

**COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND
RESTORATION ACT
(CWPPRA)**

**PROJECT STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES
MANUAL**

Revision 17

March 9, 2010

Table of Contents

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
PROJECT STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES MANUAL	1
1. APPLICABILITY	1
2. REFERENCES	1
3. PURPOSE.....	1
4. DEFINITIONS	1
5. GENERAL.....	4
a. RESPONSIBILITIES	4
b. COST SHARING	5
c. MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS	7
d. PROJECT COST LIMITS.....	9
6. PROCEDURES.....	10
a. PROJECT PLANNING AND SELECTION.....	10
b. COST SHARING AGREEMENTS.....	14
c. ESCROW ACCOUNT AMENDMENT	15
d. PRE-CONSTRUCTION FUNDS DISBURSEMENT	15
e. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND DESIGN.....	15
f. PRE-CONSTRUCTION MONITORING	17
g. REAL ESTATE	18
h. FINAL ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	19
i. CONSTRUCTION APPROVAL FOR NON-CASH-FLOW MANAGED PROJECTS.....	20
j. PHASE 2 APPROVAL FOR CASH-FLOW MANAGED PROJECTS	21

k.	CONSTRUCTION FUNDS DISBURSEMENTS:	22
l.	PROJECT BID OVERRUNS	23
m.	MONITORING:	25
n.	OMRR&R 25	
o.	PROJECT CLOSEOUT.....	26
p.	PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION OR TRANSFERS TO OTHER PROGRAMS.....	26
q.	STORM RECOVERY PROCEDURES CONTINGENCY FUND	28
r.	STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES AMENDMENTS AND TRACKING.....	28
APPENDIX A		29
PRIORITY LIST 19 SELECTION PROCESS.....		30
___ I.	Development of Supporting Information.....	29
___ II.	Areas of Need and Project Nominations	29
___ IV.	Selection of Phase 0 Candidate Projects.....	31
___ V.	Phase 0 Analysis of Candidate Projects	31
APPENDIX B		36
ECOLOGICAL REVIEW		36
___ I.	Phase 0 activities:	37
___ II.	Phase 1 activities:	37
APPENDIX C		39
INFORMATION REQUIRED IN PHASE 2 AUTHORIZATION REQUESTS		39
___ I.	Description of Phase One Project.....	39
___ II.	Overview of Phase One Tasks, Process and Issues	39
___ III.	Description of the Phase Two Candidate Project	39
___ IV.	Checklist of Phase Two requirements:	39

APPENDIX D	42
CALENDAR OF REQUIRED ACTIVITIES	42
APPENDIX E	43
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT SOP	44
I. Introduction:	44
II. What constitutes a demonstration project:.....	44
III. Submission of candidate demonstration projects:	44
IV. Evaluation of candidate demonstration projects:.....	45
V. Funding approval:.....	47
VI. Engineering and design:	47
VII. Reporting of results:	48
APPENDIX F	49
CWPPRA - CIAP PARTNERSHIP SOP	49
I. INTRODUCTION	49
II. BACKGROUND	49
APPENDIX G	53
MONITORING CONTINGENCY FUND SOP.....	53
APPENDIX H	55
TRACKING OF CHANGES.....	55

**COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND
RESTORATION ACT
(CWPPRA)**

PROJECT STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES MANUAL

1. APPLICABILITY

This manual is applicable to all Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) Agencies and the Local Sponsor in the management of the CWPPRA projects. These standard procedures shall not supersede nor invalidate any rules or regulations internal to any Agency.

2. REFERENCES

- a. Pub. L. 101-646, Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act, hereinafter referred to as the "CWPPRA."
- b. Pub. L. 91-646, Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended by Title IV of Pub. L. 100-17, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

3. PURPOSE

The purpose of the SOP is to establish standard procedures among the separate Agencies and the Local Sponsor in the managing of CWPPRA projects.

4. DEFINITIONS

The definitions in Section 302 of the CWPPRA are incorporated herein by reference.

