of Agriculture
Mr. Thomas Bigford, U.S. Department of Commerce
Colonel Kenneth Clow, U.S. Department of the Army, Chairman

III APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Task Force meeting held on December 16, 1994 (enclosure 3) were approved unanimously with no discussion. Mr. Rhoades made the motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. Bigford seconded it. [1/74]¹

IV. TASK FORCE DECISIONS

A. CWPPRA Feasibility Studies--Steering Committee

Mr. Podany briefed the Task Force on the Steering Committee established at the December 16, 1994, Task Force meeting, and presented the committee's mission statement (enclosure 4). There was considerable discussion of the roles of the

¹ The Task Force meeting was recorded on audio tape. The bracketed figures represent the tape no./counter no. for the discussion of this item. Multiple tape/counter numbers are used when an item is discussed more than once during the meeting.

interagency study teams and the Steering Committee, particularly with regard to whether the study teams were no longer needed with the Steering Committee in place. Mr. Frugé and Mr. Podany envisioned the Steering Committee's role as being one of oversight, involving such activities as assuring compliance with protocols and procedures, whereas the study teams would be involved in day-to-day study activities, such as assigning study tasks. Dr. Bahr and Dr. van Heerden expressed the opinion that the Steering Committee obviates the need for the study teams. Mr. Frugé stated that he was only concerned that sufficient agency involvement in the studies be guaranteed; whether the involvement was accomplished through interagency study teams or the Steering Committee was immaterial. [3/455-5/222]

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That item 5 of the Steering Committee's mission statement be revised as follows: The Steering Committee will be the vehicle to ensure participation of all of the Task Force agencies in their respective areas of expertise throughout the study process.

Second: Dr. Bahr.

Passed unanimously. [5/223-256]

B. Fiscal Year 1995 Budget Amendment: Louisiana Barrier Shoreline Study.

Dr. DeRouen briefed the Task Force on the status of the Barrier Shoreline study, informing the Task Force that the budget submitted by DNR should have included a technical study advisor for year one only; thus, \$30,000 can be subtracted from the estimate for years two and three (enclosure 5 is the budget request for year one). In response to a question from Mr. Podany, Dr. DeRouen noted that funding designated for the study team was actually included for meetings in general. Mr. Frugé pointed out that close involvement in the study by Mr. Jeff Williams could increase Interior's funding requirement beyond the budgeted amount; the department will request an amendment if it becomes appropriate. [5/272-346]

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force amend the fiscal year 1995 budget to provide \$1,007,000 for first-year funding of the Barrier Shoreline study.

Second: Mr. Rhoades.

Passed unanimously. [5/347]

C. Fiscal Year 1995 Budget Amendment: Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution Study.

Mr. Axtman briefed the Task Force on the status of the MRSNFR study. He advised the Task Force that the study team, as directed by the Task Force at the December 16, 1994, meeting, had reviewed the study cost estimate for potential cost savings; the result was a reduction in front-end costs, with the possibility that the costs would be incurred later, unless sufficient alternatives could be screened out at an early stage. Enclosure 6 is the proposed first-year budget. [5/352-414]

Motion by Mr. Rhoades: That the Task Force amend the fiscal year 1995 budget to provide \$919,900 for first-year funding of the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution study.

Second: Mr. Landreneau.

Passed unanimously. [5/465]

D. Final Approval for Construction of the East Mud Lake Project, 2nd Priority Project List.

Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendation that the Task Force grant final construction approval for the East Mud Lake project, contingent upon approval of the monitoring plan by the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee and completion of pre-construction monitoring. Col. Clow informed the Task Force of a question raised by Mr. Mark Davis regarding the impact of the programmatic EIS being prepared by the New Orleans District on marsh management. Mrs. Hawes responded that the district's regulatory personnel have advised landowners that they will continue to process permit applications while the EIS is being prepared. Mr. Darryl Clark informed the Task Force that the permit for the East Mud Lake project has already been approved, along with the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Bigford questioned the urgency of constructing this project prior to completion of the EIS and publication of a marsh management report by the EPA Advisory Board. Mr. Landreneau replied that there is a certain urgency in keeping projects on schedule, as well as a need to prevent the loss of eroding wetlands in the project area. Col. Clow pointed out that the project has received considerable scrutiny and that the EIS will not settle all of the questions. [7/333-514]

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force approve construction of the East Mud Lake project from the 2nd Priority Project List, with the provision that construction is not to commence until the monitoring plan has been completed and approved by the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, and pre-construction monitoring has been completed.

