

# Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

## TASK FORCE MEETING

July 23, 1998

### Minutes

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Opening comments were made by Dr. Len Bahr, who served in a dual role of Task Force Chairman and representative of the Governor's Office. Colonel Conner requested Dr. Bahr to serve as acting chair of the Task Force because he was unable to attend the meeting due to a death in his family. Dr. Bahr convened the fourteenth meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 9:40 a.m. on July 23, 1998, at the National Wetlands Research Center in Lafayette, Louisiana. The agenda is enclosure 1. The Task Force was created by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA, commonly known as the Breaux Act), 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 enclosure 2. Listed below are the six Task Force members excluding Colonel Conner. Mr. Tom Bigford was represented by Mr. Tim Osborn. Also, Mr. Don Gohmert was represented by Mr. Bruce Lehto.

Dr. Len Bahr, State of Louisiana and Acting Chairman  
Mr. William Hathaway, Environmental Protection Agency  
Mr. David Frugé, U.S. Department of the Interior  
Mr. Don Gohmert, U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Mr. Tom Bigford, U.S. Department of Commerce

#### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes for the meeting held on April 14, 1998, were discussed. Dr. Len Bahr commented positively on the evolving synergy between Task Force agencies in conducting the Breaux Act Program. Mr. Bob Stewart of the National Wetlands Research Center was recognized by Mr. Dave Frugé, for his hospitality in providing the conference room at the center for the Task Force meeting. A memo of thanks was provided through Mr. Tim Osborn by Tom Bigford to the Task Force for their support of and participation in the Coastal Society's 16<sup>th</sup> International Conference (enclosure 3). Mr. Dave Frugé made the motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Tim Osborn seconded the motion. The minutes of the Task Force meeting held on April 14, 1998 (enclosure 4), were then approved unanimously.

#### IV. TASK FORCE DECISIONS

##### A. Recommendation of Project Deauthorizations

Mr. Robert Schroeder presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee to approve the deauthorization of four projects: Pass-a-Loutre Crevasse, MR-7, MR-8/9a(USACE), Priority Project List (PPL) 3; Grand Bay Crevasse, BS-7, PBS-6(USACE), PPL 4; Avoca Island Marsh Creation, TE-35, CW-5i(USACE), PPL 6; and Bayou Boeuf Pumping Station, TE-33, XTE-32I(EPA), PPL 6. The standard operating procedures in effect for deauthorization were followed.

Motion by Mr. Tim Osborn: That the Task Force approve the deauthorization of Pass-a-Loutre, Grand Bay Crevasse, Avoca Island Marsh Creation and Bayou Boeuf Pumping Station.

Second to Motion: Mr. William Hathaway  
Passed unanimously

##### B. Consideration for Initiation of Project Deauthorization

Mr. Britt Paul (NRCS) provided an overview to the Task Force on Southwest White Lake Shore Protection (Demonstration Project), from the 3<sup>rd</sup> PPL (enclosure 5) and requested initiation of project deauthorization by the Task Force. The consensus of the Task Force was to begin the process.

##### C. Report on the Status of the Needs List

Enclosure 6, contains the draft Needs List, which was presented by Rick Hartman (NMFS). Mr. Gary Rauber presented an overview of the effort. Ms. Katherine Vaughan had some concerns relative to accuracy of cost and WVA figures for projects listed.

Mr. Rick Hartman commented that figures represented a range of values, which are found in information contained in PPL's where detailed analysis was performed. Mr. Rick Hartman requested that agencies review the draft Needs List and comment to him concerning revision. Mr. Dave Frugé commented that ~~FEEM~~ <sup>feasibility</sup> Study results should be used to further refine Needs List figures, and that a current Needs List presentation be developed to give Congress a sense of our coastal restoration needs. Ms. Katherine Vaughan expressed concern that Congress could be misled by data included in the Needs List that may conflict with other more refined data that would come forward later on coastal restoration projects.

Based on differing views of the Needs List purpose among CWPPRA, Mr. Rick Hartman asked the Task Force whether a range of costs or an approximate cost was more desirable. Mr. Martin Cancienne commented that the Needs List will have to show some type of cost relationship to projects, with perhaps some qualifiers to demonstrate the enormous coastal restoration need

to Congress. Mr. Oneil Malbrough commented on proceeding with attaching costs to projects. He suggested that costs used be construction costs, not fully-funded costs. Mr. Martin Cancienne indicated that these cost figures will be ultimately used to make qualitative judgment calls on whether to build projects. Mr. Mark Davis indicated that the Needs List should be qualified on the premise of its intent. Issues of cost scale and order of magnitude are important to the presentation of the Needs List to Congress and the rest of the country. The Needs List is an interim step towards Coast 2050 strategies, which is effectively a higher purpose document than the Needs List. Dr. Bill Good commented that the Needs List is project-oriented whereas Coast 2050 is strategy-oriented. This could generate confusion in a comparative review of the documents. The Needs Lists introduction should include a statement of its purpose, (presentation of projects and construction costs), relative to the more comprehensive, higher order Coast 2050 document that is a plan for much more than just construction of projects.

It was agreed that the Needs List would consist of an overview and a simple listing of projects with their approximate cost. The document would be sent to our Senators and Congressmen, State Senate and House Natural Resource Committees, Coastal State Senators and House Members, and State Wetlands Authority Members.

D. Report on Status of Updating Fully Funded Monitoring Plan Costs for Priority Project List Projects

Mr. Tom Podany provided an overview with a description of the contents of updated documents handed out at the meeting (enclosure 7). Mr. George Townsley provided details of the economic evaluation of monitoring plan cost. Mr. Tim Osborn thanked NRCS and DNR for addressing this issue. Ms. Katherine Vaughan asked the Task Force to vote on this, considering that the development of these costs have been completed. Mr. Jack Caldwell commented that budgeting items such as these be separated from the concept of cash flow and that the decision to approve them be treated individually of cash flow issues, so that a continuing fund would be available to handle unexpected monitoring costs increases. Mr. Greg Steyer provided revised monitoring plans to each Task Force member of their agencies' projects. He also provided revised spread sheets for monitoring plans and implementation costs (dated 7/17/98) (enclosure 7). Previous versions of these spread sheets, which were originally presented in the Task Force meeting book (dated 6/23/98), are also contained in enclosure 7.

E. Report on Status of Updating Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs for Priority Project List Projects

An O&M draft economic summary (enclosure 8) was provided by Mr. George Townsley. Also included in enclosure 8 is an example O&M economic evaluation for a project. Mr. Tom Podany said that

the Task Force did not need to take any action at this time, as the issue is being addressed and significant work has been done towards finalizing these costs.

F. Consideration for Approval of Procedures to Handle Bid Overruns

Mr. Tom Podany provided an overview of the Technical Committee's actions relative to these procedures as summarized for the Task Force (enclosure 9). Mr. Dave Frugé offered additional language. Mr. Bill Hathaway expressed reservations with approving these procedures at this time, in order to allow the Task Force agencies to further evaluate and consider additional language and revisions offered at the July 23, 1998 Task Force meeting. Mr. Tim Osborn requested that no vote be made today, but that each agency act in accordance with these proceedings on an interim basis until all agencies are satisfied with the language. Mr. Jack Caldwell asked that the Task Force approve the procedure, contingent on a motion to reconsider at a later date, and that a follow up fax vote by the Task Force on revised language be executed within a week. In lieu of the motion Dr. Bahr requested that this be done.