- a. The term "Agencies" shall mean the agencies listed in the CWPPRA that makeup the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force, and the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources.
- b. The term "Federal Sponsor" shall mean the Federal Agency assigned to a CWPPRA project with responsibility to manage the implementation of the project.
- c. The term "Local Sponsor" shall mean the State of Louisiana, as represented by the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR) unless otherwise specified.

- d. The term “Technical Committee” shall mean the committee established by the Task Force to provide advice on biological, engineering, environmental, ecological, and other technical issues.
- e. The term “Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee” shall mean the working level committee established by the Technical Committee to form and oversee special technical workgroups to assist in developing policies and processes, and recommend procedures for formulating plans and projects to accomplish the goals and mandates of CWPPRA.
- f. The term “Priority Project List (PPL)” shall mean the annual list of projects submitted by the Task Force to Congress in accordance with Sec. 303.(a) of the CWPPRA.
- g. The term “total project cost” shall mean all Federal and non-Federal costs directly related to the implementation of the project, which may include but are not limited to engineering and design costs; lands, easements, servitudes, and rights-of-way costs; project construction costs; construction management costs; relocation costs; pre-construction, construction, and post-construction monitoring costs; operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation (OMRR&R) costs; supervision and administration costs; environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA, and HTRW); and other costs as otherwise provided for in the Cost Sharing Agreement.
- h. The term “total project expenditures” shall mean the sum of all Federal expenditures for the project and all non-Federal expenditures for which the Federal Sponsor has granted credit.
- i. The term “Cost Sharing Agreement” shall mean any Agency agreement entered into by the Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor for engineering and design, real estate activities, construction, monitoring, and OMRR&R of a project in accordance with Sec. 303. (f) of CWPPRA.
- j. The term “life of the project” shall mean 20 years from completion of construction of the project or functional portion of the project, unless otherwise stated in the Cost Sharing Agreement for the project.
- k. The term “project funding categories” shall mean the six distinct project-funding areas:
- 1) Engineering and Design (E&D)
 - 2) Real Estate
 - 3) Construction
 - 4) Monitoring
 - 5) Operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation (OMRR&R)

6) Corps of Engineers Program Management Costs

For cash flow-managed projects (See paragraph 4.q below), the Real Estate and Monitoring project funding categories will be further sub-categorized as Phase 1 and Phase 2. E&D will be categorized as Phase 1 only while Construction and OMRR&R will be categorized as Phase 2 only.

- l. The term “escrow account” shall mean the bank account established by the Local Sponsor in accordance with the CWPPRA Escrow Agreement executed between the Corps of Engineers, the Local Sponsor, and the financial institution selected by the Local Sponsor to act as custodian for the escrow account.
- m. The term “overgrazing” shall mean allowing cattle and other grazing animals to forage within the project lands, easements or rights-of-way to the detriment of the wetlands.
- n. The term “State fiscal year” shall mean one fiscal year of the State of Louisiana, beginning July 1 and ending June 30 of the following calendar year.
- o. The term “Federal fiscal year” shall mean one fiscal year of the Government, beginning October 1 and ending September 30 of the following calendar year.
- p. The term “Conservation Plan” shall mean the Coastal Wetlands Conservation Plan prepared by the State of Louisiana in accordance with Section 304 of the CWPPRA.
- q. The term “cash flow-managed projects” shall mean those projects which are approved and funded in two phases during the October (Phase 1) and January (Phase 2) Task Force budgeting meetings. Phase 1 will generally mean those pre-construction activities as defined in paragraph 4.r below and Phase 2 will generally mean those activities approved by the Task Force as defined in paragraph 4.s below. While the two phases will be fully funded when approved by the Task Force, long term Phase 2 OMRR&R and post-construction monitoring funds will only be made available on a yearly basis (to be approved at September Technical Committee and October Task Force meetings) in three year increments. Cash flow-managed projects are generally those projects approved on PPLs 9 and later.
- r. The term “Phase 1” shall include, but not be limited to, a determination of environmental benefits, any necessary hydrologic data collection and analysis, Pre-construction Biological Monitoring, Monitoring Plan Development, and Engineering and Design, and draft OMRR&R Plan (named the Projects Operations and Schedule Manual when referring to Corps projects) Development. Engineering and Design includes Engineering, Design, environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA, HTRW) and permitting, Project Management, and Real Estate requirements up to, but not including, the purchase of real estate.

