

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

TASK FORCE MEETING

October 21, 1998

Minutes

I. INTRODUCTION

Opening comments were made by Colonel William Conner, who convened the fifteenth meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force at 9:35 a.m. on October 21, 1998, in the Conservation Hearing Room of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The agenda is shown as 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 presented as enclosure 2. Listed below are the six Task Force members.

Dr. Len Bahr, State of Louisiana
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
COL William L. Conner, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chairman

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes for the meeting held on July 23, 1998, were discussed. COL Conner praised the work of Dr. Bahr on the productive meeting held on October 20, 1998 with the State Wetland Authorities. Mr. Tom Bigford announced that he will be moving to another job position in his agency, and this meeting of the Task Force would be his last to serve for the Department of Commerce. Mr. Bigford also indicated that Mr. Jim Burgess of his agency would be filling the Department of Commerce position on the Task Force. COL Conner commended Mr. Bigford for his extensive and meaningful involvement as a Task Force member of the CWPPRA Program, and wished him well in his new challenges. Mr. Bill Hathaway made the motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Don Gohmert seconded the motion. The minutes of the Task Force meeting held on July 23, 1998 (enclosure 3), were then approved unanimously.

IV. TASK FORCE DECISIONS

A. Recommendation of Procedure for Conducting the 9th Priority Project List (PPL).

Mr. Edmond Russo provided a brief overview of the new planning process for 9th PPL projects. Dr. Steve Mathies presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee to approve the procedure for the 9th PPL process, which was refined through extensive efforts of the agencies and the State (enclosure 4). The most significant change to the process was the distinction between non-complex and complex projects, and the respective approaches outlined for developing these different project types. Non-complex projects were to be developed in a traditional manner. Complex projects would have a development plan that would address issues and analyses in the level of detail required. The course of study to arrive at the costs and benefits of complex projects would not be constrained to a single PPL cycle. This development stage would be planned prior to study initiation to extend through the number of PPL cycles necessary to ensure that the project could compete for funding on that future PPL when the project was fully developed. There were some minor recommendations for corrections/revisions to the procedure that were identified for compiling a final revision. These are reflected in the revised version, which is presented in enclosure 5.

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force approve the PPL 9 Project Planning Process with recommended revisions.

Second to Motion: Dr. Bahr

Motion passed unanimously

Dr. Bahr recommended that due to the notable changes in the PPL process, a summary version be included in the public notice that announces the start of the 9th PPL. It was the consensus of the Task Force to pursue this recommendation.

B. Recommendation of Approval for the FY 99 Planning Budget.

Mr. Russo provided an overview of the FY 99 budget, which was refined by the agencies and the State through several iterations prior to this meeting. The original budget, which was presented to the Task Force in their meeting books, was replaced with a revision copy during the meeting. Mr. Russo explained that the revisions were very minor and did not effect the budget figures. The original FY 99 budget is contained in enclosure 4 following the Draft PPL 9 Planning Process. Likewise the revised FY 99 budget is presented in enclosure 5 after the Final PPL 9 Planning Process version.

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the Task Force approve the FY 99 Budget.

Second to Motion: Mr. Gohmert

Motion passed unanimously

C. Discussion and Recommendation for Development of a Cash Flow Budgeting Procedure.

Dr. Mathies indicated that there are early stage developments of these concepts, but that the Task Force should provide guidance on such a procedure. A draft working proposal is contained in enclosure 6. Mr. Gohmert suggested that an Options paper be developed to elevate several possible methods for cash flow budgeting, and that a summary of pros and cons be compiled to compare the outlined options. Based on the comparative essay, a recommendation of the most favorable option should be stated for consideration of the Task Force in arriving at a decision for proceeding. Mr. Gohmert recommended that each agency should consider electing an individual with the appropriate background and experience in their organization to participate in developing the paper. Mr. Bigford mentioned that due consideration of the language contained in our Cost Sharing Agreements should be investigated to ensure compatibility with the options proposed for consideration. Ms. Vaughan suggested that consideration should also be given to grant requirements, permit requirements, and a timeline to "Zero Glidepath" of the Program, i.e., fiscal closeout of projects at the conclusion of the Program. Dr. Bahr suggested carefully phrasing the wording of the paper regarding program closeout, so that no momentum is lost in transitioning through reauthorization. By consensus of the Task Force, these guidelines were agreed upon for development of the Options Paper on Cash Flow Budgeting.

D. Recommendation of Project Deauthorization

Dr. Steve Mathies presented the recommendation of the Technical Committee to approve the deauthorization of Southwest Shore White Lake Protection (Demonstration Project), ME-12. Enclosure 7 contains that request. The standard operating procedures in effect for deauthorization were followed.