G. Report on Status of Task Force Directive to Consider Revised Procedures for the Development, Selection, and Funding of Priority Project Lists (PPLs)

Dr. Len Bahr recommended the Engineering Work Group be included in refinements. Mr. Tom Podany indicated that all Work Groups and the public are open to provide input to the idea of developing a selection procedure for an \$80 million List once every two years, based on a two-year-long PPL process initiated at the close of PPL 8. Mr. Jack Caldwell pointed out that the statutory requirements requires that we are to annually prioritize projects. The Task Force indicated that this was only required up to the development of the 1993 Restoration Plan. At Mr. Tom Podany's request, the Task Force agreed to use the 2 yr cycle for budgeting purposes in FY 99. Mr. Tim Osborn suggested that the prospect of a 2 yr cycle be proposed to the public in a formal notice. The Task Force could base their decision on public response and the continued formulation of the 2 yr cycle by the Technical Committee. The Task Force agreed.

H. Report on Other Anticipated Project Cost Increases

New Cut Closure project was proposed for funding by EPA. There was concern expressed as to whether it should be shown on the proposed budget without consensus for funding (enclosure 10). The Engineering Work Group was directed to look at New Cut Closure proposal for a cost perspective. EPA and DNR are looking at cost for the prospect of a contract modification to the ongoing barrier island work. The decision on PPL 8's available dollars was based on items of this proposed budget being deferred until future Task Force meetings. A lengthy discussion ensued

concerning the process used to select and earmark funds to build projects. Some expressed the perception that there is a problem when \$200 million remains unexpended 9 yrs into the program. There was a sense that another procedure was needed to prioritize funding for projects based on the annual funding needs of projects ready for construction or in construction phase. In this way, larger, more complex and expensive projects that enter into a long design and construction process could be funded in stages as necessary, such that in the interim period prior to completion, smaller projects that can be quickly implemented could be built. Mr. Mark Davis proposed that this is a policy issue that needs to be discussed at the next Task Force meeting. Ms. Katherine Vaughan suggested that projects such as Myrtle Grove be used as a prototype for staged funding. Dr. Len Bahr asked that this be addressed also in the selection process refinement as previously directed.

I. Discussion of Cost Sharing Percentages for Phases of 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> PPL Projects

Mr. Tom Podany provided the discussion of cost sharing percentages. The consensus of the Task Force was that the intent of the legislation on cost sharing is that all project costs for projects approved on the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> list would be cost shared 90%/10% (enclosure 11).

J. Request for Construction Approval for Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet (MRGO) Disposal Area Marsh Protection, PO-19, XPO-71, and Status Report on West Bay Sediment Diversion Project, MR-3, FMR-3 (enclosure 12).

Mr. Bill Hicks provided the summary for the projects. Motion was made by Mr. Dave Frugé for approval of the MRGO project.

Second to Motion: Mr. Tim Osborn  
Passed unaimously

Mr. Hicks indicated that the current cost estimate for the West Bay project has changed from \$13 million to \$16 million. In consideration of this estimated cost increase, there was general consensus of the Task Force that this continues to be a project worth pursuing.

K. Delivery of Status Reports

Mr. Tom Podany provided all summaries (enclosure 13). Mr. Oneil Malbrough asked when there would be another opportunity to provide public input on the progress and direction of MRSNFR. Mr. Podany indicated that scheduling another public meeting would be considered.

#### L. Status of the Coastwide Strategy (Coast 2050)

Dr. Bill Good provided a summary of the status to develop the coastwide strategy. A date in October will be coordinated to brief the Task Force again.

#### M. Report of Program Performance and Project Implementation

Dr. Steve Mathies provided the summary on Program Performance and Project Implementation (enclosure 14). A large portion of the \$223 million funds are scheduled to be spent in the next 2 yrs. Dr. Mathies asked that the Task Force, through the Outreach Committee, coordinate ground breaking ceremonies. He also suggested that national leaders including the President, and Vice-President be invited.

#### N. Outreach Committee Report

Enclosure 15 contains the Outreach Committee Report and a handout provided at the meeting when ground breaking is scheduled. Mr. Herb Bourque (USDA-NRCS) briefed the Task Force on Watermarks proposed budget with an example of the proposed increase in color pages to increase readership. Also, to increase the total printed issues to 1500 copies a year allowing for 4 issues per annum.

Coordination is being initiated to bring the White House Wetlands Task Force Working Group on a tour of Coastal Louisiana, which will be spear headed by the Corps with assistance of the State.

#### V. DATE AND LOCATION OF NEXT TASK FORCE MEETING

The next Task Force Meeting was tentatively scheduled for October 21, 1998 at 9:30 a.m. in Baton Rouge, LA. Task Force members will be contacted with final meeting details at a later date. A joint meeting of the Task Force and the State Wetlands Authority is scheduled for October 20<sup>th</sup> in Baton Rouge to discuss the outputs of Coast 2050.

#### VI. WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

No written questions or comments were received from the public.

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT

The Task Force Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

**TASK FORCE MEETING AGENDA**

Main Conference Room  
National Wetlands Research Center  
700 Cajundome Boulevard, Lafayette, Louisiana

July 23, 1998  
9:30 a.m.

Tab

- I. Meeting Initiation
  - a. Introduction of Task Force Members or Alternates
  - b. Opening Remarks by Task Force Members
  
- II. Adoption of Minutes from the April 14, 1998 Meeting..... D
  
- III. Recommendation of Project Deauthorizations. (Robert Schroeder)
  - a. Pass-a-Loutre Crevasse, MR-7, MR-8/9a (USACE)
  - b. Grand Bay Crevasse, BS-7, PBS-6 (USACE)
  - c. Avoca Island Marsh Creation, TE-35, CW-5i (USACE)
  - d. Bayou Boeuf Pumping Station, TE-33, XTE-32i; (EPA) ..... E
  
- IV. Consideration for Initiation of Project Deauthorization: Southwest Shore White Lake Protection (Demonstration Project), ME-12. (Britt Paul) ..... F
  
- V. Report on Status of the Needs List. (Gary Rauber)..... G
  
- VI. Report on Status of Updating Fully Funded Monitoring Plan Costs for Priority Project List Projects. (Robert Schroeder)..... H
  
- VII. Report on Status of Updating Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs for Priority Project List Projects. (Robert Schroeder)..... I
  
- VIII. Consideration for Approval of Procedures to Handle Bid Overruns. (Tom Podany)..... J
  
- IX. Report on Status of Task Force Directive to Consider Revised Procedures for the Development, Selection, and Funding of Priority Project Lists. (Tom Podany) ..... K
  
- X. Report on Other Anticipated Project Cost Increases. (Tom Podany)..... L
  
- XI. Discussion of Cost Sharing Percentages for Phases of 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> List Projects. (Robert Schroeder) ..... M

ENCL 1

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING AGENDA  
(continued)

Tab

- XII. Request for Construction Approval for Mississippi River - Gulf Outlet (MRGO) Disposal Area Marsh Protection, PO-19, XPO-71, and Status Report on West Bay Sediment Diversion Project, MR-3, FMR-3. (Bill Hicks)..... N
- XIII. Delivery of Status Reports: (Tom Podany)  
a. 8<sup>th</sup> Priority Project List;  
b. Report to Congress;  
c. Feasibility Study Steering Committee;  
d. Atchafalaya Liaison Group; and  
e. State Conservation Plan..... O
- XIV. Status of the Coastwide Strategy, Coast 2050. (Bill Good) ..... P
- XV. Report of Program Performance and Project Implementation. (Steve Mathies)..... Q
- XVI. Outreach Committee Report. (Jay Gamble)..... R
- XVII. Confirmation of Task Force Facsimile Vote Approvals: (Robert Schroeder)  
a. Construction Approvals of Lake Salvador Phase II, BA-15, and Lake Chapeau Sediment Input and Hydrologic Restoration, PTE-23/26a;  
b. Construction Approval of East Timbalier Island Restoration, Phases I and II, XTE-67 and XTE-45/67b, contingent upon a FONSI to the Environmental Assessment which is currently being conducted for NEPA clearance and upon a positive issuance of a Department of the Army permit; and  
c. Approval of a no-cost extension to March 30, 1998, of the LUMCON Memorandum of Agreement for the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient, and Freshwater Redistribution Feasibility Study ..... S
- XVIII. Additional Agenda Items and Request for Public Comments..... T
- XIX. Date and Location of the Next Task Force Meeting ..... U





