

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

TASK FORCE MEETING

September 21, 1995

MINUTES

I. INTRODUCTION

Colonel Kenneth Clow, representing the Secretary of the Army, convened the twentieth meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 9:45 a.m. on September 21, 1995, in the Mineral Board Hearing Room of the State Lands and Natural Resources Building in Baton Rouge. 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 with the exception of Mr. Gohmert, who was represented by Mr. Bennett Landreneau.

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 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 June 21, 1995 (enclosure 3), were approved unanimously with no discussion. Mr. Frugé made the motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. Hathaway seconded it. [1/134]¹

IV. TASK FORCE DECISIONS

A. Approval of Fiscal Year 1996 Budget.

Mr. Robert Schroeder presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee concerning the planning budget for fiscal year 1996. Enclosure 4 is a summation of the proposed budgets of the various agencies; enclosure 5 is the overall planning

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.

budget, including the feasibility studies, the public outreach program, and the academic assistance program. In response to a question from Mr. Frugé, Mr. Schroeder advised the Task Force that detailed budgets for the feasibility studies would be reviewed and approved by the feasibility study Steering Committee. Mr. Frugé also asked whether the 12 percent cut imposed on all budget totals by the Technical Committee at its September 6, 1995, meeting would prevent the Barrier Shoreline study from moving ahead to phase 2 as scheduled. Dr. Karl DeRouen told the Task Force that the contractor's late start had left sufficient FY95 funds available so that initiation of phase 2 should not be delayed by lack of FY96 funding. [1/445-515]

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force approve the fiscal year 1996 budget as recommended by the Technical Committee, with the provision that the detailed feasibility study budgets be approved by the feasibility study Steering Committee. [1/515]

Second: Mr. Landreneau.

Motion by Dr. Bahr: That the motion on the floor be amended as follows: If funds should be come available, the 12 percent funding cut sustained by the feasibility studies will be restored. [1/522]

Second: none.

Decision on motion by Mr. Frugé:

In favor: Messrs. Frugé, Landreneau, Hathaway, and Bigford.

Opposed: Dr. Bahr. [1/552]

B. Initiation of Project Deauthorization.

Mr. Schroeder advised the Task Force that the Technical Committee recommended initiation of the deauthorization process for the Dewitt-Rollover Vegetative Plantings demonstration project, the Lower Bayou LaCache Hydrologic Restoration project, and the West Bay Sediment Diversion project.

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force initiate deauthorization of the Dewitt-Rollover Vegetative Plantings demonstration project (ME-9), the Lower Bayou LaCache Hydrologic Restoration project (TE-19), and the West Bay Sediment Diversion project (MR-3).

Second: Mr. Bigford.

Passed unanimously.

C. Approval of Monitoring Plans.

Mr. Schroeder advised the Task Force that the Technical Committee recommended approval of the monitoring plans for the West Hackberry Vegetative Plantings project, the Jonathan Davis Wetland Restoration project, and the Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration project. [4/111-119]

Motion by Mr. Bigford: That the Task Force approve the monitoring plans for the West Hackberry Vegetative Plantings project, the Jonathan Davis Wetland Restoration project, and the Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration project.

Second: Mr. Landreneau.

Passed unanimously. [4/120]

D. No-Cost Extension of the LUMCON MOA.

Mr. Schroeder presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee that the current memorandum of agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium, which provides for academic involvement in the CWPPRA process and is set to expire at the end of September 1995, be extended at no cost to allow completion of certain tasks (enclosure 6 is a copy of the contract extension). [4/456-460]

Motion by Mr. Landreneau: That the Task Force approve a no-cost extension of the memorandum of agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium.

Second: Mr. Frugé.

Passed unanimously.

V. INFORMATIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

A. Mr. Jack McClanahan, secretary of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, made a brief statement concerning the State's strategy for coastal restoration. He told the Task Force that there exists a need for small, medium, and large projects. He asked the Task Force to set timelines for the Barrier Shoreline study with a goal of commencing mining operations in the summer or fall of 1996, provided the appropriate scientific data are available. Mr. McClanahan urged the Task Force to develop a funding allocation process that would allow for the construction of large projects.