Motion by Mr. Hathaway: That the Task Force approve the deauthorization of Shore White Lake Protection (Demonstration Project), ME-12.

Second to Motion: Mr. Bigford
Motion passed unanimously

E. Report on Potential Cost Increases in the Program

In review of the spreadsheet on potential cost increases in the program, it was decided that any new project proposed additions be deleted from the spreadsheet. For this reason, the potential increase amount of \$348,073 (total cost) for Chenier Au Tigre was deleted. Also, an error in the spreadsheet computations was identified for correction. For item 3.f., the correct figure for the Cumulative Federal Funding Status cell should have been \$35,204,509. These changes revised the Total Funds Available for New Projects on the 8th PPL to \$6,818,088. The original and revised spreadsheets are contained in

enclosures 8 and 9 (revised first sheet only), respectively. The decision for establishing the available dollars for PPL 8, based on approval of these potential cost increase items, was deferred until the next Task Force meeting.

F. Discussion and Recommendation for the Bayou Lafourche Project.

Mr. McQuiddy delivered a presentation of the latest available costs and benefits of the project, and indicated that some additional work would be necessary to complete the investigations. Several speakers and the Task Force ensued into a lengthy discussion after this presentation. Some indicated that this project has the potential to benefit the bayou, but uncertainty remains of the impacts to the local residents based on the results presented up to the present time. Also, some believed that further study was necessary to resolve questions of implementability, costs, and wetland benefits. There were some comments that the project would be appropriate for this program if final study results reveal that there are substantial wetland benefits. If the project would appear, after further study, to be primarily beneficial for other factors, such as water supply and quality, there was the suggestion that another funding source be pursued other than CWWPRA. Based on this, some believed that with the prospect the project would result in multi-use benefits, it may become appropriate that CWWPRA cost share on the project with other applicable authorities and/or partners.

After much debate, there was discussions to return a portion of the project construction funds, if an additional \$500,000 would be approved to finalize the remaining investigations that have been initiated thus far.

Motion by Dr. Bahr: That \$500,000 be granted for completion of studies, \$11 million of construction funds of the project be returned to the General Fund until further study is completed, and the remaining funds be retained in the project (\$3.7 million for E&D, \$12 million for construction).

Second to Motion: Mr. Hathaway

With the State unable to vote on matters involving funding:

Opposed: USFWS, NMFS, and NRCS.

In favor: USEPA

Motion failed

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That all but \$4.2 million for the Bayou Lafourche project be deobligated, that the Task Force approve expenditure of \$500,000 for the initial additional engineering studies, that the remaining engineering and design studies would require the approval of the Task Force and that approval would be contingent upon adequate partners being identified that would provide in the Task Force's opinion sufficient financial support that would render our wetland contribution to be a cost effective one.

Mr. Hathaway indicated that there is no procedure in the Program to allow a motion to be heard by other than the sponsoring agency, regarding decisions of funding for that sponsor's projects. With the uncertainty of this, COL Conner indicated that he must disallow Mr. Frugé's motion at this time until a legal opinion could be provided on this matter. Consequently, the discussion came to a conclusion, where the matter would be resolved at a later date. Despite this, there was general consensus for providing at a minimum the required funding to complete the study questions. Ms. Vaughan stated that provision of such funds would have to be contingent on approval of the State's cost share by the State Wetlands Authority.

Motion by Mr. Gohmert: That \$500,000 be granted to complete the required studies, contingent on approval of the State's cost share by the State Wetlands Authority.

Second by Dr. Bahr

Motion passed unanimously

G. Consideration for Approval of Final Monitoring Plans.

Dr. Mathies offered the recommendation of the Technical Committee for the Task Force to consider approval of the following project monitoring plans:

- a. Nutria Harvest and Wetland Restoration Demonstration Project, LA-02;
- b. Sweet Lake/Willow Lake, CS-11b;
- c. Compost Demonstration Project, CS-26;
- d. Plowed Terrace, CS-25;
- e. Bayou Chevee, PO-22;
- f. East Timbalier Sediment Restoration, TE-25;
- g. Whiskey Island, TE-27; and
- h. East Timbalier, TE-30

Motion by Mr. Gohmert: That these monitoring plans be approved as presented.

Second to Motion: Mr. Hathaway.

Motion passed unanimously

H. Recommendation for Approval of Bid Overrun Procedure.

Dr. Mathies presented the revised Bid Overrun Procedure (enclosure 10) for consideration of Task Force approval.

Motion by Mr. Gohmert: That the procedure be adopted by the Task Force.