## ATTENDANCE RECORD



<b>DATE(S)</b> July 23, 1998 9:30 a.m.	<b>SPONSORING ORGANIZATION</b> COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT	<b>LOCATION</b> Main Conference Room National Wetlands Research Center 700 Cajundome Boulevard, Lafayette, Louisiana
--	---	--

**PURPOSE**

MEETING OF THE LOUISIANA COASTAL WETLANDS CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION TASK FORCE

**PARTICIPANT REGISTER\***

NAME	JOB TITLE AND ORGANIZATION (Include mailing address if new or changed)	TELEPHONE & FAX NUMBERS
Gary Rauber	Project Manager <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	504 862-2543 (t) 2572 (f)
Greg Steyer	DNR/CRD Biological Monitoring <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	504 342-1452 (t) 6801 (f)
Gerry Bodin	FWS <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	318-262-6662 (t) Ext 244 262-6663 (f)
Tim Axtman	COE <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	504-862-1921 (t) (f)
Edmond Russo	COE <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	(504) 862-1496 (t) (f)
CAROLE CLARK	LDNR <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	504 342 9418 (t) (f)
RANDY HANNEY	LDNR <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	504-342-3583 (t) (f)
Tom Podany	COE <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	504-862- (t) 2502 (f)
BRUCE LEHTO	NRCS <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	318-473-7756 (t) (f)
Britt Pawl	NRCS <small>Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&amp;E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force</small>	318-473-7816 (t) (f)

PARTICIPANT REGISTER (CONTINUED)

NAME	JOB TITLE AND ORGANIZATION (Include mailing address if new or changed)	TELEPHONE & FAX NUMBERS
James Siffert	COE, P.M. Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-862-1908 (1) (f)
Ric Ruebsamer	DOCMFS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-389-0508 (1) (f)
Ronny Paille	USFWS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318-262-6660 (1) ext. 234 (f)
Bill Gued	DNR Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-342-7308 (1) (f)
Sandra Dingman	Jean Lafitte National Historical Park & Pres. National Park Service, DOI Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504/589-3882 x119 (1) 504/589-3851 (f)
Rick Norama	DOE / NMFS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	389-0508 (1) 0502 (f)
NEIL MAURER	CEE/ Jefferson Pr. Enviro Dept Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	347-2100 (1) (f)
Deuse Reed	LUMCON Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	8512800 (1) (f)
Wes McQuiddy	EPA Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	214-665-6722 (1) -6689 (f)
David Wright	DOI - FWS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318/262-6630 (1) (f)
Joyce Alton	NRCS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318/896-8503 (1) (f)
MARK DAVIS	CRL Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-344-6555 (1) (f)
Heanre Peckham	EPA Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-389-0736 (1) 0704 (f)

PARTICIPANT REGISTER (CONTINUED)

NAME	JOB TITLE AND ORGANIZATION (Include mailing address if new or changed)	TELEPHONE & FAX NUMBERS
Sidney Coffey	Dir. Communication, LONR Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-342-4844 504-342-3447
Herb Bourque	Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318-473-7762 318-473-7612
Steve Mallin	COE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(504) 862-2878 (t) (f)
Avin Jones	MMS; New Orleans Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504.736.1713 (t) 504.736.2407 (f)
Steve Gilbreath	Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-865-1259 (t) 504-865-5543 (f)
MARTIN CANDIENNE	Cong Billy Tauzin Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-6218490 (t) (f)
Bill Hicks	COE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(t) 504 862 2626 (f)
Ray [unclear]	COE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(t) 504 862 2755 (f)
Jay Gamble	EPA / COE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(t) 504-862-2786 (f)
Dev Ethier	EPA Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(t) (f)
Cathy Mufias	Gov's Office Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(504) 342-3968 (t) (f)
Ed Probst	NWRC / USGS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318 266 8500 (t) (f)
Teresa M. [unclear]	NMFS Lafayette Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318-482-5915 (t) -6630 (f)



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

July 20, 1998

MEMORANDUM FOR: CWPPRA Task Force

FROM: Tom Bigford *Tom*  
DOC Representative

SUBJECT: The Coastal Society's 16<sup>th</sup> International Conference

Although I am unable to attend the CWPPRA Task Force meeting on July 23, 1998, I do want to offer my sincere thanks to the entire CWPPRA family for their support of and participation in The Coastal Society's conference last week in Williamsburg, Virginia. The July 14 session on "The Louisiana Wetlands Experience - Teamwork and Results" offered us the pleasure to share the success we have come to expect from our efforts under the Breaux Act. Special thanks go to Col. Bill Conner and his colleagues (especially Robert Buisson), Katherine Vaughan and her colleagues (especially Karl Morgan), and Mark Davis and his understanding fiancée. Jack Caldwell also attended the conference and offered many insightful comments during the opening plenary (about the Louisiana Christmas tree program and other state efforts) and luncheon (about state shares of federal oil and gas royalties). He and Katherine also unveiled the state's impressive, new pop-up display on wetland loss. My thanks to everyone.

Our next effort will be to secure a session at Coastal Zone '99 in San Diego next July. National conferences offer the CWPPRA program a great opportunity to gain the attention it needs at the national level, and for individual participants to reap the personal recognition they deserve.

I hope to see you at the next CWPPRA Task Force meeting, or at a dedication ceremony in the interim.



**Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act**

**TASK FORCE MEETING**

**April 14, 1998**

**Draft Minutes**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Colonel William L. Conner, representing the Secretary of the Army, convened the thirtieth meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 9:35 a.m. on April 14, 1998, at the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources office in Baton Rouge. The agenda is enclosure 1. The Task Force was created by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA, commonly known as the Breaux Act), 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 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  
(Ms. Beverly Ethridge represented EPA for part of the meeting)  
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 for the meeting held on January 16, 1998, were discussed. Mr. Hathaway observed that his statements on the need to revise the project development, selection, and funding process might not have been clearly depicted in the January 16 meeting minutes. In addition to developing guidance for the Needs List, he recommended that guidance on selecting future lists be more clearly defined than it has been for past lists. Colonel Conner agreed that it was beneficial to clear up the discussion on the selection process related to the Needs List, Coast 2050, and both funded and unfunded priority list projects. After Mr. Hathaway was satisfied that further discussion would be directed to this item, he made the motion to approve the minutes, and Mr. Frugé seconded it. The minutes of the Task Force meeting held on January 16, 1998 (enclosure 3), were then approved unanimously.

b. the issue of establishing a contingency fund (for storms, vandalism, and permit requirements) be deferred until the next Technical Committee meeting;

c. any project currently showing a zero budget for O&M (due to uncertainties over the final design) be handled in accordance with normal project development procedures (a final O&M plan will be developed for these projects in due course when the design is sufficiently complete); and

d. no action be taken by the Task Force until the Economic Work Group has completed indexing the costs for inflation.

Ms. Vaughan stated that the permits for CWPPRA projects include a commitment to perform 20 years of monitoring and that these commitments must be considered in any changes contemplated by the Task Force. She suggested that a summary of operations and maintenance costs be presented whenever a project is presented for approval to the Task Force. Mr. Frugé recommended that lead agencies try to keep O&M plans as far below the 125 percent cost cap as possible; reaching the 125 percent cost cap, he said, should be an exception, rather than the rule.