Second: Mr. Landreneau.

In favor: Messrs. Frugé, Landreneau, and Rhoades and Dr. Bahr. Clow

Abstaining: Mr. Bigford. [7/517]

E. Printing of Land Loss Maps.

Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendation for Task Force funding of \$40,000 for printing of land loss maps prepared by the New Orleans District's Geology Section. The eight maps provide complete coverage of coastal Louisiana, depicting land loss in each of four discrete time periods: 1932-'58, '58-'74, '74-'83, and '83-'90.

Motion by Mr. Bigford: That the Task Force amend the fiscal year 1995 budget to provide \$40,000 for printing 300 copies of eight maps depicting land loss in coastal Louisiana from 1932 to 1990.

Second: Mr. Landreneau.

In favor: Messrs. Frugé, Landreneau, and Bigford and Dr. Bahr.

Absent: Mr. Rhoades. [8/532]

F. Funding for the Academic Advisory Group

Mrs. Hawes briefed the Task Force on the proposed activities of the Academic Advisory Group for fiscal year 1995 and requested that approximately \$110,000 be allocated for funding of those activities. [8/536-9/84]

Motion by Mr. Landreneau: That the Task Force amend the fiscal year 1995 budget to provide \$110,000 for involvement of the Academic Advisory Group.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: Messrs. Frugé, Landreneau, and Bigford and Dr. Bahr. Clow

Absent: Mr. Rhoades. [9/85-90]

G. Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Project.

Mr. Green briefed the Task Force on a National Park Service request for funding of the engineering and design effort for a shoreline protection project on Lake Salvador. The FEMA-financed project will be built in the vicinity of a breakthrough to Bayou Segnette. The estimated cost of engineering and design is \$60,000, 25 percent of which would have to be provided by a local sponsor. The project was listed as deferred on the first Priority Project List. Dr. van Heerden advised the Task Force that the State would have to ascertain that the project is consistent with its current goals, but said he believes the State would almost certainly be willing to cost share on the project. [9/289-339]

Motion by Mr. Bigford: That the Task Force provide \$45,000 in construction funds for engineering and design of the National Park Service's Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection project, subject to approval by the State, which will provide \$15,000 in cost-sharing funds.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: Messrs. Frugé, Landreneau, and Bigford and Col. Clow.

Absent: Mr. Rhoades. [9/340-344]

V. INFORMATIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

A. Dr. Good reported that LDNR, LDWF, and the LSU Agricultural Extension Service held a series of meetings throughout the coastal zone to discuss the need for and impacts of coastal restoration with local citizens, particularly fishermen. The three issues of greatest concern to the public were: impacts of freshwater diversions, the timetable for construction of barrier island restoration projects, and access (by both humans and aquatic organisms) to marsh management projects. Dr. Good said that

he is now preparing a report, which will be made available to anyone present at this Task Force meeting. [2/286-309]

B. Mr. Thomas reported on the status of the Conservation Plan. He advised the Task Force that an agreement among the Administrator of the EPA, the Secretary of the Army, the Director of the USFWS, and the Governor still lacks the signatures of the Secretary and the Governor; the Governor is prepared to sign as soon as the Secretary has done so. Col. Clow said that the agreement is being reviewed by Army Counsel in Washington, D.C. Mr. Thomas informed the Task Force that a meeting is scheduled for March 26, 1995, to review the draft grant proposal and develop a preliminary schedule. [5/472-532]

C. Reports on the status of approved priority list projects were given by Messrs. Elguezabal, Thomas, Frugé, Osborn, and Landreneau. [5/533-6/474]

D. Dr. Bahr reported that Coastal Summit '95 was a success. The planning group has agreed to reconvene some of the work groups; dates have not yet been set. Summit participants will receive a report on the conference as well as the plan for following up. [7/529-8/72]

