

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

New Orleans
30 September 1996
1:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Introductions
- II. Adoption of Minutes from the 26 June 1996 Meeting
- III. Status of Tasks from the June 1996 Meeting Requiring Further Action) *funded by Const #*
National Outreach Proposal
 1. Outreach Committee Report (Mr. Addison)
 2. Proposal by the State of Louisiana (Sec. Caldwell)
- IV. Status of Development of the State Conservation Plan (Ms. Ethridge) *Draft 30 Mar 97 Final = 30 May 97*
- V. Status of Feasibility Studies (Mr. Podany)
- VI. Status of the Construction Program (Mr. Clark)
- VII. Fiscal Year 1997 Budget (Mr. Schroeder)
- VIII. Amendments to the Restoration Plan (formal approval) (Mr. Green)
- IX. Monitoring Plan for the Brady Canal Project (Mr. Schroeder)
- X. *Approved* Expanded Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project (Mr. Schroeder) *additional + 768,000*
- XI. *Approved* Revised GIWW to Clovelly Hydrologic Restoration Project (BA-2) (Mr. Schroeder) *smaller version of project*
- XII. Atchafalaya Liaison Group Proposal (Mr. Schroeder)
- XIII. 6th Priority Project List (Mr. Green) *Approval in 1st meeting in 1997. (Mar?)*
- XIV. Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Restoration Plan Evaluation Report (Mr. Meffert)
- XV. Additional Agenda Items
- XVI. Request for Public Comments
- XVII. Date and Location of the Next Task Force Meeting

Lake Salvador - new estimate?
BA-2 - new estimate?

25 Sep 96
4:15 p.m.

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

TASK FORCE MEETING
September 30, 1996

MINUTES

I. INTRODUCTION

Colonel William Conner, representing the Secretary of the Army, convened the twenty fourth meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 1:00 pm on September 30, 1996, in the District Assembly Room of the Corps headquarters building 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. All members were in attendance.

Dr. Len Bahr, State of Louisiana
Mr. William Hathaway, Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. David Frugé, U.S. Department of the Interior
Mr. Donald Gohmert, U.S. Department of Agriculture
Mr. Thomas Bigford, U.S. Department of Commerce
Colonel William Conner, U.S. Department of the Army, Chairman

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Task Force meeting held on June 26, 1996 (enclosure 3), were approved unanimously with no discussion. Dr. Bahr made the motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. Gohmert seconded it. [1/57]¹

IV. TASK FORCE DECISIONS

A. Outreach Committee Report and Proposal by the State of Louisiana

Mr. Addison, chairman of the Outreach Committee, presented the committee's recommendation for a comprehensive outreach program that would educate the public and involve people in the CWPPRA program (enclosure 4). He estimated the cost of the program at as much as \$180,000 per year, although the proposed budget of \$130,000 would be adequate for initiating the program; more funds could be requested later if required. [1/63]

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.

Secretary Jack Caldwell of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources presented a plan to work with the Outreach Committee, other agencies and organizations, and contractors to provide public education and involvement in the CWPPRA program. [1/329] He assured the Task Force that the State's formal outreach proposal would be ready for review very soon and that it would not call for an expensive program. [2/170] Col. Conner noted that Mr. Addison, as chairman of the Outreach Committee, would be responsible for assuring a seamless connection between CWPPRA outreach efforts and those of other programs, such as the Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program.

Motion by Mr. Gohmert: That the Task Force approve the proposal of the Outreach Committee and that the State prepare a scope of work for developing a national outreach program under the Conservation Plan. [1/516]

Second: Mr. Frugé.

Passed unanimously. [2/166]

B. Fiscal Year 1997 Budget

Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendation for the fiscal year 1997 budget (enclosure 8 shows the detailed agency budgets; enclosure 9 is a summary of the planning program). He noted that LDNR's budget request includes \$90,000 for preparation of an oyster lease geographic information system, a new item supported by all of the agencies. He advised the Task Force that the Technical Committee will establish guidelines for the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee for formulation of the fiscal year 1998 budget. [3/100-141]

Mr. Frugé pointed out that this budget does not include costs for NEPA compliance and monitoring plan development, which will now be construction costs; priority list development costs have increased by about \$389,000 over the FY 96 amount, mostly due to two of the agencies. He suggested that limits should be set for budget amounts for each task. He also recommended that less money be spent in planning for smaller scale projects, and that areas be identified for large-scale project planning on the 7th Priority Project List. [3/142-246]

Mr. Martin Cancienne, representing Congressman Billy Tauzin, advised the Task Force of the need to address large projects to demonstrate CWPPRA's effectiveness to the nation as a whole. [3/247-260]

At the request of Mr. Bigford, Col. Conner stated that \$50,000 of the \$140,000 unallocated in the FY 97 budget would be reserved for outreach activities. [3/265-270]

Motion by Mr. Gohmert. That the Task Force approve the fiscal year 1997 budget as recommended by the Technical Committee.