Mr. Schroeder presented a description of the process to carry out an evaluation of operation and maintenance plan cost increases (enclosure 5). The consensus of the Task Force was to proceed with this process.

#### C. Consideration for Approval of the Grand Bayou Project Additions.

Mr. Schroeder presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee to the Task Force that they approve the additions to the Grand Bayou project, which increase both the scope and cost of the project.

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force approve the increase in both the scope and cost of the Grand Bayou project. The fully funded cost of the project would increase by \$3,977,700 from \$5,135,468 to \$9,113,168. The increase in scope would involve the inclusion of an area in Lafourche Parish, east of Bayou Pointe au Chien and west of Grand Bayou Canal, Grand Bayou, and Cutoff Canal. The project will involve construction of the Bayou Pointe au Chien Structure, canal plug removals, spoil bank gapping, structure removal, and trenasse cleaning (see enclosure 6).

Second: Mr. Hathaway.  
Passed unanimously.

to anticipate an annual funding stream that is greater than \$40 million.

Motion by Mr. Hathaway: That the Task Force direct the Technical Committee to develop formal procedures for implementing Coast 2050 and the Needs List, and for amending the existing priority project list selection process. The development of these procedures shall consider, but not be limited to the following items:

- a. integrating Coast 2050 concepts;
- b. retaining 2/3 funding for large-scale projects and 1/3 funding for small-scale projects;
- c. reviewing EPA's January 1998 letter to the Task Force;
- d. soliciting CZM coordinator input on proposed changes;
- e. using the procedures as a communication tool to the public, recognizing the Task Force's commitment to the process;
- f. implementing a longer (2-year) planning process for large projects;
- g. using planning funds to evaluate non-CWPPRA projects (to leverage non-CWPPRA funding of environmentally friendly projects under the consistency requirement of the act); and
- h. adding realistic land rights acquisition policy as part of planning.

Second: Dr. Bahr.  
Passed unanimously.

#### E. Public Outreach Committee Role in Project Dedications

Mr. Gohmert complimented the Public Outreach Committee on the good job they did with the barrier island project dedications that week.

Motion by Mr. Gohmert: That the Task Force give charge to the Outreach Committee to develop a process for having high quality project dedications on future Breaux Act projects.

Second: Dr. Bahr.  
Passed unanimously.

Dr. Mathies observed that the helicopter tours provided for the barrier island project dedications were not paid out of project funds. While the tours proved to be very popular, they were also very expensive. He suggested that if it was the desire of the Task Force to continue providing such tours for project

version of this procedure would be ready for the next Task Force meeting.

D. Feasibility Study Steering Committee Report.

Mr. Podany provided information to the Task Force on the status of the Louisiana Barrier Shoreline Study and the Mississippi River Sediment, Nutrient and Freshwater Redistribution Study. He reported that a preliminary draft report, for the Barrier Shoreline feasibility study would be completed in September 1998 and a final draft would be available in December 1998. If this report were favorable, steps to begin the development of a contract for an EIS would begin. The EIS would take 18 month and could be completed by February 2001. On the Mississippi River study, a preliminary draft report will be prepared by July 1998 to feed into the Coast 2050 effort. The draft of the feasibility report would be completed in December 1998, with a final in June 1999.

E. Report on the Status of Coast 2050.

Dr. Bill Good provided a report on the status of Coast 2050. He explained that small-scale strategies and objectives have been presented to the Task Force agencies in prior discussions. His report covered large-scale strategies (enclosure 7). He postulated that at current land loss rates, fisheries production in the Barataria and Terrebonne basins would approach zero by the year 2050. He asked the Task Force to determine when it wanted to be involved in reviewing Coast 2050 products (July and October were identified as timeframes when Task Force feedback would be required). Colonel Conner stated that he wanted data provided to him for review as soon as it was available. Other members of the Task Force agreed. A special meeting of the Task Force would be held in late September, possibly including the State Wetlands Authority, to review the public comments on the plans and register a Task Force position. In addition, Dr. Good requested approval to move forward with a time capsule for Coast 2050. Colonel Conner directed, with the concurrence of other Task Force members, that Dr. Good proceed with liaisons on this matter among interested groups, such as the Boy Scouts of America and Mr. Donald Lirette, President of the Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana.

F. Report on Outreach Committee.

Ms. Beverly Ethridge provided a report on the status of the outreach committee (enclosure 8). The Task Force praised the efforts of the committee in connection with the barrier island project dedications held the previous day. Mr. Frugé asked about the status of the coastal brochure and whether it had been provided to the Congressional delegation. Ms. Ethridge replied that the committee would look into it.



that the project would compare favorably with other projects constructed under CWPRA; a more detailed discussion of benefits for this project will be provided at the next Task Force meeting. Ms. Vaughan stated that there is some possibility that the pipeline will be relocated at the utility owner's expense, but that this may be partially offset by an increase in real estate costs. Mr. Caldwell stated that the land-rights issues for this project are very complicated, but that the State will not let legal problems related to land rights stand in the way of project execution.

I. Report on the Status of Project Deauthorizations.

Mr. Schroeder gave a brief report on the status of 4 projects, currently under review for deauthorization: Pass-a-Loutre Crevasse, Grand Bay Crevasse, Avoca Island Marsh Creation and Bayou Boeuf Pumping Station. The Task Force voted to initiate the deauthorization of these projects at the last Task Force meeting. As per the standard operating procedures, the Technical Committee Chairman has prepared letters to the Congressional delegation, members of the state legislature, and parish presidents for these projects. Due to the fact that the comment period was still open, the Technical Committee will make a recommendation to the Task Force concerning the deauthorization of these projects at the next Task Force meeting. No objections to the deauthorization of the projects had been received to date. No objections were expressed at the meeting.

J. Status of Construction Program.

Dr. Steve Mathies reported on the status of Breaux Act construction projects. He noted that out of 75 active projects, 19 have been completed, 8 are under construction, 17 will be started this fiscal year, and 15 will be started by next fiscal year. Mr. Frugé recommended that the Task Force not count the Conservation Plan as a completed project; this change will be reflected in future reports.

K. Status of the Conservation Plan.

Ms. Katherine Vaughan reported that the first quarterly meeting with Federal agencies to review the status of the Conservation Plan would be held on 21 April. Mr. Stehle Harris, LDNR, will be the point person for tracking the plan. Ms. Katherine Vaughan listed several early accomplishments of the plan, including the preparation of 5 grant applications to EPA, the continued funding of state-funded restoration projects, and the state-funded public service announcements involving 3 celebrity spokesmen and a spokesfrog. Ms. Becky Weber reported that EPA was processing a grant award to fund a database to track no net loss.

involve eliminating the formal monitoring required for the project, in light of the low cost of the project in relation to the costs of formal monitoring. This change would result in a cost decrease of \$200,783 for the project, which reflects a revised cost from \$512,000 to \$311,417. Colonel Conner stated that Corps could conduct informal monitoring of the project at no cost to the Breaux Act, due to the Corps' frequent presence in the area.

Motion by Dr. Bahr: That the Task Force approves the change in scope for MR-GO Back Dike project.

Second: Mr. Frugé.  
Passed Unanimously.

#### **VII. DATE and LOCATION OF THE NEXT TASK FORCE MEETING**

The next Task Force meeting was tentatively scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on July 23, 1998 in Lafayette, Louisiana. Task Force members will be contacted to confirm the date and location.

#### **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mr. Dave Richard, Executive Vice President of Stream Property Management, Inc., provided a comment on an earlier discussion of the Trans-Texas Water Supply study. He stated that in accordance with the 1951 Sabine River Compact, the State of Texas controls one-half of the water in the river. In spite of conservation and Senate Bill No. 1, by the year 2040 and perhaps before, Texas will need more water. He stated that the focus of the planning effort should be on how to sustain the areas in Louisiana affected by this seemingly inevitable change.