E. Mr. Rhoades announced that as a result of a reorganization within EPA, this will probably be his last meeting as the agency's Task Force representative. He will be replaced by Mr. Bill Hathaway in the late spring or early summer. Mr. Rhoades told the Task Force that he had enjoyed his participation on the Task Force, and that the production of four priority project lists is testament to a job well done. He pointed out the need to get cost sharing agreements signed, to make sure that the public is (and feels) part of the process, and to conduct the educational campaign necessary to develop the public support essential to making the program successful. He expressed his gratitude for an opportunity most of his colleagues will never have--the opportunity to work on an ecosystem which is important not only to the nation but probably also to the world. [8/72-182]

F. Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendation to provide \$12,000 for funding of a request for proposals concerning an input/output model intended to help demonstrate the linkages between Louisiana's coastal wetlands and the economies of other states. Dr. Bahr, Mr. Bigford, and Mr. Frugé expressed opposition to the recommendation, largely due to the uncertainty of the results of the study, which is estimated to cost a minimum of \$150,000. The Task Force took no action relative to the recommendation. [8/202-531]

G. Dr. van Heerden requested \$300,000 for modeling the hydraulics of the Mermentau basin. Mr. Schroeder advised him that the USACE Black Bayou study will cover the entire Mermentau basin, and that the appropriate course of action at this point is for the interested parties (i.e., USACE, DNR, and NRCS, which is conducting a Mermentau River Basin study) to meet to discuss study needs and

funding requirements. At Mr. Thomas's request, Col. Clow directed that EPA be invited to the meeting. [9/106-221]

VI. TASKS REQUIRING FURTHER ACTION

A. Criteria for Selection of Priority List Projects.

Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendation that the Task Force adopt in principle a set of project selection criteria to provide consistency in the project selection process (the proposed criteria are shown at enclosure 7). The committee also directed the formation of a subcommittee to refine the weights assigned to the various criteria. Dr. Bahr, Mr. Rhoades, Dr. van Heerden, and Mr. Davis (of the Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana) suggested that the committee ought to reconsider the criteria. There was some discussion as to whether the Task Force should await the results of a workshop to be sponsored by the Coalition the week of May 22 for the purpose of considering selection criteria for CWPPRA projects. [1/84-2/125]

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Technical Committee be directed to produce within 30 days a revised proposal for project selection criteria, to be distributed to the Task Force and other interested parties for review, with the provision that revisions may be made as a result of the Coalition's May workshop.

Second: Mr. Rhoades.

Passed unanimously. [2/126-146]

B. Public Outreach.

Dr. Bahr announced that the Governor's Office had contracted with Gus Weill, Inc., to develop a proposal for a communications strategy. The proposal was presented to the Task Force by company representatives. [2/393-3/449]

Action: The Task Force directed the Outreach Committee to review the proposal and provide a written report prior to the next Task Force meeting. [3/432]

C. State Position Regarding Project Cost Overruns.

Dr. van Heerden advised the Task Force that the State is not in a position to handle the cost overruns on approved priority list projects. He said that he has been instructed by Secretary McClanahan that future cost sharing agreements must have language requiring review by the secretary if a project's base cost is to be exceeded. In cases where the cost exceeds 125 percent of the baseline cost, he said that the project should be deferred and reevaluated. He further said that DNR will request a modification in the language of approved cost sharing agreements to require review and approval by the secretary. Mr. Elguezabal pointed out that this policy raises significant legal issues which will have to be addressed. [6/482-7/183]

Action: The Task Force directed the Technical Committee to address the pertinent legal issues and present its findings to the Task Force. [7/184]

D. Carryover from Prior Fiscal Years

Mr. Green reported that, while the books are not yet cleared on fiscal years '92 and '93, there have been sufficient funds returned to provide for the FY '95 NEPA compliance requirements. The New Orleans District is still working to deobligate some unexpended funds, which will probably result in a surplus of about \$200,000 (beyond the amount required to fund NEPA compliance). [7/200-332]

Action: The Task Force directed the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee and the Technical Committee to determine how surplus funds should be spent. [7/323]

E. Procedure for Project Deauthorization.

The West Bay Sediment Diversion project and the Lower Bayou LaCache project were mentioned as candidates for deauthorization. [5/553-548; 6/280-320] There presently exists no procedure for deauthorization of priority list projects; there is a consensus among the agencies that public involvement must be a part of any established procedure. [9/225-256]