B. Mr. Jim Tuttle, chief of Engineering Division of the Corps' Lower Mississippi Valley Division, gave a presentation on the Mississippi/Atchafalaya system. He noted that the Corps has been controlling the distribution of flows between the two rivers for about 30 years. Mr. Tuttle pointed out that it is very difficult to design a sediment diversion, as flow and sediment do not move in constant proportions. He agreed that there are good reasons for increasing the flow in the Atchafalaya, but he advised the Task Force that a number of problems would result: a decrease in the flood flow capacity of the Mississippi River, necessitating the raising of levees; an increase in salinities in the lower Mississippi; problems to the shipping industry caused by more flow and sediment in the Atchafalaya River; and an increase in flood profiles on the Atchafalaya with continued development of the delta. Mr. Tuttle noted that the Corps still does not have enough knowledge of the system to predict how it would react to a change in distribution. [1/156-360]

C. Mr. Podany reported on the actions of the feasibility studies Steering Committee. He advised the Task Force that, contrary to the procedure of returning budgeted funds to the Task Force at the end of each fiscal year, the committee intends to allow feasibility study funds to be carried over. This action assumes that unexpended funds represent a delay in accomplishing tasks rather than a savings in cost; the funds are expected to be still required to complete the intended work. [1/562-581]

D. Dr. DeRouen reported on the Barrier Shoreline study (see fact sheet at enclosure 7), and Mr. Axtman briefed the Task Force on the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution study (fact sheet at enclosure 8). Dr. van Heerden advised the Task Force that LDNR has initiated a public involvement program for the proposed Bayou Lafourche diversion project; they have held a meeting in Donaldsonville and set up a citizens' group. He requested that the Task Force keep in mind that this effort is underway.

E. Reports on the status of projects from priority project lists one through four were given by Messrs. Landreneau, Thomas, Elguezabal, Yakupzack, and Osborn. [1/136-435]

F. Ms. Beverly Ethridge, Environmental Protection Agency, gave a report on the status of the Conservation Plan. She informed the Task Force that the governor has entered into a memorandum of agreement with the Federal agencies and that EPA is processing the State's grant request, which is now ready for final approval. Ms. Ethridge reported that the State expects development of the plan to take about a year. [4/467-477]

G. Dr. Joseph Suhayda briefed the Task Force on the simulation model he has used to investigate the hydrologic effects of barrier islands. He told the Task Force that the model showed the islands to have an influence on average and extreme events and that loss of the islands would increase surge action. However, he reported that under normal conditions, openings between the islands must be closed down more than anticipated to have a significant effect on hydrology.

H. Mr. Green reported that the agencies were proceeding with the analysis of candidate projects for the 5th Priority Project List. He said that public meetings to present the candidate projects would be scheduled for November, and that the committees would then prepare a recommendation for the Task Force, which is scheduled to select the list at the December 20, 1995, meeting. [4/436-445]

I. Mr. Addison reported on the budget for the public outreach program. [4/551-5/127]

J. Col. Clow asked the Task Force members if there were any issues concerning project construction with which the Task Force might be of help. Dr. Bahr advised

the Task Force that the LDWF and LDNR have worked well with the oyster industry and he is proud of the progress they've made. Mr. Osborn reported that NMFS has developed a procedure by which the agency walks through a project with the contractor, LDNR, and the landowner; he said their partnering has been critical in moving projects along. [4/486-547]

K. Ms. Mitias reported on the status of the issue concerning the revision of cost sharing agreements. She reminded the Task Force that the issue arose over the State's concern at signing a commitment which allowed for a 25 percent increase in a project's cost at a time when the State's wetlands trust fund is suffering a decrease in revenues. Ms. Mitias informed the Task Force that the State does not wish to revise any cost sharing agreements, but is interested only in having more accurate cost estimates when the agreements are signed. She said she anticipates the work group will meet again. [5/131-168]

VI. TASKS REQUIRING FURTHER ACTION

A. Funding of New Feasibility Study.

Dr. van Heerden presented a request from the State for funding of a study of the Chenier Plain. In response to a similar request at the June 21, 1995, Task Force meeting, Col. Clow had suggested that the Corps's Black Bayou study would be an appropriate vehicle for addressing problems in the Chenier Plain. Dr. van Heerden advised the Task Force that State representatives on the Black Bayou study team had reported that the scope of that study is not adequate to address the State's concerns.