Second. Dr. Bahr

Passed unanimously. [3/292]

C. Amendments to the Restoration Plan

Mr. Green presented the amendments approved via a 22 Jul 96 telephone vote by the Task Force for the Louisiana Coastal

Wetlands Restoration Plan. He noted that procedures established by the Task Force call for a formal vote at its next meeting [3/301-3/310]

Motion by Mr. Frugé. That the Task Force approve the addition of the following projects to the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Restoration Plan.

- a. XTV-20 Little White Lake Terracing
- b. CW-n Oil Field Restoration (to be added on a coastwide basis)
- c. XBA-75 Jetty Modification at Tiger Pass
- d. XBA-76 Mississippi River Diversion at Boothville
- e. XBA-75 Terrebonne Ridge Hydrologic Restoration
- f. PPO-2h Lake Borgne West of Shell Beach
- g. XCS-55 Sabine Terracing Assumption of Maintenance

Second. Mr. Hathaway
Passed unanimously. [3/312]

D. Monitoring Plan for the Brady Canal Project
Mr Schroeder presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee for approval of the monitoring plan for the Brady Canal project. [3/315-346]

Motion by Mr. Gohmert. That the Task Force approve the monitoring plan for the Brady Canal project as recommended by the Technical Committee.

Second. Mr. Frugé.
Passed unanimously. [3/348]

E. Expanded Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project

Mr. Schroeder briefed the Task Force on the recommendation of the Technical Committee for approval of the expanded Lake Salvador Shoreline Demonstration Project (enclosure 10). [3/350-3/518]

Motion by Dr. Bahr. That the Task Force approve the expanded Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project as recommended by the Technical Committee.

Second. Mr. Gohmert
Passed unanimously. [3/520]

F. Revised GIWW to Clovelly Project

Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendation for approval of the revised GIWW to Clovelly project. He noted that land rights problems have caused the lead agency to reduce the scope of the project (enclosure 11). [3/521-3/540]

Motion by Mr. Bigford. That the Task Force approve the revised GIWW to Clovelly project as recommended by the Technical Committee.

Second. Mr. Frugé
Passed unanimously. [3/542]

G. Atchafalaya Liaison Group Proposal

Mr. Schroeder presented the Technical Committee's recommendations for a proposal to establish the Atchafalaya Liaison Group (enclosure 12). He said the group would assure the sharing of information among studies, that recommendations made by non-CWPPRA studies are consistent with the Restoration Plan, that opportunities for combining restoration projects are maximized, and that the Task Force is apprised of issues developed in non-CWPPRA studies as they affect CWPPRA. Mr. Schroeder advised the Task Force that the liaison group would report through the Technical Committee. In response to a question from Col. Conner, Mr. Schroeder said that there would be a report from the group at each Task Force meeting. [3/547-4/40]

Dr. Good noted that LDNR may need another seat on the liaison group for Sandra Thompson, who is very involved in work on the Atchafalaya basin. Col. Conner agreed that Ms. Thompson could be added to the committee. [4/70-77]

Mr. Oneil Malbrough suggested that local sponsors should be included in the meetings, perhaps as members of the committee. Mr. Schroeder agreed that including the local sponsors is very important. [4/79-93]

Motion by Dr. Bahr. That the Task Force approve the Atchafalaya Liaison Group Proposal as recommended by the Technical Committee.

Second. Mr. Bigford
Passed unanimously. [4/95]

V. INFORMATIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

A. Status of Development of the State Conservation Plan

Ms. Beverly Ethridge of the EPA briefed the Task Force on the status of the the Conservation Plan authorized by section 304 of the CWPPRA (see enclosure 5). She reported that LDNR will hold public meetings concerning the plan in October 1996. She said the draft plan should be ready for Task Force review by March 30, 1997, and the plan is scheduled to be finalized by May 30, 1997. Dr. Good noted that LDNR's Coastal Management Division will be assuming more of a lead role as plan development moves into regulatory and mitigation issues.

Sec. Caldwell advised the Task Force that cost-sharing provisions of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 are not clear--it is not certain whether the reduction in the State's share applies to funds allocated in 1996 and 1997 or to projects approved in those years. Col. Conner agreed that legal experts will have to interpret the language. [2/180-275]

B. Status of Feasibility Studies

Mr. Podany gave a brief overview of the activities of the Feasibility Study Steering Committee. He reported that project study plans for both the Barrier Shoreline study and the Mississippi River Diversion study are in draft form.

Mr. Podany told the Task Force that the fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Barrier Shoreline study is \$418,000, including \$62,600 to be returned to the Mississippi River Diversion study, \$107,600 to complete phase 1 of the feasibility study, and \$247,000 either to complete the phase 1 EIS or to initiate phase 2 (with a determination to be made in the first three months of 1997). He said the final report for phase 1 is to be completed in March 1997, which is a three-month slip from the original schedule as a result of delays in the modeling effort. Enclosure 6 is a fact sheet on the study.