Motion by Mr. Landreneau: That the Technical Committee be directed to review the issue of deauthorization of priority list projects and present a recommendation to the Task Force at the next scheduled meeting.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: Messrs. Frugé, Landreneau, and Bigford and Dr. Bahr. *Claw*

Absent: Mr. Rhoades. [9/257-270]

VII. DATE AND LOCATION OF THE NEXT TASK FORCE MEETING

The next Task Force meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 21, 1995. Task Force members will be contacted to confirm the date.. [9/350]

VIII. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No written questions or comments were received from the public.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The Task Force meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
15 March 1995

Enclosure 1

Agenda

Enclosure 1

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

New Orleans

15 March 1995

9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

Tab

I. Introductions	
A. Task Force members or alternates	
B. Opening remarks by Task Force members	
II. Adoption of Minutes from the 16 December 1994 Meeting	D
III. Status of Tasks from the December 1994 Meeting Requiring Further Action	
A. Modification of the Evaluation and Selection Procedures for Priority List Projects--Mr. Schroeder	E
B. Development of Broader Public Involvement Strategy	F
i. Report on Outreach Committee--Mr. Addison	
ii. Proposal for Enhanced Public Involvement--Dr. Bahr	
IV. Status of Feasibility Studies	
A. Steering Committee Overview--Mr. Podany	G
B. Louisiana Barrier Shoreline Study--Dr. Van Heerden	H
C. Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Diversion Study--Mr. Axtman	I
V. Status of Development of the State Conservation Plan--Mr. Thomas	J
VI. Status of Approved Priority List Projects--Lead Agencies	K
VII. State Position Regarding Project Cost Overruns--Dr. van Heerden	L
VIII. Status of Planning Program Finances--Mr. Green	M
IX. Final Construction Approval for East Mud Lake Project--Mr. Schroeder	N
X. Report on Coastal Summit--Dr. Bahr	O
XI. Report on Proposed Input/Output Model of Wetland Benefits--Mr. Schroeder	P
XII. Report on Printing of Land Loss Maps--Mr. Schroeder	Q
XIII. Report on Academic Assistance Groups--Mrs. Hawes	R

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

New Orleans

15 March 1995

9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

(continued)

XIV. Proposal for Mermentau Basin Feasibility Study--Dr. van Heerden..... S

XV. Additional Agenda Items..... T

XVI. Date and Location of the Next Task Force Meeting..... U

XVII. Request for Written Questions from the Public..... V

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
15 March 1995

Enclosure 2

Attendance Record

Enclosure 2



ATTENDANCE RECORD



DATE(S) 15 Mar 95	SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force	LOCATION USACE New Orleans District District Assembly Room
----------------------	---	---

PURPOSE Meeting of the Task Force: 1st Quarter 1995

PARTICIPANT REGISTER *

NAME	JOB TITLE AND ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Jim Stone	Gov. Office / Coastal	504 342-6229
Rick Hardman	NMFS	389-0508
Stan Green	USACE Png Div	(504) 862-1486
Greg Steyer	DNR/CRD	504 342-9435
Ken Bahr	Gov Office / Coastal	504 342-6834
MARK DAVIS	CRCC	504 766 0195
Bill Good	DNR	504-342-7308
Calley Brignac	DNR	504-342-5330
CHRIS CLARK	LDNR	504 342 9418
JOHN D RADFORD	CRD / DNR	(504-342-9423)
Tom Polansky	USACE Png Div	504-862-2502
Karl DeRouen	LDNR	342-1375
Daniel Calverra	Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	318 437-3500
Norm Thomas	USEPA	214 655 2200
Samuel Holder	Minerals Management Service	504 736 2776
Ric Robinson	DOC/NMFS	504-389-0508
Bryth Pugh	USDA -NRCS	318 473 7816
Loisy Pale	USFWS	389-262-6662 ext. 234
Arant Clark	CRD/DNR	504-342-6690
Deuroe Reed	LDNR/CRD	504 851 2800
erry Bodin	Fish & Wildlife Service	318-262-6662 x244
Off Van Neuch	CRD DNR	504-342-1375
Gulser WOOD	Jeff Parish. Environmental	504 838-4230