Col. Clow directed the Technical Committee to evaluate the Task Force's position in terms of available funds and develop a strategy for handling new studies. Dr. Bahr announced that the State will present a proposal for a Chenier Plain study at the next Task Force meeting.

B. Allocation of Project Funds

Mr. Schroeder presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee concerning the allocation of funds between large- and small-scale projects (enclosure 9). In response to a suggestion by Mr. Frugé, Col. Clow directed that a flow chart be prepared outlining the procedure. [1/441] Dr. Bahr advised the Task Force that the State had not been present at the meeting at which the recommendation was prepared (September 21, 1995, prior to the Task Force meeting); Dr. Stone was in attendance, but did not consider himself a representative of the State. Dr. Stone noted that his comments on the recommendation had not been incorporated by the committee. Col. Clow directed the State to prepare comments on the recommended proposal; these would be forwarded to the members of the Technical Committee, and an attempt would be made to resolve any issues without another meeting. Dr. Bahr said that the State's comments would be available by September 25, 1995. Col. Clow advised the Technical Committee that he would like to have the matter closed by the end of that week (September 29).

C. Deauthorization of Projects

Dr. van Heerden presented a list of projects and said the State wishes to meet with the various lead agencies to discuss the potential deauthorization of projects on the list (enclosure 10). He advised the Task Force that deauthorizations are necessary in light of the fact that current cost estimates are \$40 million in excess of available construction funds. [2/13-50] Mr. Elguezabal reported that if the three projects for which deauthorization was initiated at today's meeting are considered, as well as the unsupported projects from the 4th Priority Project List, all priority lists can be considered to be adequately funded except the second, which would be about \$2 million to \$3 million short. Overall, the program would have a surplus of about \$16.5 million. [2/428-443] Dr. van Heerden suggested that funds made available by deauthorizations could be combined with rolled-over funds from future priority lists to fund mid-sized projects, which he defined as those costing from \$10 million to \$100 million.

Dr. van Heerden outlined the major points of a State proposal for funding of large-scale projects: funds released through deauthorization of projects from the first four priority project lists should be earmarked for large-scale projects; at least two-thirds of annual construction funds should be allocated to large-scale projects; construction funds should be rolled forward to enable construction of large-scale projects; the Task Force may consider large-scale projects for authorization whenever they might be nominated by a Task Force member and the State; evaluation of these projects will include consideration of comments received at a public meeting, evaluation by the Technical Committee in accordance with the CWPPRA, and final consideration by the Task Force. He said that if the Task Force should adopt this proposed procedure, the State would immediately nominate the Ship Shoal barrier island restoration project. [2/200-266]

Mr. Landreneau pointed out that careful consideration must be given to the projects that the State proposes to deauthorize. He told the Task Force that the projects proposed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service originated at the local level and then passed through a rigorous evaluation and a tough selection process. He noted that the combined effects of NRCS projects cover 27,000 acres, equivalent to a large-scale project, and provide benefits in a very cost-effective manner, averaging less than \$1,400 per acre. He advised the Task Force that some local governments had revised their local programs in accordance with projects approved on previous priority project lists. He stressed the need for public involvement in the deauthorization process. [2/476-502]

Mr. Roy Francis (representing Lafourche Parish), Ms. Tina Horn, (Cameron Parish), Mr. Ray Conner (Cameron Parish), Mr. Ted Joannen (North American Land and Sweet Lake Land Co.), Mr. Charles Broussard (Vermilion Parish), Mr. Randy Moertell (Golden Ranch), Mr. Mike Bertrand (Vermilion Parish, presented a letter from Mr. Don Sagrera, president, Vermilion Parish Police Jury; see enclosure 11), and Ms. Marnie Winter (Jefferson Parish, presented a letter from Mr. Mike Yenni, president, Jefferson Parish; see enclosure 12) urged caution in deauthorizing projects. Mr. Kirk Cheramie applauded the State's effort to deauthorize smaller projects in favor of barrier island restoration. [3/0-373]