Mr. Podany reported that the Mississippi River Diversion study draft report and EIS are to be completed in February 1998, and the final report is to be completed in December 1998. Enclosure 7 is a fact sheet on the study.

Dr. Bahr expressed concern that the diversions being considered in the study amount to a small part of the river's total discharge. Col. Conner explained that from an engineering standpoint, there is no flow available for diversion; however, he noted that that is not a satisfactory answer, and that a more useful answer is dependent on policy. Dr. Bahr replied that conversations with many knowledgeable individuals had made it clear to him that it's possible to determine how much water and sediment can be taken out of the river. He suggested that the next Steering Committee meeting include Dick Kessel and Hans van Beek rather than simply Corps of Engineers personnel. [2/277-511]

C. Status of Construction Program

Mr. Scott Clark of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reported on the status of CWPRA projects, noting that 42 cost-sharing agreements have been executed. He told the Task Force that eleven projects have been completed, seven are ongoing, and three have been deauthorized. [2/521-3/90]

D. 6th Priority Project List

Mr. Green briefed the Task Force on the status of the 6th Priority Project List. He noted that candidate projects have been selected and the agencies have begun preparation of designs and cost estimates. He said that selection of the list is expected in March 1997. [4/100-131]

E. Report on the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Restoration Plan Evaluation Report

Mr. Doug Meffert of LDNR reported on the Louisiana Coastal Restoration Plan Evaluation report. He noted that an ad hoc committee established by the Technical Committee has met three times to review and discuss the report. He advised the Task Force that the document should be ready for Technical Committee review by November 27, 1996, and that Task Force approval is scheduled for March 1997. [4/135-221]

VI. ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

A. Conservation Plan Meetings

Dr. Good noted that schedules for the public workshops concerning the State's conservation plan were available, and he requested as much participation and support from the agencies as possible. [4/221-235]

B. Terrebonne Basin Workshop

Dr. Bahr informed the Task Force that the State is holding an invitation-only workshop on October 29 and 30, 1996, to look at an overall plan for the Terrebonne Basin. He said that invitations will be sent out shortly. Dr. Bahr added that the workshop will be followed by a one-day public meeting. [4/236-268]

C. Bayou Lafourche Project

Mr. Thomas briefed the Task Force on the status of the Bayou Lafourche project. He said that EPA has completed a very successful scoping process. He told the Task Force that the scope of work for the engineering and design effort will address all of the concerns presented in conjunction with the scoping meetings. [4/270-301]

D. Subsidence as a Consequence of Mineral Extraction

Col. Conner said that he had been asked by a member of the League of Women Voters to investigate possible effects of mineral extraction on subsidence in coastal wetlands. Sec. Caldwell agreed that LDNR would perform the investigation. [4/302-324]

VII. DATE AND LOCATION OF THE NEXT TASK FORCE MEETING

The next Task Force meeting is tentatively scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on December 18, 1996, at the Corps headquarters building in New Orleans. Task Force members will be contacted to confirm the date. [4/330]

VIII. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No written questions or comments were received from the public.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Col. Conner declared the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

September 30, 1996

Enclosure 1

Agenda

Enclosure 1

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

New Orleans

30 September 1996

1:00 p.m.

AGENDA

Tab

I	Introductions	
	A. Task Force Members or Alternates	
	B. Opening Remarks by Task Force Members	
II	Adoption of Minutes from the 26 June 1996 Meeting.....	D
III	Status of Tasks from the June 1996 Meeting Requiring Further Action	
	National Outreach Proposal	
	A. Outreach Committee Report (Mr. Addison).....	E
	B. Proposal by the State of Louisiana (Sec. Caldwell).....	F
IV	Status of Development of the State Conservation Plan--Ms. Ethridge	G
V	Status of Feasibility Studies--Mr. Podany	H
VI	Status of the Construction Program--Mr. Clark.....	I
VII	Fiscal Year 1997 Budget--Mr. Schroeder.....	J
VIII	Amendments to the Restoration Plan (formal approval)--Mr. Green.....	K
IX	Monitoring Plan for the Brady Canal Project--Mr. Schroeder.....	L
X	Expanded Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection	
	Demonstration Project--Mr. Schroeder	M
XI	Revised GIWW to Clovelly Project--Mr. Schroeder.....	N
XII	Atchafalaya Liaison Group Proposal--Mr. Schroeder.....	O
XIII	6th Priority Project List--Mr. Green	P
XIV	Report on the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Restoration Plan	
	Evaluation Report--Mr. Meffert.....	Q
XV	Additional Agenda Items	R
XVI	Request for Public Comments	S
XVII	Date and Location of the Next Task Force Meeting	T

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
30 September 1996

FISCAL YEAR 1997 BUDGET

For Task Force Decision.

Mr. Schroeder will present the Technical Committee's recommendation concerning the proposed planning budget for fiscal year 1997. Enclosed are a summary sheet of the proposed planning program and a breakdown by task of the agencies' budget requests.