s. The term "Phase 2" shall mean Construction (including Project Management, Contract Management, and Construction Supervision & Inspection), Post-construction Biological Monitoring (to include construction phase biological monitoring), OMRR&R, and the Purchase of Real Estate.

t. The term "October and January budgeting meetings" shall mean the budget meetings at which the Task Force approves planning and construction funding levels for the program. The following will be considered at the October budgeting meeting: demonstration project approvals, PPL Phase 1 approvals, planning budget approval, O&M and monitoring approvals, and Corps administrative cost approvals. Phase 2 approvals will be considered at the January budgeting meeting.

5. **GENERAL**

a. RESPONSIBILITIES

(1) Federal Sponsor:

(a) Assure that funds spent on a project are spent in accordance with the project's Cost Sharing Agreement and the CWPPRA.

(b) Perform any audits of the Local Sponsor's credits for the project as required by the project's Cost Sharing Agreement and the individual agency's regulations.

(c) No later than September 30 of each year, the Federal Sponsor shall provide the Local Sponsor with an annual statement of prior State fiscal year expenditures in a format agreeable to the Local and Federal Sponsor.

(d) Each quarter, Federal Sponsors will review funds within each approved project under their purview and determine whether funds may be returned to the Task Force. Funds may be returned to the Task Force by the simple deobligation process covered in paragraph 6.p below. Federal Sponsors should provide the status of potential obligations in the "Remarks" section of the program summary database.

(2) Local Sponsor:

(a) Provide the necessary funds as required by the project's Cost Sharing Agreement.

(b) Perform any work-in-kind required by the Cost Sharing Agreement.

(c) Furnish the Federal Sponsor with the documentation required to support any work-in-kind credit requests.

(d) Unless otherwise specified, all correspondence to the Local Sponsor shall be addressed to:

Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Coastal Restoration and Management
Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
P.O. Box 44027
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-4027

(3) Corps of Engineers (as funds administrator):

(a) For the purposes of funds control, and at the request of the Task Force, the Corps of Engineers will act as bookkeeper, administrator, and disbursing officer of all Federal and non-Federal funds. All correspondence from the Agencies and the Local Sponsor to the Corps of Engineers regarding funding requests and the status of funding requests shall be addressed to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
ATTN: CEMVN-PM-C
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

(b) Use Corps of Engineers financial accounting procedures.

(c) Manage the funds for the project.

(d) Disburse project funds as requested by the Federal Sponsor.

(e) Regularly report to the Agencies and the Local Sponsor on the status of the project accounts.

(f) By August 31 of each year, furnish each Federal Sponsor a report on project expenditures for the last State fiscal year.

(g) By the 20th of the month following the end of a fiscal quarter, the Corps of Engineers will prepare and furnish all the Agencies and the Local Sponsor a report on the status of funding and cost sharing for each of their projects. The most current version of this report will be posted by the Corps on the internet. (www.lacoast.gov)

(h) Provide program management duties, e.g. PPL reports, minutes of meetings, distribution of planning documents, etc.

b. COST SHARING

(1) Pre-State Conservation Plan: As provided in Section 303(f) of the CWPPRA, prior to the approval of the State Conservation Plan, the Federal share of the total project cost shall be 75% and the non-Federal share of the total project cost shall be 25%.

(2) Post-State Conservation Plan¹

(a) General: As provided for the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation Plan, effective December 1, 1997, cost sharing is revised for unexpended funds from 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal to 85% Federal and 15% non-Federal for all future Priority List projects and Priority Lists 1 through 4 projects. For Priority Lists 5 and 6 projects, cost sharing is reduced from 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal to 90% Federal and 10% non-Federal.

(b) Definitions²: The term "total project expenditures", as stated in paragraph 4.h, shall mean the sum of all Federal expenditures for the project and all non-Federal expenditures for which the Federal Sponsor has granted credit. An expenditure is a disbursement of funds for charges incurred for goods and services.