Earlier in the meeting, but pertinent to this item of discussion, the Honorable Robert Adley, Louisiana House of Representatives, had advised the Task Force that the State would have a new administration in a matter of months and that it would be inappropriate to delay any small projects that would show results. [1/91-133]

Col. Clow advised the agencies that the list presented by the State initiates discussions between the State and the various lead agencies concerning project deauthorization. The agencies must now contact the State to continue the dialogue and develop a position which can be brought to the Technical Committee. [3/539-589]

D. Cost Sharing under the Conservation Plan

Mr. Elguezabal observed that there is uncertainty concerning the applicability of the cost sharing provisions of the Conservation Plan: it is uncertain whether the 15 percent State share will be applied to earlier projects or only to new ones. Mr. Hathaway advised the Task Force that under general grant regulations it is not possible to go back and change a cost sharing arrangement. Dr. Good expressed his hope that agreements in effect at the time the Conservation Plan is approved would be revised. Col. Clow directed the agencies to begin to float the issue within their respective organizations; he requested a report (although not necessarily a definitive answer) at the next Task Force meeting. [5/308-350]

VII. ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

A. Dr. Good presented the concept of programmatic budgeting. Under this concept, a basin restoration plan would be defined as a single project with numerous components. Under one approach to the concept, Dr. Good said that current State activities which fulfill the CWPPRA mandate (such as monitoring and operation and maintenance of existing State projects) could be considered CWPPRA projects, making them eligible for Federal funding. Under the second approach (Dr. Good noted that the two approaches are not mutually exclusive), the Task Force could apply the cost of some existing projects (such as the Pointe a la Hache and Naomi siphons) to the State's CWPPRA cost sharing requirement. The Task Force would be able to show a greater number of completed projects and increase the available amount of State cost sharing funds at the same time. [5/169-415]

B. Mr. Frugé presented a summary of information developed with the assistance of Mr. Keith Taniguchi of the USFWS Washington office. He compared the scope of Louisiana CWPPRA projects with that of projects which were funded under section 305 of the Act and contained restoration components. Section 305 funds projects in other coastal states and territories. Mr. Frugé said that the average acreage restored by 15 of those projects is 341. The average acreage protected, created, or restored through projects on the first four priority project lists is 629, or about 1.8 times the acreage restored via the section 305 coastal grants program. Mr. Frugé acknowledged that coastal wetland loss problems in Louisiana are bigger than those in other states, requiring larger solutions; however, he pointed out it is necessary to keep in mind that the "small scale" CWPPRA priority list projects approved to date are large in

comparison to projects funded by other coastal wetland conservation programs.
[5/420-438]

C. In order to clarify a point for the press, Mr. Green asked whether the Task Force's inclusion of the $1/3/2/3$ concept in its project funding allocation guidance to the Technical Committee constituted an endorsement of that concept. Under this concept, $1/3$ of priority list funds in any given year would be dedicated to small-scale projects, while $2/3$ would be reserved for large-scale projects. Mr. Frugé noted that the Task Force had agreed to the concept on two separate occasions. Col. Clow asked if any member were uncomfortable with the endorsement, then stated that the Task Force was in agreement in endorsing the $1/3/2/3$ concept. [5/441-462]

VIII. DATE AND LOCATION OF THE NEXT TASK FORCE MEETING

In accordance with policy, the next Task Force meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 20, 1995. Task Force members will be contacted to confirm the date.

IX. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No written questions or comments were received from the public.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Bahr moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:30 p.m. Mr. Landreneau seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

21 September 1995

Enclosure 1

Agenda

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

Louisiana State Lands and Resources Building
Baton Rouge
21 September 1995
9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

Page

- I. **Introductions**
 - A. Task Force Members or Alternates
 - B. Opening Remarks by Task Force Members

- II. **Adoption of Minutes from the 21 June 1995 Meeting**.....