Mr. Mark Davis reported that the Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana will hold its coastal stewardship award May 1, 1998, in Thibodaux.

#### **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The Task Force meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.



MR. "MIKE" FOSTER, JR.  
GOVERNOR

JACK C. CALDWELL  
SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

December 17, 1997

Donald W. Gohmert, State Conservationist  
Natural Resource Conservation Service  
3737 Government Street  
Alexandria, Louisiana 71302

RE: De-authorization of CWPPRA Project ME-12 SW Shore White Lake Protection,  
(Demonstration Project) Federal Sponsor, NRCS  
Cost Share Agreement No. 68-7217-4-58  
DNR Agreement No. 35-95-20

Dear Mr. Gohmert:

The above mentioned CWPPRA project has demonstrated that planting California bulrush as a wave dampening technique along a one-mile section of the southwest shoreline of White Lake is not effective in preventing the encroachment of White Lake into the interior fresh water vegetation and the shallow water areas of Deep Lake. Results recorded, through project monitoring, show that of the initial 3,200 California bulrush plants established in the project area, only 35 plants are still present. The plants that are present have 3 to 5 stems and exhibit no lateral spread. LDNR/CRD feels that this demonstration project indicates that it is not feasible to plant and maintain vegetative planting in the designated project area because of the high water levels and wave energy. Therefore LDNR/CRD, as sponsoring state agency, recommends that this project be deauthorized. This action will save any additional monitoring and/or maintenance expenditures.

Should you concur with our recommendation, as sponsoring federal agency, we are requesting your assistance in securing deauthorization of this project through proper channels.

If additional information is needed or you have any questions, please contact my office at (504) 342-2710, or Katherine Vaughan, Assistant Secretary, Office of Coastal Restoration and Management at (504) 342-1375.

Sincerely,

Jack C. Caldwell  
Secretary

cc: Katherine Vaughan, Assistant Secretary  
Gerry Duszynski, Assistant Administrator



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Natural Resources  
Conservation Service

5151 Government Street  
Alexandria, Louisiana  
71302

January 23, 1998

Mr. Jack Caldwell  
Secretary, LDNR  
P. O. Box 94396  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9396

Dear Mr. Caldwell:

RE: Deauthorization of CWPPRA Project ME-12 SW Shore  
White Lake Protection (Demonstration Project)

I have received your letter of December 17 regarding the deauthorization of the above referenced project. I concur with your recommendation. By copy of this letter I am requesting the CWPPRA Task Force initiate the formal deauthorization procedures for this project.

Sincerely,

*Donald W. Gohmert, Acting*

Donald W. Gohmert  
State Conservationist

cc: CWPPRA Task Force

July 13, 1998

### Overview of the Needs List

The purpose of this document is to identify the restoration projects that are necessary to approach the "no net loss" goal for Louisiana's coastal wetlands. Implementation of these projects will reduce or compensate for most of the erosion of Louisiana's coastal wetlands.

The document is a compilation of projects identified as beneficial to the restoration of Louisiana's coastal wetlands. Projects identified within this document are intended to be considered for funding under CWPPRA, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA), the Louisiana Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund, or any other possible funding mechanism. The document has two sections: 1) a table listing a brief description of each project and providing an approximate cost; and, 2) an appendix providing a more detailed description and a map of each project identifying approximate component sites.

Projects included in this document were derived from previously reviewed CWPPRA Priority Project Lists, as well as recommendations from the Coast 2050 regional teams. They are divided into regions, based on the four Coast 2050 regional teams, and then further identified as either "large scale" or "small scale".

ENCL 6

**CWPPRA MONITORING PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION COSTS**  
for previously approved but revised monitoring plans

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT	BASELINE MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION	MONITORING PLAN DEVELOPMENT	BASELINE MONITORING DEV. & IMP. BUDGET	TASK FORCE REVISED MONITORING DEV. & IMP. BUDGET	TASK FORCE REVISED MINUS BASELINE BUDGET
BA-02	GIWW to Clovelly	\$1,433,974	\$12,175	\$1,446,149	\$1,236,624	-\$209,525
CS-17	Cameron Creole Watershed	\$220,000	\$12,639	\$232,639	\$374,511	\$141,872
PO-18	Bayou Sauvage Phase 1	\$553,000	\$9,533	\$562,533	\$360,328	-\$202,205
CS-18	Sabine Refuge Protection	\$67,000	\$9,534	\$76,534	\$97,362	\$20,848
TE-16	Timballer Island Plantings	\$34,750	\$8,569	\$43,319	\$69,673	\$26,354
TE-17	Falgout Canal Plantings	\$34,750	\$8,773	\$43,523	\$62,994	\$19,471
CS-18	West Hackberry Plantings	\$34,750	\$9,067	\$43,817	\$68,630	\$24,790
ME-06	Dewitt-Rollover Plantings**	deauthorized				
BA-19	Barataria Bay Wetland/Waterway Wet. Rest.	\$134,000	\$8,375	\$142,375	\$83,424	-\$58,951
TE-19	Lower Bayou La Cache Wetland**	deauthorized				
PO-17	Bayou La Branche Wetland	\$134,000	\$9,075	\$143,075	\$274,024	\$130,949
ME-09	Cameron Prairie Refuge	\$67,000	\$9,846	\$76,846	\$101,177	\$24,331
TV-03	Vermilion River Cutoff	\$90,000	\$7,945	\$97,945	\$91,796	-\$6,149
TE-20	Eastern Isles Demaris	\$481,200	\$9,189	\$490,389	\$511,530	\$21,141
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 1</b>	<b>\$3,283,424</b>	<b>\$194,849</b>	<b>\$3,478,273</b>	<b>\$3,332,063</b>	<b>-\$146,210</b>
Priority List 2						
AT-02	Atchafalaya Sediment Delivery	\$131,626	\$9,672	\$141,298	\$212,750	\$71,452
ME-04	Freshwater Bayou	\$892,411	\$12,135	\$904,546	\$661,466	-\$243,080
PO-18	Bayou Sauvage Phase II	\$484,012	\$9,533	\$493,545	\$281,427	-\$212,118
CS-22	Clear Marsh	\$67,526	\$8,094	\$75,620	\$107,218	\$31,598
CS-20	East Mud Lake	\$638,676	\$12,639	\$651,315	\$1,372,544	\$721,229
BA-20	Jonathan Davis Wetland	\$670,940	\$12,272	\$683,212	\$616,665	-\$66,547
TE-22	Point au Fer	\$85,432	\$8,065	\$93,497	\$74,327	-\$19,170
AT-03	Big Island Mining	\$131,626	\$9,672	\$141,298	\$205,993	\$64,695
CS-21	Highway 364	\$233,572	\$11,748	\$245,320	\$394,931	\$149,611
PO-06	Fritchie Marsh	\$668,513	\$12,320	\$680,833	\$915,647	\$234,814
TV-09	Boston Canal Bank	\$69,687	\$9,571	\$79,258	\$137,735	\$58,477
CS-09	Brown Lake Marsh Management	\$638,676	\$11,466	\$650,142	\$620,564	-\$29,578
TE-23	West Belle Pass	\$131,626	\$9,430	\$141,056	\$163,974	\$22,918
TE-24	Eastern Isles Demaris Phase 1	\$131,626	\$9,189	\$140,815	\$157,804	\$16,989
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 2</b>	<b>\$5,352,949</b>	<b>\$146,636</b>	<b>\$5,499,585</b>	<b>\$6,961,771</b>	<b>\$1,462,186</b>
Priority List 3						
MR-06	Channel Armor Gap Crevasse	\$269,483	\$9,814	\$279,297	\$393,778	\$114,501
TV-04	Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration	\$834,015	\$12,490	\$846,505	\$766,937	-\$79,568
MR-07	Pass-a-Loutre Crevasse	pending deauthorization				
TE-26	Lake Chapuis Marsh Creation	\$667,212	\$11,611	\$678,823	\$748,112	\$69,289
TE-28	Brady Canal Hydrologic Restoration	\$663,206	\$9,951	\$673,157	\$1,064,338	\$391,181
BA-15	Lake Salvador Shore Protection (Demo)	\$131,667	\$9,051	\$140,718	\$68,809	-\$71,909
ME-12	SW Shore, White Lake Protection (Demo)	\$63,018	\$6,737	\$69,755	\$41,282	-\$28,473
PO-20	Red Mud Coastal Restoration (Demo)	\$312,910	\$11,137	\$324,047	\$367,364	\$43,317
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 3</b>	<b>\$3,141,781</b>	<b>\$72,791</b>	<b>\$3,214,572</b>	<b>\$3,530,629</b>	<b>\$316,057</b>
Priority List 4						
CS-24	Perry Ridge Shore Protection (Half)	\$67,780	\$6,477	\$74,257	\$153,704	\$77,437
BA-23	Barataria WW Shore Protection (West)	\$67,780	\$6,589	\$74,369	\$131,332	\$56,963
MR-08	Bank Use of Hopper Dredged Material	\$32,402	\$5,241	\$37,643	\$36,954	-\$689
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 4</b>	<b>\$167,962</b>	<b>\$22,307</b>	<b>\$190,269</b>	<b>\$321,990</b>	<b>\$131,701</b>
Priority List 5						
ME-13	Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization	\$68,993	\$9,910	\$78,903	\$56,748	-\$22,155
TE-29	Raccoon Island Breakwaters (Demo)	\$203,400	\$9,233	\$212,633	\$192,384	-\$20,249
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 5</b>	<b>\$272,393</b>	<b>\$19,143</b>	<b>\$291,536</b>	<b>\$249,132</b>	<b>-\$42,404</b>
Priority List 6						
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 6</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Priority List 7						
	<b>Subtotal Priority List 7</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$12,196,529</b>	<b>\$375,417</b>	<b>\$12,571,946</b>	<b>\$14,825,576</b>	<b>\$1,451,630</b>