Recommendation of the Technical Committee:

That the Task Force approve the fiscal year 1997 budget as presented.

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act FY97 Budget Summary

26 Sep 96

	Amount (\$)
State of Louisiana	
DNR	371,100
Gov's Ofc	95,300
LDWF	15,800
Total State	482,200
EPA	354,700
Dept of the Interior	
USFWS	235,800
NBS	73,200
USGS Reston	8,800
USGS Baton Rouge	12,000
Total Interior	329,800
Dept of Agriculture	434,900
Dept of Commerce	317,300
Dept of the Army	832,000
Agency Total	2,750,900
 <u>Feasibility Studies</u>	
Barrier Shoreline Study	418,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total Feasibility Studies	1,813,000
 <u>Projected Budgets</u>	
Academic Advisory Group	75,000
Oyster Lease GIS (DNR)	90,000
Public Outreach	130,000
Total Projected	295,000
Total Allocated	4,858,900
Unallocated Balance	141,100
 <u>Recommended for Deletion from Planning Program*</u>	
NEPA Compliance	658,400
Monitoring Plan Development	140,200

*The Technical Committee recommends that these items be funded from the construction budget.

Coastal Lands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act
Fiscal Year 1997 Budget

28 Sep 96

Task	Department of the Army			Department of the Interior			State of Louisiana			Department of Commerce			CWP/PRA Total Amount (\$)
	Number	Amount (\$)	USFWS Amount (\$)	NBS Amount (\$)	USCS Reim Amount (\$)	USCS BR Amount (\$)	DNR Amount (\$)	LDWF Amount (\$)	Offices of Gov Amount (\$)	EPA Amount (\$)	Agriculture Amount (\$)	Commerce Amount (\$)	
Evaluate Benefits of FFL6 Candidate Projects (Env WG)	PL 6040	38,435	46,972	10,354	12,000	17,676	15,780	29,468	6,954	177,640	163,155		
Develop Designs and Cost Estimates	PL 6050	78,261	4,404			8,632	21,468	34,086	16,305	30,048	16,702		
Revise Design and Cost Est (Engr Wk Grp)	PL 6060	8,499	0			2,221	3,678	5,519	1,999	30,578	5,239		
Evaluate Effectiveness of FFL6 Cand Projects (Econ WG)	PL 6070	6,615	0			1,864	4,991	7,010	9,222	39,003	17,241		
Prepare Fact Sheets (Lead Agencies)	PL 6080	6,316	1,174			1,258	5,292	3,032	949	20,121	13,662		
submit fact sheets (Lead Agencies)	PL 6090	0	0			8,328	0	5,156	2,774	13,662	5,897		
Present Candidate Projs for FFL6 to Public	PL 6100	13,929	3,523			3,146	3,334	3,682	1,424	17,241	26,361		
Engr & Env Wk Grps Apply Selection Criteria	PL 6110	3,106	2,349			2,590	4,140	2,884	4,625	19,490	23,088		
FWS Selects Draft FFL6 Projects	PL 6120	5,785	2,349			2,942	3,334	2,860	949	23,088	9,886		
TC and CPO Review and Approve FFL6 Recommendation	PL 6130	0	2,155			1,046	0	592	0	5,897	26,361		
Present Draft FFL6 Projects to La. Nat. Res. Com.	PL 6140	4,259	1,174			3,577	3,685	3,693	4,747	19,490	19,490		
Agencies Prepare Input for FFL6 Report	PL 6150	9,284	3,327			3,589	4,453	3,496	4,625	23,088	23,088		
Task Force Reviews and Approves FFL6	PL 6160	0	0			928	0	1,202	949	9,886	9,886		
Prepare FFL6 Report	PL 6170	20,089	0			0	0	798	0	939	939		
Finalize FFL6 Report	PL 6180	9,088	0			0	0	0	0	0	0		
Submit FFL6 Report to ASA(CW)	PL 6200	939	0			0	0	0	0	0	0		
ASA(CW) Reviews FFL6 Report	PL 6250	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0		
ASA(CW) Submits FFL6 Report to Congress	PL 6300	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	0		
FWS Prepares Revisions to Restoration Plan	RP 3010	7,864	1,566			15,734	5,756	1,775	5,934	38,628	38,628		
FWS Reviews Revisions to Restoration Plan	RP 3020	2,063	1,957			8,063	1,716	1,775	2,834	18,399	18,399		
TC, CPO Review Revisions to Restoration Plan	RP 3030	0	1,957			5,134	3,234	1,950	3,086	15,361	15,361		
TF Reviews Revisions to Restoration Plan	RP 3040	0	2,349			5,629	2,197	1,548	2,374	14,096	14,096		
Develop a Plan for FFL7	PL 7010	5,673	2,349			8,489	6,168	3,242	6,049	31,970	31,970		
Agencies select Nominees for FFL7	PL 7020	9,578	3,914			10,363	15,240	11,648	8,775	59,539	59,539		
FWS Mtg to select FFL7 Candidate Projects	PL 7030	16,906	1,957			15,245	7,880	8,316	3,431	53,736	53,736		
Develop Project Information for WVA	PL 7040	10,247	15,657	21,768		60,167	6,950	32,517	44,601	191,927	191,927		
Develop Design & Cost Est for FFL7 Cand Projs	PL 7050	165,792	3,131			12,838	30,670	62,344	30,905	305,680	305,680		
Engr Wk Grp Reviews signs and Cost Est	PL 7060	8,499	0			3,684	8,706	2,374	2,374	26,496	26,496		
Evaluate Benefits of FFL7 Candidate Projects (Env WG)	PL 7070	63,373	75,186			9,329	31,846	29,998	29,295	239,027	239,027		
Agencies Prepare Fact Sheets	PL 7080	7,842	1,566			2,984	3,432	7,010	11,655	34,488	34,488		
Econ Wk Grp Evaluates Project Effectiveness	PL 7090	6,615	0			964	3,432	4,934	0	15,945	15,945		
Submit Fact Sheets for FFL7 Projs	PL 7100	0	0			4,407	0	0	0	4,407	4,407		
Program Management---Coordination	PM 7010	100,623	14,875	8,800		54,858	61,694	53,756	28,825	418,731	418,731		
Program Management---Correspondence	PM 7020	60,941	3,914			7,491	13,980	16,013	9,725	120,064	120,064		
Prog Mgmt--Budget Development and Oversight	PM 7030	60,816	3,914			10,722	19,736	15,438	24,362	134,989	134,989		
FWS Mtg (7 mtgs; prep and attendance)	PM 7010	17,467	5,480			4,027	11,804	15,453	7,816	62,048	62,048		
Steering Com Mtg (4 mtgs; prep and attend)	SC 7010	11,484	4,697			6,167	9,943	10,126	8,695	51,112	51,112		
Tech Com Mtg (4 mtgs; prep and attend)	TC 7010	21,824	6,263			3,552	10,920	14,703	3,898	61,160	61,160		
Task Force mtg (4 mtgs; prep and attend)	TF 7010	37,505	7,829			5,061	15,478	12,849	19,804	98,326	98,326		
Public Outreach	PO 7010		5,872	10,344		5,532	8,496	9,080	2,000	41,324	41,324		
Prepare Evaluation Report (Report to Cong)	ER 7010	4,348	3,914	5,707		31,903	5,660	3,628	6,171	61,332	61,332		
State Consistency Determination	CS 7010					12,000	0	0	0	12,000	12,000		
Miscellaneous Technical Support	MS 7010			25,023									
Total by Agency		832,000	235,800	73,200	8,800	371,100	95,300	434,900	317,300	2,750,900	2,750,900		
NEPA Compliance (Including FRWs)	NE 7010	140,946	39,251	28,000		1,534	128,000	199,960	120,682	658,373	658,373		
Monitoring Plan Development	MP 7010		0	44,200		96,000			0	140,200	140,200		