Second to Motion: Mr. Hathaway

Motion passed unanimously

I. Recommendation for Approval of Project Implementation for Nutria Harvest Demonstration Project, LA-02TS

Enclosure 11 contains a letter of request for implementation of the Nutria Harvest project, which was presented by Messrs. Darryl Clark and Noel Kindler.

Motion by Mr. Frugé: That the project be approved for implementation as presented

Second: Mr. Gohmert

Motion passed unanimously

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

Mr. Townsley provided an overview of the economic evaluations made to date. A summary is presented in enclosure 12. Of issue was whether agencies having completed projects should move towards returning excess project funds to the General Fund, in order to minimize the additional amount of funds that would be recommended to properly fund operation and maintenance (O&M) of projects. The Economic Workgroup indicated that if excess funds were returned to the General Fund, about \$7.5 million would be needed to cover unanticipated O&M costs. If no excess funds from projects were returned to the General Fund, about \$10.5 million would be needed for this. The Task Force endorsed agency reviews of completed projects, in order to return funds not deemed needed so that these evaluations could be completed by the next Task Force meeting.

K. Discussion on Decision to Establish Consistency of Acreage Amounts Reflected in Various CWPPRA Reports and Publications.

Dr. Mathies delivered the recommendation of the Technical Committee to ensure that we maintain consistency when publishing CWPPRA project acreage amounts, in order to avoid conflicting reports. It was the consensus of the Task Force to adopt this as a policy.

L. Delivery of Status Reports

Dr. Steve Mathies provided summaries of the reports, which are contained in enclosure 13.

V. DATE AND LOCATION OF NEXT TASK FORCE MEETING

The next Task Force Meeting was tentatively scheduled for January 20, 1999 at 9:30 a.m. in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Task Force members will be contacted with final meeting details at a later date.

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.



ATTENDANCE RECORD



DATE(S) October 21, 1998 9:30 a.m.	SPONSORING ORGANIZATION COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT	LOCATION Conservation Hearing Room Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Building 625 North 4 th Street, Baton Rouge, 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
Bruce Lett	USDA - NRCS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	38-423-2256 (t) (f)
Gary Rauber	COE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	304 862 2543 (t) 2572 (f)
Edmund Russo	COE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504 862-1496(t) 2572(f)
Greg Steye	DNR Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504 342 9435 (t) 6801 (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 (t) - 66 89 (f)
Jeanene Pickham	EPA Check for public meeting notice: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-389-0736 (t) -0704 (f)
Bryth Poy	NRCS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318 473 7811 (t) (f)
Don Gohmert	NRCS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318 (t) 473-7751 (f)
David Fung	DOI - USEWS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318/262-6630 (t) (f)
Rickey Ruebeum	DOC/NMFS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	225/389-0508 (t) 0506 (f)

PARTICIPANT REGISTER (CONTINUED)

NAME	JOB TITLE AND ORGANIZATION (Include mailing address if new or changed)	TELEPHONE & FAX NUMBERS
Osborn	NMF'S - Silver Spring Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	301-73-0171 (f) 301-73-0184 (f)
Diane D. Smith	DNR - CRD / Assistant Administrator Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Task Force	225/342-3949 (f) (f)
Steve Mathis	CEE Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504/ 862-2678 (f) (f)
Ronny Paille	FWS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	318 262-6662 ext 234 (f) (f)
ONEIL MALBROUM	Jefferson PA / CEEC Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(504) 347-2100 (f) (f)
Jay Iselt	NRCS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(318) 291-3060 (f) (f)
M. Gasliano	CEI for EPA Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	225-383-7455 (f) (f)
Bill Good	DNR Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(f) 225-342-7308 (f)
Alvin 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	503-736-1713 (f) (f)
Steve Gault	DNA Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	225 342-0961 (f) (f)
Rick Horton	NMF'S Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	(f) (f)
John R...	USGS Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	342-2077 (f) (f)
MARTIN CANCIENNE	LONG Billy TANZIN Check for public meeting notice: <input type="checkbox"/> P&E Subc. <input type="checkbox"/> Tech. Com. <input type="checkbox"/> Task Force	504-621-8490 (f) (f)

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 16th 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 3rd PPL (enclosure 5) and requested initiation of project deauthorization by the Task Force. The concensus 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 ~~FDA~~^{feasibility} 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 CWPRA, 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 5th and 6th 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 5th and 6th 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 20th 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.

Draft Planning Process for the 9th Priority Project List (PPL)
and the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 Planning Program Budget

October 21, 1998

Planning Process
for the Remainder of the 8th Priority Project List (PPL) and the 9th PPL
for the Development of the Fiscal Year 1999 Planning Program Budget

1.0 Introduction.

For completion the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 planning budget, the finalized version of the PPL 9 planning process is described in the following. This process was used for the 9th PPL to complete the FY 99 Planning Schedule and Budget for each agency, as shown in Encl. 2. For budgeting purposes, tasks previously established for the 8th PPL that will occur in FY 99 are contained in Encl. 2. These tasks are not described below. In Encl. 2, tasks for PPL 8 and 9 are identified by "PL" category and sequence number. Other FY 99 tasks for which costs should also be estimated are listed in Encl. 2 below the PL tasks.