Note: Baseline monitoring implementation budgets taken from Task Force Project Status Report dated January 9, 1998 except where project changes affected monitoring budgets.  
 The Task Force approved monitoring plan development costs to be added to implementation budgets on August 23, 1998, except for those projects to be paid for out of planning.  
 Task Force Revised Monitoring Development and Implementation Budget is based on a Task Force decision on April 14, 1998 to add up to 3 million dollars to approved plans to adjust for inflation.  
 All projects had previously received final Task Force approval prior to the budget review decision on April 14, 1998.

**CWPPRA MONITORING PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION COSTS**  
for unapproved monitoring plans

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT	BASELINE MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION	MONITORING PLAN DEVELOPMENT	TASK FORCE		
				BASELINE MONITORING DEV. & IMP. BUDGET	REVISED MONITORING DEV. & IMP. BUDGET	
Priority List 1	MR-03	West Bay Sediment Diversion	\$1,184,815	\$12,131	\$1,196,946	\$1,196,946
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 1</b>	<b>\$1,184,815</b>	<b>\$12,131</b>	<b>\$1,196,946</b>	<b>\$1,196,946</b>
Priority List 2	BS-03a	Caernarvon Diversion Outfall	\$812,670	\$11,445	\$824,115	\$837,103
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 2</b>	<b>\$812,670</b>	<b>\$11,445</b>	<b>\$824,115</b>	<b>\$837,103</b>
Priority List 3	PO-19	MRGO Back Dike Marsh Protection	\$170,747	\$8,841	\$179,588	\$191,577
	BA-04c	West Point a La Hache Outfall Mgmt	\$884,521	\$11,397	\$875,918	\$837,055
	CS-04a	Cameron Creole Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	BA-21	B. Perot and B. Rigoletes Marsh Rest.	deauthorized			\$0
	TE-25	East Timberlake Island Restoration	\$139,405	\$8,304	\$147,709	\$142,636
	CS-23	Replace Hog Island, West Cove	\$805,812	\$10,436	\$816,248	\$836,094
	BS-04a	White's Ditch Outfall Management	deauthorized			\$0
	TE-27	Whiskey Island Restoration	\$134,691	\$8,556	\$143,247	\$139,313
	PO-09a	Violet Freshwater Distribution (No pumps)	\$607,146	\$12,255	\$619,401	\$607,146
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 3</b>	<b>\$2,722,322</b>	<b>\$58,789</b>	<b>\$2,781,111</b>	<b>\$2,753,821</b>
Priority List 4	PO-21	Eden Isles East Marsh Restoration	deauthorized			
	BA-22	Hydrologic Restoration of Bayou L'ours Ridge	\$836,686	\$12,175	\$850,861	\$837,830
	TE-30	E. Timberlake Sediment Restoration (Ph2)	\$132,396	\$10,761	\$143,157	\$145,047
	BS-07	Grand Bay Crevasse	pending deauthorization			
	CS-25	Plowed Terraces (Demo)	\$26,142	\$11,875	\$38,017	\$41,450
	TE-31	Flotant Marsh Fencong (Demo)	\$20,934	\$10,111	\$31,045	\$185,670
	CS-26	Compost (Demo)	\$33,809	\$10,043	\$43,852	\$75,544
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 4</b>	<b>\$1,051,967</b>	<b>\$54,965</b>	<b>\$1,106,932</b>	<b>\$1,283,547</b>
Priority List 5	BA-24	Myrtle Grove Siphon (Phase 1)	\$855,992	\$11,244	\$867,236	\$836,900
	BA-3c	Naomi Outfall Management	\$523,851	\$11,209	\$535,060	\$589,166
	TV-12	Little Vermilion Bay Sediment Trapping	\$143,067	\$9,162	\$152,229	\$143,470
	TE-10	Grand Bayou Diversion	\$882,528	\$12,142	\$894,670	\$837,800
	BA-25	Bayou Lafourche Siphon (Phase 1)	\$855,992	\$11,781	\$867,773	\$881,585
	CS-11b	Sweet Lake/Willow Lake (Phase 1)	\$143,067	\$12,356	\$155,423	\$145,600
	PO-22	Bayou Chevee Marsh Creation	\$143,067	\$9,879	\$152,946	\$144,170
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 5</b>	<b>\$3,547,584</b>	<b>\$77,773</b>	<b>\$3,625,357</b>	<b>\$3,578,878</b>
Priority List 6	CS-27	Black Bayou Hydraulic Restoration	\$878,250	\$13,276	\$891,526	\$838,930
	TE-33	Bayou Boeuf Pump Station, Incr. 1	pending deauthorization			
	MR-09	Delta-Wide Crevasses	\$584,812	\$12,833	\$597,445	\$288,050
	TV-14	Marsh Island Hydrologic Restoration	\$648,601	\$13,221	\$661,822	\$673,747
	TE-34	Penchant Basin Plan w/ Shoreline Stabilization	\$855,145	\$20,367	\$875,512	\$868,020
	TV-15	Sediment Trapping at the Jaws	\$142,920	\$10,815	\$153,736	\$148,820
	TV-13a	Oaks/Avery Canals Hydrologic Restoration Incr.	\$666,113	\$13,221	\$679,334	\$673,747
	TE-32	Lake Boudreaux Basin Freshwater Intro - Alt. B	\$855,145	\$11,240	\$866,385	\$858,650
	BA-26	Barataria Bay Waterway Bank Protection East	\$71,069	\$10,185	\$81,254	\$78,790
	TE-35	Marsh Creation East of Atchafalaya R. - Incr. 1	pending deauthorization			
	MR-10	Dustpan/Cutterhead Dredging - Demo	\$0	\$10,517	\$10,517	\$48,000
	LA-02	Nutria Harvest for Wetland Restoration Demo	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000
	TV-16	Chenier Au Tigre Shoreline Demo	\$134,710	\$10,290	\$145,000	\$145,000
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 6</b>	<b>\$4,838,565</b>	<b>\$130,965</b>	<b>\$4,969,530</b>	<b>\$4,824,770</b>
Priority List 7	BA-27	Barataria Land Bridge (Ph 1)	\$71,905	\$8,868	\$80,773	\$81,560
	BA-28	Grand Terre Vegetative Planting	\$137,407	\$8,924	\$146,331	\$146,930
	TE-36	Thin Mat Floating Marsh (Demo)	\$151,619	\$8,924	\$160,543	\$160,543
	ME-14	Pecan Island Terracing	\$140,680	\$9,687	\$150,367	\$151,530
		<b>Subtotal Priority List 7</b>	<b>\$501,611</b>	<b>\$36,403</b>	<b>\$538,014</b>	<b>\$540,560</b>
		<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$14,657,814</b>	<b>\$383,471</b>	<b>\$15,041,285</b>	<b>\$14,818,420</b>