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

1. The meeting agenda and a list of attendees are attached (enclosures 1 and 2). All subcommittee members were present.
2. Mr. Ken Bahlinger of LDNR briefed the subcommittee on the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection demonstration project, which was approved on the 1st Priority Project List. He explained that the proposed project had been relocated from its original site on the northwest shore of Lake Salvador because irregularities in the shoreline would have made it difficult to assess the project's effectiveness. Mr. Ruebsamen noted that NMFS, the lead agency for the project, had some concerns with liability; there are privately owned structures in the original project area which might have suffered detrimental impacts from the demonstration project. The location was moved to the east, to the lake's north shore. Local interests, notably St. Charles Parish, strongly opposed this change. NMFS and DNR therefore developed a second phase of the project which consisted of a rock dike along the shoreline at the original site (enclosure 3). The cost of phase 2 of the project is estimated to be \$1,435,700. DNR expects to be able to construct phase 1 for about \$700,000, a savings of about \$300,000 over the original estimate.

Mr. Green asked whether the reasons for relocating the original project still existed; Mr. Ruebsamen said that they did. Mr. Paille questioned the value of expanding the demonstration project to an area in which conditions were so different (especially, exposure to a different wave climate) from those affecting the phase 1 project.

Motion by Ms. Peckham: That the subcommittee recommend that the Technical Committee advise St. Charles Parish to submit the phase 2 project as a candidate for the 7th Priority Project List, and that phase 2 not move forward as a revision of the original Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection demonstration project.

Second: Mr. Paille.

In favor: Ms. Peckham and Messrs. Paille and Green.

Motion failed to carry.

Motion by Mr. Clark: That the subcommittee recommend that the Technical Committee submit phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection demonstration project as proposed with a recommendation for Task Force approval.

Second: Mr. Hartman.

In favor: Messrs. Clark, Hartman, Paille, and Paul.

Opposed: Ms. Peckham and Mr. Green.