2.0 Background on the Formulation of the PPL 9 Planning Process.

In order to establish a protocol for the project planning process, initial work was necessary to finalize the particulars of the PPL 9 planning program. What follows are steps or activities deemed by the P&E as necessary for development of PPL 9 and subsequent lists.

PL 9010 – Initial Process Formulation. A draft proposal for the PPL 9 project planning process was disseminated the week of August 24, 1998, for review and comment by Coast 2050 participants, local governments, the public, and members of the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee (P&E).

PL 9015 – Intermediate Process Formulation. During a meeting of the P&E in New Orleans on September 1, 1998, the initial draft proposal was discussed and comments were made for consideration. Coast 2050 participants, local governments, and the public were invited to attend the meeting and provide their input. A revised proposal was produced based on the discussion at this meeting, which was re-distributed to the P&E the week of September 7, 1998 for advance review prior to their next meeting.

PL 9020 – Final Process Formulation. A P&E meeting was convened in Baton Rouge on September 11, 1998, to discuss and make further comments on the PPL 9 planning process, with a view towards establishing the FY 99 budget. Further comments were incorporated that were formulated as a result of the Technical Committee meeting held in Baton Rouge on October 8, 1998. The planning process presented in the following constitutes a recommended final version of the PPL 9 planning process.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING AGENDA

Conservation Hearing Room
Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Building
625 North 4th Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

October 21, 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 July 23, 1998 Meeting D

- III. Consideration for Approval of Procedures for the 9th Priority Project List (PPL) and the FY 99 Planning Budget. (Tisdale) - 9:30 am to 9:45 am E

- IV. Discussion of Concepts for Cash Flow Budgeting of Future Selected and Approved PPL Projects. (Tisdale) - 9:45 to 10:15 am F

- V. Report on Other Anticipated Project Cost Increases. (Mathies) - 10:15 to 10:45 am G

- VI. Consideration for Approval of Procedures to Handle Bid Overruns. (Mathies) - 10:45 pm to 11:00 pm H

- VII. Recommendation of Project Deauthorization of Southwest Shore White Lake Protection (Demonstration Project), ME-12. (Paul) - 11:00 pm to 11:15 pm I

- VIII. Consideration for Approval of Project Implementation for the Nutria Harvest and Wetland Restoration Demonstration Project, LA-02. (Mathies) - 11:15 pm to 11:30 pm J

- Lunch 11:30 am 12:30 pm

- IX. Discussion of the Bayou Lafourche Project. (Tisdale) - 12:30 am to 1:15 am K

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

TASK FORCE MEETING AGENDA
(continued)

Tab

- X. Consideration for Approval of Final Monitoring Plans. (Steyer) - 1:15 pm to 1:30 pm
 - a. Nutria Harvest and Wetland Restoration Demonstration Project, LA-02;
 - b. Sweet Lake/Willow Lake, CS-11b;
 - c. Compost Demonstration Project, CS-26;
 - d. Plowed Terrace, CS-25;
 - e. Bayou Chevee, PO-22;
 - f. East Timbalier Sediment Restoration, TE-25;
 - g. Whiskey Island, TE-27; and
 - h. East Timbalier, TE-30 L

 - XI. Review and Discussion for Decision on: (Tisdale) - 1:30 pm to 2:00 pm
 - a. Acreage Amounts Reflected in Various CWPPRA Reports and Publications;
 - b. Annual Reporting on Status of Projects in Implementation Phase; and
 - c. Implementation of "As-Builts" Database for Completed Projects.....M

 - XII. Delivery of Status Reports: (Mathies) - 2:00 pm to 2:45 pm
 - a. Program Performance and Project Implementation;
 - b. 8th Priority Project List;
 - c. Report to Congress;
 - d. Feasibility Study Steering Committee;
 - e. Outreach Committee Report;
 - f. Needs List;
 - g. Atchafalaya Liaison Group; and
 - h. State Conservation Plan..... N

 - XIII. Report on Status of Updating Fully Funded Costs for Monitoring Plans and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) for Priority Project List Projects. (Mathies) - 2:45 pm to 3:00 pm..... O

 - XIV. Status of the Coastwide Strategy, Coast 2050. (Good) - 3:00 pm to 3:15 pm..... P

 - XV. Additional Agenda Items and Request for Public Comments - 3:15 pm to 3:45 pm Q