ATTENDANCE RECORD



DATE(S) 15 Mar 95	SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force	LOCATION USACE New Orleans District District Assembly Room
----------------------	---	---

PURPOSE Meeting of the Task Force: 1st Quarter 1995

PARTICIPANT REGISTER *

NAME	JOB TITLE AND ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Jeanne Rockwell	EPA	214-665-8330
W. Clifford Smith	T. Baker Smith & Son, Inc.	504 8681050
Donnell Swenson	Gulf Intracoastal canal area	318 235-1634
John Woodard	CPG. La. Landowner Assoc	504-879-3528
Mike Holland	COE - Planning	504 862-2517
K.H. Schroeder Jr	Corps - Planning	504-862-2288
Russell Rhodes	EPA	214-665-2260
Karen Cantrell	Eric J. Co	504-342-3964
DAIR CARNEY	COE - PLANNING	504-862-2528
JOHN CURRAN	GCCA DELTA CHAPTER PRESIDENT	504-524-3376
Roy Francis	LAFORCHER Parish	504 632-4666
ONEIL MALIBRON	Coastal Engineering	504-868-3434
NICK CONSTAN	PD-E	862-1906
TOM BIGFORD	NMFS	301/713-2325

* If you wish to be furnished a copy of the attendance record, please indicate so next to your name.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
15 March 1995

Enclosure 4

Steering Committee Mission Statement

Enclosure 4

**STEERING COMMITTEE FOR COASTAL WETLANDS
PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT (CWPPRA)
FEASIBILITY STUDIES**

MISSION:

Expedites planning and implementation of the concurrent Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient and Freshwater Redistribution Study and the Barrier Shoreline Study. Provides strategic guidance to ensure that study managers develop draft implementation plans for these studies by Jan 96.

FUNCTIONS OF STEERING COMMITTEE:

1. Gets feasibility studies started and provides study guidance, conflict resolution, coordination, and review of the content of work throughout the studies' durations
 - resolves issues relating to scopes of work
 - seeks approval from Task Force on study scopes of work and schedules.
2. Provides general overview and strategic planning on:
 - funding sources
 - compliance to protocols and procedures
 - implementation of the studies
3. Reports directly to and from Task Force
4. Provides upward reporting; forms contacts within agencies to coordinate efforts
5. Supplements, but does not supercede, the continuing active participation of the interagency study teams established for these studies

MEMBERS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE:

The following individuals have been appointed to the committee by their respective Task Force agencies:

Gerry Bodin	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Len Bahr	Office of the Governor
Britt Paul	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Jeanene Peckham	Environmental Protection Agency
Tom Podany	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ric Ruebsamen	National Marine Fisheries Service

In addition, the Steering Committee has designated the study manager from each study as a non-voting member of the committee:

Study Manager for the Barrier Shoreline Study: Ivor L1. van Heerden, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
Study Manager for the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient and Freshwater Redistribution Study: Tim Axtman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

15 March 1995

Enclosure 5

Barrier Shoreline Study First-Year Budget

Enclosure 5

PROPOSED BARRIER SHORELINE FEASIBILITY STUDY BUDGET -- YEAR 1

1. Direct Labor Cost:

JOB TITLE	RATE		HOURS		TOTAL COST
Asst. Secretary	29.81	x	208	=	\$ 6,200
Special Assistant	17.79	x	520	=	9,251
Special Proj. Coordinator	22.71	x	520	=	11,809
Engineer Manager	28.05	x	208	=	5,834
Engineer Manager	28.05	x	208	=	5,834
Engineer Supervisor	25.17	x	208	=	5,235
Engineer Advanced	22.29	x	520	=	11,591
NR Geoscience Supervisor	24.74	x	208	=	5,146
NR Geoscience Specialist	15.11	x	520	=	7,857
NR Program Specialist	17.35	x	520	=	9,022
Secretary 2	11.38	x	520	=	5,918