- III. **Status of Tasks from the June 1995 Meeting Requiring Further Action**
 - A. Public Outreach--Mr. Addison
 - B. Revision of Cost Sharing Agreements--Ms. Mitias.....
 - C. Section 307(b) Study (Mississippi Atchafalaya Flow Distribution)--Mr. Tuttle.....

- IV. **Status of Feasibility Studies**
 - A. Steering Committee Overview--Mr. Podany.....
 - B. Louisiana Barrier Shoreline Study--Dr. DeRouen.....
 - C. Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution Study--Mr. Axtman.....

- V. **Status of Development of the State Conservation Plan--Mr. Thomas**.....

- VI. **Status of Approved Priority List Projects--Lead Agencies**

- VII. **Approval of No-Cost Extension of LUMCON MOA--Mr. Schroeder**.....

- VIII. **Approval of Monitoring Plans--Mr. Schroeder**.....
 - A. West Hackberry Vegetative Plantings demonstration project (CS-19)
 - B. Jonathan Davis Wetland Restoration (BA-20)
 - C. Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration (TV-04)

- IX. **Final Construction Approval for Point au Fer Project--Mr. Schroeder**.....

- X. **Requests for Project Deauthorization--Mr. Schroeder**

 - A. Dewitt/Rollover Vegetative Plantings Demo (ME-8)
 - B. Lower Bayou LaCache Hydrologic Restoration (TE-19)
 - C. West Bay Sediment Diversion (MR-3)

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING

Baton Rouge

21 September 1995

9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

(continued)

- XI. Approval of the Fiscal Year 1996 Budget--Mr. Schroeder..... Q
- XII. Report on the Monitoring Program--Mr. Steyer R
- XIII. Status of the 5th Priority Project List--Mr. Green..... -
- XIV. Project Funding Allocation--Mr. Schroeder.....
- XV. Discussion of Means to Expedite Project Implementation--Mr. Schroeder.....
- XVI. Additional Agenda Items 1
- XVII. Date and Location of the Next Task Force Meeting..... W
- XVIII. Request for Written Questions from the Public..... A

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING
21 September 1995

APPROVAL OF
THE FISCAL YEAR 1996 BUDGET

For Task Force decision.

Mr. Schroeder will present the Technical Committee's recommendation concerning the fiscal year 1996 budget. A summary of the agencies' proposed budgets is enclosed. Also enclosed is a table depicting proposed agency budgets and feasibility study budgets and projected budgets for the outreach program and academic assistance.