 - XVI. Date and Location of the Next Task Force Meeting - 3:45 pm to 4:00 pm.....R
- Adjourn - 4:00 pm

Finalized Planning Process for the 9th Priority Project List (PPL)
and the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 Planning Program Budget

December 1, 1998

Planning Process for the 9th Priority Project List (PPL)
and the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 Planning Program Budget

1.0 Introduction.

The finalized version of the PPL 9 planning process is described in the following. This process has been instituted by the Task Force through the work and recommendations of the Planning & Evaluation Subcommittee and Technical Committee. The FY 99 Planning Schedule and Budget for each agency reflects this process and is shown in Encl. 1. For budgeting purposes, tasks previously established for the 8th PPL that will occur in FY 99 are contained in Encl. 1. These tasks are not described below. In Encl. 1, tasks for PPL 8 and 9 are identified by "PL" category and sequence number. Other FY 99 tasks for which costs should also be estimated are listed in Encl. 1 below the PL tasks. Encl. 2 is a flowchart for the PPL 9 planning process.

2.0 Background on the Formulation of the PPL 9 Planning Process.

In order to establish a protocol for the project planning process, initial work was necessary to finalize the particulars of the PPL 9 planning program. What follows are steps or activities deemed by the P&E as necessary for development of PPL 9 and subsequent lists.

PL 9010 – Initial Process Formulation. A draft proposal for the PPL 9 project planning process was disseminated the week of August 24, 1998, for review and comment by Coast 2050 participants, local governments, the public, and members of the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee (P&E).

PL 9015 – Intermediate Process Formulation. During a meeting of the P&E in New Orleans on September 1, 1998, the initial draft proposal was discussed and comments were made for consideration. Coast 2050 participants, local governments, and the public were invited to attend the meeting and provide their input. A revised proposal was produced based on the discussion at this meeting, which was re-distributed to the P&E the week of September 7, 1998 for advance review prior to their next meeting.

PL 9020 – Final Process Formulation. A P&E meeting was convened in Baton Rouge on September 11, 1998, to discuss and make further comments on the PPL 9 planning process, with a view towards establishing the FY 99 budget. Further comments were incorporated that were formulated as a result of the Technical Committee meeting held in Baton Rouge on October 8, 1998. On October 21, 1998, the Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force approved the PPL 9 Planning Process and FY 99 Schedule and Budget, contingent on minor edits identified during the meeting.

3.0 Methodology for Development, Evaluation, Selection, and Funding of Projects on the 9th PPL.

For tasks described in that to follow, estimated dates are shown in Encls. 1 and 2. Preliminary locations are provided for cases where there will be meetings as part of these tasks.

3.1 Investigation Phase. In regional nomination workshops open but not limited to the public, local governments, the State, and Federal Agencies, participants will be invited to nominate projects for consideration as candidate and demonstration projects for the 9th PPL. Each project proposed as a candidate or for demonstration purposes must support one or more Coast 2050 strategies in order to qualify for consideration in the process. It will be recommended that projects be proposed with the intention of specifically addressing Coast 2050 regional strategies recognized as being among the most important to coastal restoration.

PL 9025 - Regional Nomination Workshops. Four meetings, one in each of the Coast 2050 regions, (Cameron, Morgan City, and two meetings in New Orleans) will be conducted by the P&E to receive project nominations from any interested party for the 9th PPL. Invitation for these meetings will include the public, State and local government representatives, Federal Agencies, the State, the CWPPRA Workgroups¹, and the Regional Planning Team (RPT) of Coast 2050.

Any number of projects will be accepted for nomination in each Coast 2050 region. After receiving nominations in each region, the focus of the regional meeting will be to engage in interactive discussions of the projects nominated. The purpose of these discussions will be to arrive at a select group of projects per region, through general consensus of meeting attendees, to carry forward for consideration in the PPL 9 planning process. The goal of each regional meeting will be to qualitatively identify up to 15 of the total number of nominee and demonstration projects that exhibit the highest potential for addressing Coast 2050 strategies. At the conclusion of each meeting, the P&E will approve the consensus-based group of up to 15 projects for the region. If necessary, the P&E will establish a 15-project cutoff of the consensus-based group of projects, in the event the number of projects recommended through discussions exceeds 15.

After finalizing the list of up to 60 projects for the four regions, no additional projects of any type will be added to the PPL 9 process after this stage. A public announcement will be mailed to present the final list of nominee and demonstration projects. A brief description and map of the projects will be included in the package.

¹ Engineering Workgroup (EngWG), Environmental Workgroup (EnvWG), Economics Workgroup (EcoWG), Monitoring Workgroup (MWG), Academic Advisory Group (AAG), and real estate specialists from both the Corps and DNR.