TOTALS 4160 \$ 83,697

2. Overhead Costs: @ 22.99% = \$ 19,242

TOTAL (Direct Labor) \$ 102,939

3. Other Costs:

Graphics \$ 1,000
 Printing 1,000
 Travel (mileage, Per
 (Diem Lodging) 7,000
 Contracts
 1. 30,000 - Technical Study Advisor
 2. 750,000 - SOS, Phase I
 3. 115,500 - Federal & State agencies*
 18,000 - Agriculture
 27,000 - Army
 18,000 - Commerce
 22,500 - USEPA -
 18,000 - Interior
 12,000 - Governor's Office

TOTAL OTHER COSTS: \$ 904,500

TOTAL COST: \$ 1,007,439

* Inclusive of all agency costs for participation in study effort including travel expenses, preparation for and participation in meetings, overhead, etc.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

15 March 1995

Enclosure 6

Mississippi River Diversion Study First-Year Budget

Enclosure 6

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

15 March 1995

**MISSISSIPPI RIVER SEDIMENT, NUTRIENT, AND
FRESHWATER DISTRIBUTION FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Mr. Tim Axtman will brief the Task Force on the status of the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Distribution study. Enclosed is an outline of the proposed fiscal year 1995 budget for the study.

Breakdown of MRSNFR costs and distribution for remainder of FY 95

Organization	Study Element I	Study Element II	Total Cost (Costs x \$1000)
COE			
PD-FE	80.5	2.5	83.0
PD-E	35.8	32.0	67.8
PD-R	6.4	24.55	32.95
PD subtotal			183.75
ED-H	215.0	10.0	225.0
ED-F		16.6	16.6
ED-SR		15.0	15.0
ED subtotal			250.4
RE-L		5.0	5.0
subtotal	337.7	105.65	443.35
DNR-CRD	25.5	28.5	54.0
EPA	26.8	3.45	30.25
NMFS	19.2	7.0	26.2
NRCS	43.0	47.7	90.7
USFWS	9.0	6.4	15.4
NBS		6.0	6.0
USGS	2.0	10.0	12.0
LDWF		27.8	27.8
AAG	4.0	4.6	8.6
subtotal	129.5	141.45	270.95
TOTAL	467.2	247.1	714.3
Contingencies 12%			85.7
Study Funding Requirement Remainder of FY			800.0
Current FY 95 Expenditures			119.9
Unbudgeted expenditures for the preparation of the study scope and preliminary study tasks, by all Task Force agencies during this FY, amount to \$119,900.			
Total FY 95 Funding Requirement			919.9
Current Total Study Cost (w / contingencies)			4,092.4

The estimates for the remainder of the fiscal year reflect the development and execution of preliminary hydraulic models for the riverine and proto-typical receiving area portions of the study area. In addition baseline socio-economic and environmental conditions will be established with existing information and a minimum of new data collection. These analyses will be directed toward the development of an interim report or draft implementation plan approximately one year from the initiation of the study. This preliminary report will identify the range of resource redistribution which is physically possible and attempt to make qualitative assessments regarding existing conditions and resources which would stand to be affected by various alternatives. This initial report will assist in identifying which concept plans are supported by the state and give an update on the plan formulation process. The plan formulation process is expected to be substantially completed in November of 1997 with the preparation of a draft feasibility report. The total study duration is expected to be 41 months with the final feasibility report completed in September 1998.

These estimates also account for continuing efforts by the study team and work groups to establish the detail scope for the intermediate analyses of the study.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
15 March 1995

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PLANNING PROGRAM FINANCES

Mr. Green will brief the Task Force on the status of unexpended CWPPRA funds from prior fiscal years. A table displaying unexpended funds for each agency by fiscal year is enclosed.

14 Mar 95

Available CWPPRA Funds
(Amounts in \$)

	Obligations not Billed			Total	Anticipated Unexpended Balances			Total
	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94		FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	
EPA			238,678	238,678				0
Dept of Commerce								
NMFS	144,831	80,883	103,226	328,940	144,831	80,883		225,714 *
NOS	17,545	2,812		20,357	17,545	2,812		20,357 **
Dept of the Interior								
NPS	11,782			11,782				0
USFWS	118,388	685	41,818	160,891				0
USGS Reston				0				0
NWRC			9,590	9,590				0
Dept of Agriculture				0				0
State of Louisiana								
Gov's Ofc	31,782	53,400	44,102	129,284	31,782	53,400		85,182 †
DNR			78,178	78,178				0
Bar Isl Advrs			25,993					
USACE	334,623	-9,000	166,743	492,366	334,623	-9,000	154,443 ††	480,066
Unbudgeted			92,907	92,907				92,907
Total	627,169	75,380	731,140	1,433,689	496,999	74,695	247,350	819,044 → NEPA

Compliance
\$600k
EIS/EIA
for study
proposed

* Signed acceptances of deobligations were received on 6 Mar 95.