(c) Implementation: All expenditures that were incurred through November 30, 1997 (invoices that were submitted to CEMVN-PM-C and all funds disbursed by check), will be considered part of the original cost sharing percentages. These expenditures will be subtracted from the approved current estimates and cost shared at 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal. The remaining funds expended beginning December 1, 1997 will be considered part of the revised cost sharing provisions.

(d) Cost Sharing Agreements: Future cost sharing agreements will reflect the new cost sharing percentages and existing cost sharing agreements will be amended to reflect the new cost sharing percentages.

(e) Database: As stated in paragraph 5.a(1)(a), the Corps of Engineers will act as bookkeeper, administrator, and disbursing officer of all Federal and non-Federal funds. A database is in place at present to record all estimates, obligations, and expenditures. Federal Sponsors will keep the Corps of Engineers informed of

¹Formally approved at the January 16, 1998 Task Force meeting.

²At the December 16, 1997 Joint Meeting of the P&E Subcommittee and the Technical Committee the term "expenditure" was further clarified as being on a cash basis. For example, work-in-kind (WIK) and costs paid would be considered expenditures. However, costs submitted would not be considered an expenditure.

current approved project estimates and schedules in order to have the latest information in the database.

c. MANAGEMENT OF FUNDS

(1) Escrow Agreement:

(a) There will be only one escrow account established for all CWPPRA projects. The Corps, the Local Sponsor and the financial institution chosen by the Local Sponsor shall execute the basic escrow account agreement in a form agreeable to all parties.

(b) Within the one escrow account, the Corps of Engineers shall maintain separate sub-accounts (one for each project covered by the escrow agreement) and allocate project funds only to the extent that funds are available in the project sub-account. Non-government escrow shall be in the project sub-accounts.

(c) Upon execution of the Escrow Agreement, and in accordance with the Cost Sharing Agreement, the Local Sponsor shall deposit in the escrow account established for the CWPPRA projects an amount equal to the difference between 25 percent (15 percent after the Conservation Plan is approved except 5th and 6th list projects for which the percentage is 10 percent) of the total project expenditures to date and the amount of expenditures by the Local Sponsor for which the Federal Sponsor has granted credit. In addition, the Local Sponsor shall also deposit 25 percent (15 percent after the Conservation Plan is approved except 5th and 6th list projects for which the percentage is 10 percent) of the estimated total project costs for the remainder of the State fiscal year less any anticipated expenditures by the Local Sponsor.

(d) In accordance with Section 303(f)(3) of the CWPPRA the Local Sponsor shall provide a minimum of 5% of the total project cost in cash. In order to properly account for these funds, the Local Sponsor shall deposit into the escrow account at least 5% of the estimated expenditures for the following State fiscal year. For projects where the Local Sponsor is the construction agency, the 5% escrow requirement is waived. However, in those cases, the Local Sponsor must provide a letter indicating that they are the primary construction agency and that the required cash contribution is provided through their award and management of the construction contract.

(2) Work-in-Kind: Credit for work-in-kind or other activities performed by the Local Sponsor will be granted as follows:

(a) By September 1 of each year the Local Sponsor shall submit to the Federal Sponsor a statement of expenditures in a format agreeable to the Federal Sponsor. It is the Federal Sponsor's responsibility to assure that the amount of credit given is in accordance with the Cost Sharing Agreement and applicable regulations and, if required, audits are performed.

(b) After review and approval, but no later than 90 days after receipt of the statement of expenditures from the Local Sponsor, the Federal Sponsor shall forward to the Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, ATTN.: CEMVN-PM-C, with copy to the Local Sponsor, a request that credit be given the Local Sponsor for the work performed. This statement shall indicate the amount of credit to be granted to the Local Sponsor, by project funding category, and the period covered.

(c) The Corps of Engineers will give credit to the Local Sponsor on the project in the amount stated and inform both the Local Sponsor and the Federal Sponsor of the current status of funding and cost sharing for the project.