PL 9030 – Nominee Project Review and Assignment. In one scoping meeting (Lafayette) involving the public, local governments, agencies/State, Workgroups, and the RPT, the 60 nominee and demonstration projects carried forward will receive a cursory review for discussion and comment. Additionally, there will be an opportunity to address issues of interest and concern. During this review, each nominee project will be categorized by level of effort necessary to fully evaluate and construct, as either:

- ◆ non-complex, with only basic analyses² required, or
- ◆ complex, where the analysis will be considered relatively detailed in nature.³

At the completion of the meeting, there will be an attempt to assign at least one complex project to each Federal Agency and the State. Each Federal Agency and the State will adopt up to 15 complex and non-complex projects of the 60, depending on staffing, and/or other factors, for preliminary investigation-level research after this meeting. There will be an attempt to assign an equitable distribution of complex and non-complex projects to each Federal Agency and the State, depending on the number of these projects of the 60.

PL 9040 – Scoping and Screening Phase. For projects of the 60 nominees proposed as candidates, the purpose of this phase will be to: (1) raise technical issues of concern, (2) screen each nominee project against qualification criteria for candidate projects, and (3) identify investigations and analyses that will be necessary during the development phase.

In preparation for this phase, preliminary investigation-level research will be performed by agencies and the State that are respectively assigned to nominee projects in task PL 9035. This background work will include identification of historical trends and their causes and effects, current conditions (using existing monitoring and other available information), and forecasted no-action changes for 5, 10, 15, and 20 years into the future. Agencies of nominee projects will bring to this meeting any available schematics, photographs, hydrographs, etc., as deemed necessary to facilitate discussions.

A two- to three-day-long scoping and screening meeting (Baton Rouge) will be conducted by the P&E, with participation of the public, local governments, Workgroups, and the RPT. It is very important that at this stage all agencies and the State involve their engineering expertise in support of these meetings, to include but not be limited to engineers in the following functions/disciplines: waterways, hydraulics/coastal, geotechnical, structures, relocations, and cost estimating.

² The categorization of non-complex being the case where there is certainty and consensus of the problems and corrective measures proposed.

³ Complexity defined as the case where advanced analyses will be required to address issues of uncertainty and/or lack of consensus of: (1) the existence of either a problem and associated magnitude, and/or (2) validity or functionality of proposed corrective measures.

COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION, AND RESTORATION ACT

In this stage, each nominee and demonstration project will be evaluated using the following criteria to determine if the project:

- ◆ appears to fall within the intent of the Act for restoration of vegetated wetlands (other benefit categories that may exist other than this should also be identified),
- ◆ is identified to have adverse effects/conflicts with existing features and/or facilities that are functioning for another genuine purpose,
- ◆ falls more within the scope of other programs/studies that are currently under way to address the stated problems,
- ◆ is technically not possible/not implementable, or against governmental policy.

By consensus of the P&E, all nominee and demonstration projects that have been favorably evaluated against these criteria will be recommended for carry-over into the next level of evaluation, which will be the candidate project phase. The P&E will then vote to determine the top complex projects non-complex projects of those projects passing the scoping and screening phase, based on the level of planning funds reasonably believed to be available by the P&E to carry out the proper development of the projects. The voting for complex and non-complex projects will occur in two separate lists, where the top 6 complex projects and top 30 non-complex projects would be respectively carried forward for development. Prior to voting, the P&E would be able to adjust the caps for projects to be carried forward, depending staffing and financial resources available under the Program. In this voting process, the sequencing of strategies of Coast 2050 will be the primary factor of consideration. Projects that pass the scoping/screening phase that are not voted among the top contenders for respective categories of non-complex/complex that year could be re-nominated in the next planning cycle for consideration.

Next, approximately 3 to 5 non-complex projects of the top 30 will be respectively assigned to each Federal Agency and the State for development. There will be an attempt to assign at least one complex project of the top 6 to each agency and the State, depending on agency/State position on their capacity for development of the complex project in consideration. During assignment of projects for development, projects initially assigned to agencies/State for background work could possibly transferred between agencies/State to level the work load of project development.⁴

The final list of candidate and demonstration projects will be presented to the Technical Committee (TC) for consideration and revision. The Task Force (TF) will receive a recommendation from the TC on a list of candidate and demonstration projects for the 9th PPL. The TF will review this list and provide the final list of candidate and demonstration projects for further development.

⁴ Coordination will be made by the State for identification of Federal Sponsoring Agencies for projects assigned to the State for development.