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act
Fiscal Year 1996 Budget

Task	Number	Department of the Interior				State of Louisiana				Department of Agriculture			Total					
		Army		USFWS		NBS		USGS Rsn		USGS BR		DNR		LDWF	Office of Gov	EPA	Agriculture	Commerce
		Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)		Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)	Amount (\$)
Present Candidate PPL5 Projects to Public	PL 5110	19,142	2,666									7,278			6,510	5,092	3,823	44,531
Engr and Env Work Groups Apply Slectn Crit	PL 5120	7,444	1,535									4,996			3,150	3,819	1,826	22,770
PES Selects Draft PPL5 Projects	PL 5130	5,395	3,453									5,016			4,075	6,300	2,282	26,521
TC and CFG Review and Approve PPL5	PL 5140	3,734	1,535									5,087			3,125	4,521	3,875	21,877
Present PPL5 Projects to La. Nat. Res. Com.	PL 5150	1,316	192									4,136			4,850	1,068	4,905	6,712
Task Force Reviews and Approves PPL5	PL 5160	10,590	3,837									3,935			4,290	3,518	4,565	21,045
Agencies Prepare Input for PPL5 Report	PL 5170	26,462	384									5,996			4,783	4,783	4,565	30,608
Prepare PPL5 Report	PL 5180	912	1,151									0			977	912	913	29,503
Submit PPL5 Report to ASA(CW)	PL 5190	912										0						912
ASA(CW) Reviews PPL5 Report	PL 5200											0						38,156
ASA(CW) Submits PPL5 Report to Congress	PL 5210											0						84,215
P&ES Prepares Revisions to Rest Plan	RP 2010	10,383	6,139									4,783			5,050	6,095	5,706	122,067
P&ES Reviews Revisions to Rest Plan	RP 2020	11,088	7,099									8,209			4,800	8,690	6,173	39,886
TC, CFG Review Revisions to Rest Plan	RP 2030	3,959	1,919									3,888			3,875	5,229	4,665	79,350
TF Reviews Revisions to Rest Plan	RP 2040		1,919									0			3,690	5,513	3,195	111,469
Develop a Plan for PPL6	PL 6010	11,251	3,453									9,713			7,400	5,116	4,565	554,548
Agencies Select Nominees for PPL6	PL 6020	10,297	2,302									11,182			9,800	10,054	12,019	758,903
P&ES Meetings to Select PPL6 Cand Projs	PL 6030	15,957	2,302									8,612			7,700	8,196	3,132	42,767
Perform Environ Analysis of PPL6 Cand Projs	PL 6040	45,573	59,092			67,775	8,800	10,560				70,671			34,225	60,196	54,605	745,128
Develop Dsgns & Cat Est for PPL6 Cand Projs	PL 6050	77,259	3,070									13,561			38,525	80,127	33,311	355,156
Develop Dsgns & Cat Est for PPL6 Cand Projs	PL 6050 a	55,081													5,150	5,321	3,523	147,679
Engr Wrk Grp Reviews Des and Cost Est	PL 6060	8,196	1,151									9,355			3,550	4,083	1,141	20,384
Econ Wrk Grp Evaluates Proj Effectiveness	PL 6070	5,976	576									6,011			5,500	6,040	12,934	415,719
Agencies Finalize Fact Sheets	PL 6080	7,316										0				2,974	1,141	537,708
Agencies Submit Fact Sheets for PPL6 Projs	PL 6090																	
Program Management--Coordination	PM 1010	140,270	14,581									59,867			69,325	66,085	23,099	731,117
Program Management--Correspondence	PM 1020	61,929	3,837									45,858			19,150	15,339	14,253	405,544
Program Management--Bdgt Dvlpmt & Ovrsght	PM 1030	57,644	3,837									20,087			20,775	11,390	20,078	317,014
Plng and Eval Subcom Meetings	PE 1010	16,477	3,837									300			10,525	17,080	15,494	280,358
Steering Committee Meetings	SC 1010	10,689	9,209									0			9,400	10,953	7,403	40,251
Technical Committee Meetings	TC 1010	20,657	9,209									9,443			11,960	16,815	3,752	68,084
Task Force Meetings	TF 1010	35,213	7,674									9,443			14,340	13,996	16,489	80,666
Prepare Report to Congress	RC 6010	4,437	1,151									31,903				2,119		39,610
Helicopter: Videotape Proj Areas			18,773															18,773
State Consistency												12,000						12,000
Monitoring Plan Development												112,400						112,400
Public Outreach	PO 6010											0						0
Other: Travel																		0
Other: Contracts																		0
NEPA Compliance PPL5	ME 1010		7,674															7,674
NEPA Compliance, Approved Projects	ME 6010	176,760										5,010			310,700	196,304	35,915	413,989
Total by Agency		861,400	183,600	67,800	8,800	10,600	84,900	310,700	595,900	304,800	2,944,000	495,500	20,000	84,900	84,900	16,489	304,800	2,944,000

Approved 21 Sep 95

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act FY96 Budget Summary

19 Sep 95

	Amount (\$)
State of Louisiana	
DNR	495,500
Gov's Ofc	84,900
LDWF	20,000
Total State	<u>600,400</u>
EPA	310,700
Dept of the Interior	
USFWS	183,600
NBS	67,800
USGS Reston	8,800
USGS Baton Rouge	10,600
Total Interior	<u>270,800</u>
Dept of Agriculture	595,900
Dept of Commerce	304,800
Dept of the Army	861,400
Agency Total	<u>2,944,000</u>
<u>Feasibility Studies</u>	
Barrier Shoreline Study	704,000
Miss R Diversion Study	1,056,000
Total Feasibility Studies	<u>1,760,000</u>
<u>Projected Budgets</u>	
Academic Advisory Group	75,000
Public Outreach	129,000
Total Projected	<u>204,000</u>
Total Allocated	4,908,000
Unallocated Balance	92,000