3. Mr. Clark noted that he had copies of maps produced by Dr. Shea Penland depicting the causes of land loss in Louisiana's coastal zone. He advised the subcommittee that Dr. Penland has requested comments on the maps prior to finalizing them. He asked for comments by 30 September.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

4. Enclosure 4 is a table of the budgets presented by the agencies for consideration. This table includes a revision presented that morning in the budget for the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities. Table 1 shows the preliminary budget developed by the subcommittee based on these numbers.

Table 1
Proposed Budget

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	3,747,800
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	1,413,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,538,000
Total	6,903,700

The subcommittee discussed the possibility of using construction funds for NEPA compliance work, which represents \$625,400 of the proposed budget. The subcommittee agreed that any NEPA work for which funds have not yet been allocated should be funded through the construction program.

Motion by Mr. Hartman: That the subcommittee recommend using unallocated construction funds for NEPA compliance work for which NEPA funds have not yet been allocated. Cost estimates for future projects will include the cost of NEPA compliance.

Second: Mr. Clark.

Passed unanimously.

The study managers for the two feasibility studies had provided estimates for partial funding. The level shown for the Barrier Shoreline study would delay the start of phase 2 until Jan 97; the funding shown for the Mississippi River Diversion study would cause a delay of about one month. The subcommittee incorporated the lower estimates into the following table. Table 2 also includes new agency budgets deleting NEPA compliance costs.

Mr. Paul pointed out that the first six activities budgeted for FY97 had been included in the FY96 budget; thus, funds for these items should still be available. He proposed that these items be deleted from the FY97 agency budgets. This idea was not generally well received; several committee members pointed out that unforeseen tasks had required use of some of these funds, and the remainder would not likely be sufficient to cover the activities' costs.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

Table 2
Proposed Budget, NEPA Deleted

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	3,122,400
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	1,094,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total	5,816,400

Mr. Hartman expressed consternation with costs presented by the Corps for benefit evaluation (task PL6040) and development of designs and cost estimates (PL6050) for priority list candidate projects. Mr. Green emphasized the importance of these items in developing the best projects, but he agreed to see what reductions might be possible.

The possibility of budgeting monitoring plan development costs through the construction program was discussed. Mr. Greg Steyer told the subcommittee that all such costs had originally been borne by DNR; the FY96 budget was the first to contain funds for monitoring plan development. He said that the funds were taken from planning rather than construction because the monitoring allocations in the construction program were nearly always inadequate for fully implementing the monitoring protocol. When asked about the State's likely reaction to a withdrawal of planning funds, both Mr. Steyer and Mr. Radford said that the State would simply do what was necessary to develop the monitoring plans, funding the program completely if necessary or providing a 25 percent match if Breaux-Johnston construction funds were to be allocated.

Deleting monitoring plan development funds from the agencies' budgets would reduce the total by \$182,200.

Motion by Mr. Hartman: That the subcommittee recommend that monitoring plan development costs be funded with construction funds.

Second: Mr. Paul.

In favor: Messrs. Hartman, Paul, Paille, and Clark.

Table 3 displays the proposed budget once costs for monitoring plan development have been deleted.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

Table 3
Proposed Budget,
Monitoring Plan Development Costs Deleted

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	2,940,200
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	1,094,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total	5,634,200

Mr. Green noted that the costs for the feasibility studies, which totaled \$2,489,000, represented half the total planning budget. There was general agreement among the committee members that additional cuts should be made from the studies' budgets; furthermore, most members agreed that funding of the Mississippi River Diversion study was a higher priority than funding of the Barrier Shoreline study.

The subcommittee asked Mr. Gammill, manager of the Barrier Shoreline study, about the effect of deleting phase 2. Mr. Gammill advised that local interests in the western portion of the State would be distressed. However, the subcommittee members believed that the shoreline problems in the Chenier Plain are sufficiently well understood so that a study would not be a useful application of funds. Mr. Gammill said that completion of phase 1 would require \$418,000 in FY97 funds.

Motion by Mr. Hartman: That the subcommittee recommend deferring funding of phase 2 of the Barrier Shoreline study pending a review of the results of phase 1 and a decision by the Task Force concerning the need to proceed with phase 2.

Second: Mr. Green.

Passed unanimously.

Table 4 displays the proposed budget adjusted for deleting phase 2 costs.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

Table 4
Recommended Budget
(Barrier Shoreline Phase 2 Costs Deleted)

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	2,940,200
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	418,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total	4,958,200

Mr. Podany noted that the Steering Committee will address the issue of continuing the Barrier Shoreline study into phases 2 and 3 and develop a recommendation for the Task Force.

Mr. Green told the committee that he will prepare a revised table summarizing the agencies' budgets, eliminating the costs for NEPA compliance and development of monitoring plans, which the subcommittee recommends be drawn from construction funds. Upon review of this final version (enclosure 5), the subcommittee will prepare a recommendation for the Technical Committee concerning the FY97 budget.