3.2 Development Phase. In this phase, project development will occur for the candidate and demonstration projects. Demonstration and Candidate projects identified as non-complex will receive traditional PPL development. Demonstration projects that are proposed should exhibit new and innovative methods and technology, and will only have to be planned, engineered, and designed -- not analyzed for cost effectiveness. Complex projects will be developed through more detailed investigations and analyses outlined prior to initiation of development.

The P&E will provide the senior management and oversight for execution of project development, with sponsoring agencies/State selecting Project Managers (PM) from within their respective organizations to oversee this work. Each PM will report their project development status on a quarterly basis in written format (email), to the Chairman of the P&E, who will work with the PMs and the P&E to ensure timely execution of project development.

3.2.1 Complex Projects. For complex candidate projects, there will be more detailed analyses than that of traditional project development. Steps of a Project Development Plan (PDP) will be drafted by respective agencies/State sponsoring complex projects. As part of the PDP, the PM of complex projects will: (1) organize a plan of project development⁵ (2) develop a work schedule, (3) identify the technical resources that will be used⁶, and (4) estimate costs for completing tasks for development. It is expected that the PDP of a complex project would result in a development duration of about 1 to 3 years long. Therefore, it is not anticipated that complex projects where PDP execution is initiated during the PPL 9 planning cycle will be completely developed until a subsequent PPL planning cycle. Developed complex projects will be scheduled for completion and competition on a subsequent PPL to the 9th PPL.

PL 9050 -- Compilation of PDPs for Complex Projects. In drafting the PDP, consideration will be given to employ of some or all of the following steps, which are outlined below as guidance to facilitate complex project development. Draft PDPs will be compiled within 3 months after assignment to agencies/State for development.

- ◆ **Step A.** Specify the issues, problems, and opportunities.
- ◆ **Step B.** Inventory and forecast the no-action conditions for 5, 10, 15, and 20 years into the future.
- ◆ **Step C.** State the study objectives and establish screening criteria for assessing the potential of alternative plans for meeting the objectives. Formulate alternative plans and their respective increments/scales to address the wetland problems and surrounding issues, based on public input and

⁵ Simplified framework for agency consideration in organizing PDPs, which was derived from the Planning Primer, IWR Report 97-R-15, dated November 1997, and the Planning Manual, IWR Report 96-R-21, dated November 1996. These documents can be downloaded from the Internet from the location: <http://www.wtsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/currpt.htm>.

⁶ This may be in-house resources, contract services, or resources of another agency or the State.

technical considerations.⁷ Objectively apply screening criteria to alternative plans and/or respective increments/scales to eliminate any that do not meet this criteria.

- ◆ **Step D.** Evaluate the effects of implementing each of the alternative plans and their respective increments/scales, by accomplishing that which follows. Refer to Paragraph A.1 of the Appendix for detailed explanations of technical analyses of the PPL 9 process.
 - **Step D.1** Completing/determining the required engineering, environmental compliance, and real estate analyses, with graphical layout of the results on a site map to address the problem statement,
 - **Step D.2** Establish the objectives of the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) and Monitoring Plan (MP). Each agency sponsoring a project will formulate the O&M and MP objectives for their projects, and the EngWG and EcoWG will respectively refine these objectives of O&M and MP during their sessions of project review and comment. The objectives established for O&M and MP should respectively reflect only those deemed most valuable by the EngWG and EnvWG in their review of projects.
 - **Step D.3** Estimate the cost of each alternative plan and increment/scale for: Project Construction (PC) with 25% contingencies, Engineering and Design (E&D), Environmental Compliance, Real Estate Requirements (RE), Permitting (PR), Project Management (PM) (COE -- \$500/yr admin., \$30,000 min. for proj. mgt., up to 6% PC, and DNR -- 2% of PC min.), Construction Supervision and Inspection (S&I), and Periodic/Annual Costs (PAC), to include: O&M and MP of the project,
 - **Step D.4** Coordinate for completion of the Wetland Value Assessments (WVAs) of each alternative plan and increment/scale,
 - **Step D.5** Coordinate for an economic evaluation of each alternative plan and increment/scale to develop their respective fully funded first costs, and

⁷ Alternative plan, as used in this planning process, is defined as a proposed system to be studied, which consists of a number of measures assembled to function either separately or in unison to accomplish one or more objectives of the project. Scale, as used in this planning process, is defined as a specific size of an alternative plan that possesses all of the same measures that function either separately or in unison to accomplish one or more objectives of the project. Increments, as used in this planning process, are defined as respective constant-scale configurations of an alternative plan, that possesses varying combinations of measures of those comprehensively contained in the alternative plan, which function either separately or in unison to accomplish one or more objectives of the project. The criteria to identify the difference between alternative plans lies in the difference of fundamental strategy, or method of approach, that these plans respectively employ to accomplish the project objectives.