** Signed acceptances of deobligations were received on 23 Dec 94.

† Deobligations of unexpended FY92 and 93 funds are being processed.

†† \$12.3k reserved to develop RFP for I/O model study (Tech Com, 9 Mar).

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
15 March 1995

Enclosure 7

Project Selection Criteria as Recommended by
the Technical Committee

Enclosure 7

DRAFT

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CWPRA PRIORITY PROJECTS

The following criteria are proposed for use in selecting Priority Project Lists recommended by the CWPRA Technical Committee for approval by the Task Force. The criteria are to be applied to each candidate project (except proposed demonstration projects). The numerical scores derived from application of those criteria are to be used as the basic rationale for formulating the Priority Project List recommended to the Task Force.

1. **Cost-Effectiveness** - Sections 303(a) and (b) of CWPRA clearly place heavy emphasis on cost-effectiveness as a criterion for determining the order of priority for wetland restoration projects. Therefore, projects that protect, restore or create wetlands at lower relative cost (considering both habitat quality and quantity for fish and wildlife) will generally be ranked higher than other candidate projects that would be less cost-effective. Cost-effectiveness will continue to be measured on the basis of average annual cost per Average Annual Habitat Unit, utilizing the current Wetland Value Assessment methodology (WVA) or subsequent revisions.

Scoring: Using the following formula, a cost-effectiveness index is calculated for each candidate project:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Cost-Effectiveness} \\ \text{index of} \\ \text{project } n \end{array} = 10[1 - (E_n - E_1)/E_n]$$

Where: E_1 = Average Annual Cost per Average Annual Habitat Unit (AAHU) of the most cost-effective candidate project

E_n = Average Annual Cost per AAHU of project n

For example, a project that ranks third in cost-effectiveness on a list of 30 projects would have a cost effectiveness index of 5.0, calculated as follows:

$$E_n = \$600/\text{AAHU}$$

$$E_1 = \$300/\text{AAHU}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Cost-effectiveness} \\ \text{index} \end{array} = 10[1 - (600 - 300)/600] \\ = 10[1 - 300/600] \\ = 10[1 - 0.5] \\ = 10[0.5] \\ = 5.0$$

The cost-effectiveness index, which can not exceed 10 points, is multiplied by the criterion weight to calculate the project's Criterion 1 score.

Criterion weight: 0.55.

DRAFT

2. **Longevity/Sustainability** - Providing for the long-term conservation of Louisiana's coastal wetlands is a key CWPRA goal. Therefore, projects that achieve long-term maintenance or restoration of natural processes (e.g., sediment transport via crevasse) and can be sustained without extensive replacement actions will be favored over projects that will produce only short-term benefits and/or require extensive maintenance or replacement of project features to sustain long-term wetland benefits.

The WVA Team would forecast the longevity/sustainability of a project's wetland benefits, both during the 20-year project life and beyond. That forecast would consider the following factors:

1. The ability of a project (including planned operation, maintenance, and replacement actions) to provide wetland benefits through the end of the 20-year project life.
2. The project's ability to provide wetland benefits beyond target year 20 without any further operation, maintenance, or replacement of project features. This evaluation would consider anticipated effects of anticipated site-specific conditions, such as hydrology, wave energy, saltwater intrusion, subsidence, and landscape conditions.

Scoring: The WVA team would (by consensus or by majority vote if a consensus cannot be reached) select one of the conditions listed below which they determine to be most applicable to the project being evaluated.