Note: Preliminary monitoring implementation budgets taken from Task Force Project Status Report dated January 9, 1998 except where project changes affected monitoring budgets.

The Task Force approved monitoring plan development costs to be added to implementation budgets on August 23, 1998, except for \$112,500 which was allocated out of planning funds.

Task Force Revised Monitoring Development and Implementation Budget as based on a Task Force decision on April 14, 1998 to stay within original approved budget adjusted to current inflation rates.

The Technical Committee on July 7, 1998 approved adding 1 year of pre-construction monitoring and monitoring plan development costs to the original budgets prior to adjusting budgets to current dollars.

Project budgets on LA-02 and TE-36 were reallocated because project implementation is essentially monitoring. Project budgets will not increase; however, monitoring budgets for LA-02 and TE-36 are now \$497,616 and \$471,825, respectively. All other demo project budgets were adjusted to be more realistic to what is needed to address the projects goals and objectives.

All projects with TAG approved monitoring plans and budgets to date are in bold awaiting Task Force approval.

O&M Summary

CWPPRA Operation & Maintenance Funding Analysis						
Project Number	P/L	Agency	Baseline Estimate	Actual		
				Economic Work Group (1/13/1998) Estimate	Variance Original	125% of Original
BA-15, i-1	3	NMFS	60,000	98,856	38,856	75,000
BA-15, i-2	3	NMFS	0	0	0	0
BA-24b	5	NMFS	773,496	1,118,703	345,207	966,870
MR-09	6	NMFS	3,470,239	3,734,177	263,938	4,337,799
TE-22	2	NMFS	220,000	439,675	219,675	275,000
AT-02	2	NMFS	75,000	451,404	376,404	93,750
AT-03	2	NMFS	225,000	413,033	188,033	281,250
TE-25	3	NMFS	0	0	0	0
TE-30	4	NMFS	0	0	0	0
CS-27	6	NMFS	410,000	577,332	167,332	512,500
TV-15	6	NMFS	14,139	249,177	235,038	17,674
TV-12	5	NMFS	10,000	192,289	182,289	12,500
BA-28	7	NMFS	39,962	59,320	19,358	49,953
TE-26	3	NMFS	150,000	406,468	256,468	187,500
ME-14	7	NMFS	0	176,665	176,665	0
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>5,447,836</b>	<b>7,917,099</b>	<b>2,469,263</b>	<b>6,809,795</b>
PO-16	1	USFWS	290,087	271,301	(18,786)	362,609
CS-17	1	USFWS	62,560	166,321	103,761	78,200
CS-18	1	USFWS	584,160	298,753	(285,407)	730,200
PO-18	2	USFWS	283,768	322,659	38,891	354,710
CS-23	3	USFWS	778,562	648,531	(130,031)	973,203
TE-10	5	USFWS	1,073,523	2,287,916	1,214,393	1,341,904
TE-32	6	USFWS	2,546,363	2,831,847	285,484	3,182,954
LA-02	1	USFWS	0	0	0	0
ME-09	1	USFWS	303,989	185,918	(118,071)	379,986
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>5,923,012</b>	<b>7,013,246</b>	<b>1,090,234</b>	<b>7,403,765</b>
BA-02	1	NRCS	1,952,936	1,324,183	(628,753)	2,441,170
TE-17,18,CS-19	1	NRCS	97,500	74,407	(23,093)	121,875
TV-09	2	NRCS	196,226	179,941	(16,285)	245,283
ME-04	2	NRCS	632,201	809,286	177,085	790,251
PO-06	2	NRCS	399,926	305,541	(94,385)	499,908
BA-20	2	NRCS	323,283	451,967	128,684	404,104
CS-09	2	NRCS	444,992	403,563	(41,429)	556,240
CS-20	2	NRCS	382,306	519,389	137,083	477,883
CS-21	2	NRCS	149,454	330,326	180,872	186,818
TV-04	3	NRCS	386,790	646,084	259,294	483,488
TE-28	3	NRCS	1,267,703	1,240,635	(27,068)	1,584,629
PO-09a	3	NRCS	333,606	337,207	3,601	417,008
CS-24	4	NRCS	69,332	448,478	379,146	86,665
BA-22	4	NRCS	90,280	412,055	321,775	112,850
BA-23	4	NRCS	116,394	801,824	685,430	145,493
BA-03c	5	NRCS	115,313	472,866	357,553	144,141
CS-11b	5	NRCS	248,588	467,182	218,594	310,735
TE-29	5	NRCS	24,464	16,724	(7,740)	30,580
ME-13	5	NRCS	274,953	567,523	292,570	343,691
TV-13a	6	NRCS	323,026	284,508	(38,518)	403,783
BA-26	6	NRCS	213,968	1,265,458	1,051,490	267,460
CS-25	4	NRCS	0	2,914	2,914	0
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>8,043,241</b>	<b>11,362,061</b>	<b>3,318,820</b>	<b>10,054,051</b>

ENCL 8



O&M Summary

CWPPRA Operation & Maintenance Funding Analysis						
Project Number	P/L	Agency	Baseline Estimate (1/13/1998)	Economic Work Group Estimate	Actual	
					Variance from Original	125% of Original
TV-03	1	USACOE	451,000	224,978	(226,022)	563,750
CS-22	2	USACOE	400,000	795,269	395,269	500,000
TE-23	2	USACOE	228,252	431,256	203,004	285,315
TV-14, TV5/7	4	USACOE	151,479	146,534	(4,945)	189,349
PO-22	5	USACOE	250,000	238,769	(11,231)	312,500
BA-19	1	USACOE	0	0	0	0
PO-17	1	USACOE	0	0	0	0
MR-06	3	USACOE	0	0	0	0
PO-19	3	USACOE	0	0	0	0
MR-08	4	USACOE	0	0	0	0
SF-14	4	USACOE	0	0	0	0
MR-10	6	USACOE	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>1,480,731</b>	<b>1,836,806</b>	<b>356,075</b>	<b>1,850,914</b>
TE-20	1	EPA	0	0	0	0
TE-24	2	EPA	0	0	0	0
TE-27	3	EPA	0	0	0	0
PO-20	3	EPA	60,000	0	(60,000)	75,000
CS-26	4	EPA	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>60,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-60,000</b>	<b>75,000</b>
<b>Totals</b>			<b>20,954,820</b>	<b>28,129,212</b>	<b>7,174,392</b>	<b>26,193,525</b>
					<b>See **</b>	
Projects Requiring More Information to Evaluate						
BA-25	5	EPA	2,231,237			2,789,046
BS-3a	2	NRCS	94,223			117,779 *
CS-4a	3	NRCS	3,719,926			4,649,908 *
BA-04c	3	NRCS	600,431			750,539 *
TE-31	4	NRCS	20,934			26,168
TE-34	6	NRCS	1,855,804			2,319,755
TE-36	7	NRCS	69,492			86,865
BA-27a	7	NRCS	892,799			1,115,999
TV-16	6	NRCS	3,000			3,750
MR-03	1	USACOE	6,473,000			8,091,250
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>15,960,846</b>	<b>15,960,846</b>		<b>19,951,058</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>44,090,058</b>		<b>46,144,583</b>
*Unreviewed project has existing cost share agreement						
** This is net figure of over/under budget. If excess budgeted funds are not redistributed, an additional \$1,731,764 are needed, totaling \$8,906,156.						