- Step D.6 Execute incremental cost effective analyses for each alternative and respective increment/scale.
- ◆ Step E. Perform a comparison of the results from Step D for the suite of alternative plans considered to arrive at the alternative plan and increment/scale for that candidate project that is the most incrementally cost effective⁸.
- ◆ Step F. Select a recommended plan for the candidate project, based on the study objectives and any other factors, such as issues, support for specific alternative plans, etc. Rationale will be provided for selection of the recommended plan.

PL 9055 – Review and Comment of Draft PDPs for Complex Projects. Draft PDPs of complex projects will be disseminated by the PMs of complex projects to the P&E, Workgroups, and the RPT for review and comment. Written comments will be sent by reviewers to the respective project PMs for resolution and revision of the PDPs. Comments not incorporated by PMs in the final project PDPs will be resolved in a written reply to reviewers.

PL 9056 – Draft PDP Discussions for Complex Projects. Reviewers and PMs of complex projects will convene in up to 3 meetings (Baton Rouge), as required, to discuss resolutions to comments of draft PDPs and to negotiate the final format of the PDPs. Also, these meetings will be conducted to negotiate budgeting of the PDP tasks in the current and out fiscal years. Depending on the number of complex project PDPs, tasks of the PDPs may have to be spread among several FYs in order to not exceed the unallocated level of planning funds available.⁹

PL 9057 – PDP Finalization for Complex Projects. In this task, each agency/State will finalize their PDP based on the results of task PL 9056. Finalized PDPs will be disseminated to members of the P&E for formal approval, funding, and management oversight during PDP execution.

PL 9060 – Development of Complex Projects. The Task Force has reserved about \$740,000, as identified as being available in FY 99 for this task, which will be provided to agencies/State as necessary based on the requirements of approved PDPs that are finalized and are ready for execution. This is shown in the "totals" column of Encl. 1.

The PM of each project will prepare work products of the PDP for review and comment, based on input of the PM's technical resources. Work products from each step of the studies will receive review and comment by designated Workgroups and the RPT. The focus of review and comment will be to ensure accuracy, consistency, and correction

⁸ This is defined as that plan having the lowest incremental fully funded first cost above the next smaller plan in cost, in the sequence of plans of cost per unit benefit. The program "TWR Plan" was developed for this purpose by the Institute for Water Resources. IWR Plan may be downloaded from the Internet from the site: <http://www.pmc1.com/iwrplan/Download1.htm>.

⁹ Refer to PL 9060 for the level of funds available in FY 99 for complex project development.

of errors, and omissions. Table 1 presents a matrix of work responsibilities that describes the proponents for producing/refining (PR) products, and reviewing/commenting (RC) on products. All review comments must be resolved for the latest task of the executed PDP under review, prior to the PM of the complex project initiating the next step of the PDP.

Table 1
Matrix of Work Responsibilities

	Sponsoring Agency	EngWG	EnvWG	EcoWG	MWG	AAG	RPT
Step A	PR	RC	RC			RC	RC
Step B	PR	RC	RC			RC	RC
Step C	PR	RC	RC		RC	RC	RC
Step D							
Step D.1	PR	RC					RC
Step D.2	PR	RC			PR/RC		RC
Step D.3	PR	RC			RC		RC
Step D.4			PR/RC		RC	PR/RC	RC
Step D.5				PR/RC			RC
Step D.6	PR	RC	RC	RC		RC	RC
Step E	PR	RC	RC	RC		RC	RC
Step F	PR	RC	RC	RC		RC	RC

For Step C and Steps D.1 through D.3, there will be an initial EngWG review/comment of the work products for recommendations on refining the engineering aspects. After this, there will be review/comment by the EnvWG to recommend refinements to optimize the wetland benefits. The refined work products will then receive final review/comment from the EngWG to complete the final work products.

Each sponsoring agency will prepare a project development report to document and present the results of each step of the study.¹⁰ The technical data, information, analyses, and designs, for the project development steps will be placed in appendices of the report. An executive summary of the report will summarize the recommended plan, its fully funded first cost and the average annual benefits. Members of the P&E will review draft versions of the reports and provide written comments to PMs of these projects resolution and report finalization.

3.2.2 Non-Complex Projects. The tasks shown below will only be necessary at a minimum, for the development of non-complex projects. Other pertinent aspects not described below that are necessary for development of certain non-complex projects should also be completed on a case by case basis. It is expected that traditional project development for non-complex projects will be completed within a year. This is described in Steps D.1 through D.5 of Task PL 9050, which are shown by task for non-complex projects in the following.

¹⁰ Guidance available in the Planning Manual, pp. 230-237.