5. The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Encls

Stan Green, Jr.
Chairman, Planning and Evaluation
Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

4. Enclosure 4 is a table of the budgets presented by the agencies for consideration. This table includes a revision presented that morning in the budget for the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities. Table 1 shows the preliminary budget developed by the subcommittee based on these numbers.

Table 1
Proposed Budget

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	3,747,800
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	1,413,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,538,000
Total	6,903,700

The subcommittee discussed the possibility of using construction funds for NEPA compliance work, which represents \$625,400 of the proposed budget. The subcommittee agreed that any NEPA work for which funds have not yet been allocated should be funded through the construction program.

Motion by Mr. Hartman: That the subcommittee recommend using unallocated construction funds for NEPA compliance work for which NEPA funds have not yet been allocated. Cost estimates for future projects will include the cost of NEPA compliance.

Second: Mr. Clark.

Passed unanimously.

The study managers for the two feasibility studies had provided estimates for partial funding. The level shown for the Barrier Shoreline study would delay the start of phase 2 until Jan 97; the funding shown for the Mississippi River Diversion study would cause a delay of about one month. The subcommittee incorporated the lower estimates into the following table. Table 2 also includes new agency budgets deleting NEPA compliance costs.

Mr. Paul pointed out that the first six activities budgeted for FY97 had been included in the FY96 budget; thus, funds for these items should still be available. He proposed that these items be deleted from the FY97 agency budgets. This idea was not generally well received; several committee members pointed out that unforeseen tasks had required use of some of these funds, and the remainder would not likely be sufficient to cover the activities' costs.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

Table 2
Proposed Budget, NEPA Deleted

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	3,122,400
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	1,094,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total	5,816,400

Mr. Hartman expressed consternation with costs presented by the Corps for benefit evaluation (task PL6040) and development of designs and cost estimates (PL6050) for priority list candidate projects. Mr. Green emphasized the importance of these items in developing the best projects, but he agreed to see what reductions might be possible.

The possibility of budgeting monitoring plan development costs through the construction program was discussed. Mr. Greg Steyer told the subcommittee that all such costs had originally been borne by DNR; the FY96 budget was the first to contain funds for monitoring plan development. He said that the funds were taken from planning rather than construction because the monitoring allocations in the construction program were nearly always inadequate for fully implementing the monitoring protocol. When asked about the State's likely reaction to a withdrawal of planning funds, both Mr. Steyer and Mr. Radford said that the State would simply do what was necessary to develop the monitoring plans, funding the program completely if necessary or providing a 25 percent match if Breaux-Johnston construction funds were to be allocated.

Deleting monitoring plan development funds from the agencies' budgets would reduce the total by \$182,200.

Motion by Mr. Hartman: That the subcommittee recommend that monitoring plan development costs be funded with construction funds.

Second: Mr. Paul.

In favor: Messrs. Hartman, Paul, Paille, and Clark.

Table 3 displays the proposed budget once costs for monitoring plan development have been deleted.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

Table 3
Proposed Budget,
Monitoring Plan Development Costs Deleted

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	2,940,200
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	1,094,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total	5,634,200

Mr. Green noted that the costs for the feasibility studies, which totaled \$2,489,000, represented half the total planning budget. There was general agreement among the committee members that additional cuts should be made from the studies' budgets; furthermore, most members agreed that funding of the Mississippi River Diversion study was a higher priority than funding of the Barrier Shoreline study.

The subcommittee asked Mr. Gammill, manager of the Barrier Shoreline study, about the effect of deleting phase 2. Mr. Gammill advised that local interests in the western portion of the State would be distressed. However, the subcommittee members believed that the shoreline problems in the Chenier Plain are sufficiently well understood so that a study would not be a useful application of funds. Mr. Gammill said that completion of phase 1 would require \$418,000 in FY97 funds.

Motion by Mr. Hartman: That the subcommittee recommend deferring funding of phase 2 of the Barrier Shoreline study pending a review of the results of phase 1 and a decision by the Task Force concerning the need to proceed with phase 2.

Second: Mr. Green.
Passed unanimously.

Table 4 displays the proposed budget adjusted for deleting phase 2 costs.

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

Table 4
Recommended Budget
(Barrier Shoreline Phase 2 Costs Deleted)

	Amount (\$)
Agencies	2,940,200
Public Outreach	130,000
Academic Assistance Group	75,000
Barrier Shoreline Study	418,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,395,000
Total	4,958,200

Mr. Podany noted that the Steering Committee will address the issue of continuing the Barrier Shoreline study into phases 2 and 3 and develop a recommendation for the Task Force.

Mr. Green told the committee that he will prepare a revised table summarizing the agencies' budgets, eliminating the costs for NEPA compliance and development of monitoring plans, which the subcommittee recommends be drawn from construction funds. Upon review of this final version (enclosure 5), the subcommittee will prepare a recommendation for the Technical Committee concerning the FY97 budget.