## CWPPRA Project Bid Overruns (Pre-award)

### STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:

Occasionally bids on CWPPRA projects may exceed the authorized amount plus the 25% contingency amount. When bids exceed the authorized amount plus the 25% contingency amount, the options are:

- Option 1) allow the acceptance period to expire and abandon the project
- Option 2) reject all bids, reduce the scope of the project and re-advertise
- Option 3) request additional funding from the Task Force and award the contract

### DISCUSSION:

Option 1) is not an acceptable option if the project is needed.

Option 2) may be required if the bids are obviously so far over the available funding that the Task Force would not consider additional funding requests.

Option 3) the most desirable option if the overrun is not excessive enough to be considered under Option 2) as a candidate for rejection, scope reduction and re-advertisement.

If option 2 or 3 is selected, the resulting cost effectiveness should be evaluated for substantial increases in cost/habitat unit (i.e. 25% above original). This will require a review of the change in benefits by the Environmental Work Group and approval by the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee

Provisions in bidding procedures by the State of Louisiana allow for acceptance of a bid within a 30 calendar day window after the offer is made.

Provisions in bidding procedures by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, under the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), allow for acceptance of a bid within a 60 calendar day window after the offer is made.

Provisions in bidding procedures by the Corps of Engineers, under the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), mandate acceptance of a construction bid within a 30 calendar day window after the offer is made, unless the bidder grants an extension in 30 day increments.

### RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1) The final engineers cost estimate must have been reviewed and updated within 90 days prior to advertisement.
- 2) If the final estimate, prior to advertising, equals or slightly exceeds the authorized amount less the 25% contingency amount, the bid package should contain a base bid, and additive or deductive alternatives that would allow the project to be awarded within the allocated funds plus the 25% contingency amount. The base bid with additive or deductive alternatives provides additional flexibility if the base bid is lower than anticipated.

- 3) If the final estimate is within the available funds (authorized amount) prior to bidding and the base bid without alternates approach was used but the bid exceeded the authorized amount plus the 25% contingency amount, the sponsor agency (federal or state) will notify each of the agencies on the Task Force of their intention to request additional funds within 15 days of receipt of bids. The sponsor should also provide the other members of the Task Force bid data and any information that supports the request for additional funds at the same time.
- 3) If the final estimate is within the available funds (authorized amount) prior to bidding and the base bid with alternates approach was used but the bid exceeded the authorized amount plus 25% contingency amount, the sponsor agency (federal or state) would apply deductive alternates to get the project within available funds. If after taking deductive alternatives the base bid still exceeds authorized funds plus 25% contingency, the sponsor will notify each of the agencies on the Task Force of their intention to request additional funds within 15 days of receipt of bids. The sponsor should also provide the other members of the Task Force bid data and any information that supports the request for additional funds at the same time.

**NOTES:**

- 1) The State of Louisiana must agree to cost share in the additional funds requested.
- 2) If a project has already received approval for a cost increase above the 25% contingency then it must stay within the budgeted amount for construction.

**PROGRAM STATUS  
ADDITIONAL KNOWN INCREASES**

	<u>Total Costs</u>	<u>Non-Federal Costs</u>	<u>Federal Costs</u>	<u>Cumulative Federal Funding Status</u>
Starting Point (9 Jun 98 Spreadsheet)				\$594,775
<b>1. Adjustments (Uses 85-15 Cost Sharing)<sup>4</sup></b>				
a. Fully-Funded Cost of Cheniere Au Tigre increase	\$348,623	\$34,807.30	\$313,268	\$281,509
b. Fully-Funded Cost of Approved Monitoring Plans <sup>1</sup>	\$3,800,000	\$450,000	\$2,550,000	(\$2,550,000)
c. Monitoring Plan Contingency Fund	\$1,552,105	\$232,816	\$1,319,289	(\$3,869,289)
d. Fully-Funded Cost of Unapproved Monitoring Plans	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$3,869,289)
e. Anticipated Oyster Lease Impacts	\$800,000	\$120,000	\$680,000	(\$4,549,289)
f. Anticipated O&M Increases <sup>1</sup>	\$7,000,000	\$1,050,000	\$5,950,000	(\$10,499,289)
g. Anticipated Bayou Lafourche Siphon Increases <sup>2</sup>	-	-	-	UNKNOWN
h. Estimated Cost of Isles Dernieres Project Expansion (New Cut Closure)	\$4,000,000	\$600,000	\$3,400,000	(\$13,899,289)
Subtotal	\$16,700,178	\$2,487,623	\$14,212,555	
<b>2. Additional Potential Deauthorizations</b>				
None	\$0	\$0	\$0	
<b>3. Deferrals</b>	<u>Total Deferred</u>	<u>Non-Fed. Share of Deferred Amt.</u>	<u>Fed. Share of Deferred Amt.</u>	<u>Cumulative Federal Funding Status</u>
a. Delta-Wide Crevasses	\$2,736,950	\$273,695	\$2,463,255	(\$16,362,544)
b. Penchant Basin Plan	\$7,051,550	\$705,155	\$6,346,395	(\$22,708,939)
c. Lake Boudreaux Basin	\$4,915,650	\$491,565	\$4,424,085	(\$27,133,024)
d. Nutria Harvest Demo	\$1,100,000	\$110,000	\$990,000	(\$28,123,024)
e. Bayou Lafourche Siphon	\$7,500,000	\$750,000	\$6,750,000	(\$34,873,024)
f. Myrtle Grove Siphon	\$5,000,000	\$500,000	\$4,500,000	(\$39,873,024)
Subtotal	\$ 28,304,150	\$4,245,623	\$24,058,528	
<b>4. Other Adjustments</b>			<u>Amount</u>	
Estimated FY 99 Federal Construction Allotment			\$37,100,000	-\$2,773,024
<b>5. Estimated Available Funds</b>			<u>Amount</u>	
Federal Funds Available for New Projects on 8th List			(\$2,773,024)	
Non-Federal Matching Share			-\$489,353	
Total Funds Available for New Projects On 8th List <sup>3</sup>			-\$3,262,377	

<sup>1</sup> Fully funded costs subject to verification and inflation factors applied by Economic Work Group

<sup>2</sup> Estimate provided by the Environmental Protection Agency

<sup>3</sup> Excludes Funds for DNR's proposed 20% O&M Contingency for Storms and Vandalism (\$9 million)

<sup>4</sup> For PPL all projects, save PPL 5 & 6, 85-15 cost sharing was used. PPL 5 & 6 is assumed for cost sharing at 90-10. Pending Task Force decision for approval of this ratio during the July 23, 1998 meeting.