- a. Project expected to continue providing substantial wetland benefits more than 40 years after construction: 10 points.
- b. Project expected to provide substantial wetland benefits 30 to 40 years after construction: 7 points.
- c. Project expected to cease providing substantial wetland benefits 20 to 30 years after construction: 3 points.
- d. Project expected to cease providing substantial wetland benefits less than 20 years after construction: 0 points.

The point score associated with the selected condition (no point extrapolations) will be multiplied by the criterion weight of 0.15 to calculate a project's Criterion 2 score.

Criterion weight: 0.15.

3. **Support of Restoration Plan Strategy** - All eligible candidate projects must be identified in the CWPPRA Restoration plan or subsequent revisions. "Critical Projects", as defined in that Plan, directly implement a basin's key restoration strategy and objectives. "Supporting Projects" address more-localized wetland protection and restoration needs. Therefore, Critical Projects will be given greater weight than Supporting Projects.

Scoring: Based on whether a project is critical or supporting, points are assigned as listed below.

- a. Critical Projects: 10 points.
- b. Supporting Projects: 5 points.

The Criterion 3 score would be calculated by multiplying the project's points by the criterion weight of 0.15.

Criterion weight: 0.15.

4. **Supporting Partnerships** - The State's required cost share for CWPPRA projects is derived from the State's Conservation and Restoration Fund (Trust Fund). The degree to which non-Federal entities agree, in writing, to bear all or part of the State's cost-share with non-Trust Fund sources will weigh favorably in project selection: contributions could consist of cash or in-kind services, including those covering maintenance, operation, or replacement expenses. Donation of land rights would not be considered as a financial contribution.

Scoring: The following formula would be used to calculate the partnership index which cannot exceed 10 points:

$$\text{Partnership Index} = 10[1 - (SS - PS)/SS]$$

Where: SS = dollar amount of the required 25 percent non-Federal cost share
PS = dollar amount of the non-Federal cost (other than that provided via the Trust Fund) to be contributed by the partner(s)

The Partnership Index would be multiplied by the criterion weight of 0.05 to calculate the Criterion 4 score.

Criterion weight: 0.05

5. **Public Support** - The degree of public support (evidenced by written endorsement or testimony at a CWPPRA-related public meeting) is an important indicator of a project's

DRAFT

acceptability and implementability.

Scoring: From the following list, select one of the following.

- a. Project is supported by local and State elected officials, and Congressional representatives: 10 points.
- b. Project is supported by 2 of above entities: 7 points
- c. Project is supported by 1 of above entities: 3 points.
- d. Project is not supported by any of above entities. 0 points.

The appropriate would be multiplied by the criterion weight of 0.05 to calculate a project's Criterion Five score.

Note: We will solicit ideas for alternative scoring approaches from the Citizen's Participation Group and other entities.

Criterion weight: 0.05

6. **Risk/Uncertainty** - Projects with a greater probability of long-term success will rank higher than those for which there is a greater level of uncertainty regarding success. Uncertainty may stem from a project's location in a rapidly changing or subsiding area, vulnerability to hurricane damage, or the use of untested or otherwise questionable methods. Risk may arise when contaminated sediments, water quality issues, or other problems are involved.

Scoring: Each Task Force agency's WVA team member and the assigned academic advisor will be given one vote; they can vote "yes" if they have a reasonable degree of confidence that the project will meet its objectives, or "no" if they do not. Each "yes" vote will be counted as 1 point; each "no" vote will be counted as zero points. Points will be summed to determine the point total. No project can receive more than 7 points. A project's point total would be multiplied by the criterion weight of 0.05 to calculate the Criterion 6 score.

Criterion weight: 0.05.

The Criterion Scores for each project would be summed to calculate a project's Selection Score. Using those Selection Scores, projects would then be ranked in descending

DRAFT

order. The Technical Committee would then be required to select projects for inclusion in the recommended Priority Project List according to their ranking (highest scores first) until the anticipated funds are exhausted for that year. Their selection would be recommended to the Task Force for approval. The Task Force would retain the right to approve the list as recommended, or to adopt a different Priority Project List.

Summary of Criteria Weights

Cost-Effectiveness	0.55
Longevity/Sustainability	0.15
Support of Restoration Plan Strategy	0.15
Supporting Partnerships	0.05
Public Support	0.05
Risk/Uncertainty	0.05
Total	<hr/> 1.00