5. The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Encls

Stan Green, Jr.
Chairman, Planning and Evaluation
Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee meeting, 23 Aug 96

1. The meeting agenda and a list of attendees are attached (enclosures 1 and 2). All subcommittee members were present.
2. Mr. Ken Bahlinger of LDNR briefed the subcommittee on the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection demonstration project, which was approved on the 1st Priority Project List. He explained that the proposed project had been relocated from its original site on the northwest shore of Lake Salvador because irregularities in the shoreline would have made it difficult to assess the project's effectiveness. Mr. Ruebsamen noted that NMFS, the lead agency for the project, had some concerns with liability; there are privately owned structures in the original project area which might have suffered detrimental impacts from the demonstration project. The location was moved to the east, to the lake's north shore. Local interests, notably St. Charles Parish, strongly opposed this change. NMFS and DNR therefore developed a second phase of the project which consisted of a rock dike along the shoreline at the original site (enclosure 3). The cost of phase 2 of the project is estimated to be \$1,435,700. DNR expects to be able to construct phase 1 for about \$700,000, a savings of about \$300,000 over the original estimate.

Mr. Green asked whether the reasons for relocating the original project still existed; Mr. Ruebsamen said that they did. Mr. Paille questioned the value of expanding the demonstration project to an area in which conditions were so different (especially, exposure to a different wave climate) from those affecting the phase 1 project.

Motion by Ms. Peckham: That the subcommittee recommend that the Technical Committee advise St. Charles Parish to submit the phase 2 project as a candidate for the 7th Priority Project List, and that phase 2 not move forward as a revision of the original Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection demonstration project.

Second: Mr. Paille.

In favor: Ms. Peckham and Messrs. Paille and Green.

Motion failed to carry.

Motion by Mr. Clark: That the subcommittee recommend that the Technical Committee submit phase 2 of the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection demonstration project as proposed with a recommendation for Task Force approval.

Second: Mr. Hartman.

In favor: Messrs. Clark, Hartman, Paille, and Paul.

Opposed: Ms. Peckham and Mr. Green.

3. Mr. Clark noted that he had copies of maps produced by Dr. Shea Penland depicting the causes of land loss in Louisiana's coastal zone. He advised the subcommittee that Dr. Penland has requested comments on the maps prior to finalizing them. He asked for comments by 30 September.

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

Technical Committee
September 16, 1994 6

Minutes

I INTRODUCTION

Mr. Robert Schroeder, chairman, convened a meeting of the Technical Committee of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 9:40 a.m. in Room 386 of the Corps' District 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) by President Bush on November 29, 1990.

II ATTENDEES

All members of the Technical Committee were present. The Technical Committee members are listed below. A list of attendees is attached as Enclosure 2.

Dr. Bill Good, State of Louisiana
Mr. Rickey Ruebsamen, Department of Commerce
Mr. Bennet Landreneau, Department of Agriculture
Mr. David Frugé, Department of the Interior
Mr. Norm Thomas, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mr. Robert Schroeder, Department of the Army

III TECHNICAL COMMITTEE DECISIONS

A. Monitoring Plan Development Costs

Motion by Dr. Good: That costs for development of monitoring plans for priority list projects be considered a part of project construction cost.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: All

B. Cost of Aerial Photography of Coastal Louisiana

Motion by Mr. Landreneau: That the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force that funds for commissioning aerial infrared photography of coastal Louisiana, to include a set of 1:35,000 prints for each agency, be obligated from fiscal year 1994 funds.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: All

C. NEPA Compliance Costs for Approved Priority List Projects

Motion by Dr. Good: That costs for attaining compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act for approved projects from the first three priority project lists be funded with carryover from fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: All

D. Funding of Technical Advisor for Barrier Island Feasibility Study

Motion by Mr. Landreneau: That the Technical Committee approve the budget for Dr. Mark Byrnes and Mr. Randolph McBride, as requested by the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, using fiscal year 1994 funds.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: All

E. Funding of Academic Scientific Advisors

Motion by Mr. Ruebsamen: That the existing contract for the Academic Scientific Advisors be extended, with no increase in cost, for involvement in the feasibility studies and the 4th Priority Project List.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

In favor: Dr. Good and Messrs. Ruebsamen, Frugé, Landreneau, and Schroeder

Abstaining: Mr. Thomas

IV. INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Priority of Feasibility Studies

The Technical Committee agreed that approximately \$2 million should be reserved each year for funding of feasibility studies.

Input/Output Model of Wetland Benefits

The committee agreed to delete the proposed study from the FY95 budget pending an evaluation by the Economic Work Group.

FY95 Budget

The committee did not reach agreement on a budget recommendation for fiscal year 1995. Each agency will reexamine its budget in the light of comments made at the meeting and submit a revised summary sheet to all of the other agencies by close of business 19 September 1994. The committee will review the revised budgets and will meet at 8:30 a.m. on 22 September 1994 (prior to the Task Force meeting) in the Planning Division Conference Room to make an official recommendation to the Task Force.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Technical Committee meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.