(3) Funding Adjustments: Whenever the Corps of Engineers determines that:

(a) The Local Sponsor's share of the project cost to date, including cash and credits granted under paragraph 5.c(2)(c), is less than the required 25 percent (15 percent after the Conservation Plan is approved except 5th and 6th list projects for which the percentage is 10 percent) of the total project cost to date; and/or

(b) The Local Sponsor has paid, in cash, less than the required 5 percent of the total project cost to date; and

(c) Insufficient funds for the project are on deposit in the escrow account to cover the deficit; then the Corps of Engineers will inform both the Local Sponsor and the Federal Sponsor of the deficiency and request that the Local Sponsor deposit into the escrow account the necessary funds or, if allowed, furnish the Federal Sponsor sufficient proof of additional credits in the amount necessary to maintain the required cost sharing percentage.

(4) Transfer of Funds Between Projects: The Local Sponsor may request the transfer of excess project funds in its escrow account from one project to another provided that:

(a) The Corps of Engineers agrees, in writing, that the funds are excess to the project; and,

(b) The Federal Sponsor of the project losing the funds agrees, in writing, to release the funds; and,

(c) The Federal Sponsor of the project gaining the funds agrees, in writing, to the funds transfer.

d. PROJECT COST LIMITS

(1) **Non-Cash Flow Projects:** The total project cost may exceed the original PPL estimate by 25% without the Federal Sponsor formally requesting a cost increase from the Task Force. If the estimated total project cost exceeds the original PPL estimate by more than 25%, the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local Sponsor, may request approval from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force for additional funds as indicated in paragraph 6.e(2). If the increase is approved by the Task Force, no additional increase shall be allowed without the explicit approval of the Task Force. An increase of more than 25% for an individual funding category, except for monitoring as stated in paragraph 5.d(3), does not require specific Task Force approval unless the increase causes the total project cost to exceed the original PPL estimate by more than 25%. Demonstration projects are capped at 100%, even though they follow non-cash flow procedures.

(2) Cash-Flow Projects:

(a) **PHASE 1:** The Phase 1 cost may not exceed the original PPL Phase 1 estimate without the Federal Sponsor formally requesting a cost increase from the Task Force. If the estimated total cost of Phase 1 exceeds the original PPL Phase 1 estimate, the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local Sponsor, may request approval from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force for additional Phase 1 funds as indicated in paragraph 6.e(3). If the increase is approved by the Task Force, no additional increase shall be allowed without the explicit approval of the Task Force.

(b) **PHASE 2:** The Phase 2 cost may not exceed the Phase 2 cost estimate without the Federal Sponsor formally requesting a cost increase from the Task Force. If the estimated total cost of Phase 2 exceeds the Phase 2 estimate developed during Phase 1, the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local Sponsor, may request approval from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force for additional Phase 2 funds. If the increase is approved by the Task Force, no additional increase shall be allowed without the explicit approval of the Task Force.

(3) Exceptions: For those monitoring and OMRR&R category estimates that were formally reviewed and approved by the Task Force on July 28, 1998, and January 20, 1999, respectively, increases in those categories above the approved estimates shall be requested

by the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local Sponsor, from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force. These requests may occur at any Task Force meeting. Additionally, the monitoring category is capped for all projects at 100% of the original estimate approved by the Task Force and may not exceed this amount without the explicit approval of the Task Force.

(4) Disputes: Neither the Corps of Engineers, as funds administrator, nor any Federal Sponsor shall be a party to any disputes that may arise between another Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor under a project Cost Sharing Agreement.

6. PROCEDURES

a. PROJECT PLANNING AND SELECTION

(1) CWPPRA Committees: Following is a description of duties of the primary organizations formed under CWPPRA to manage the program:

(a) Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Task Force: Typically referred to as the “Task Force” (TF), it is comprised of one member each, respectively, from five Federal Agencies and the State of Louisiana. The Federal Agencies of CWPPRA include: the U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) of the Department of Interior, the Natural Resources Conservation

(b) Service (NRCS) of the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the National Marine Fisheries Service of the Department of Commerce (USDC), the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Governor’s Office of the State of Louisiana represents the state on the TF. The TF provides guidance and direction to subordinate organizations of the program through the Technical Committee (TC), which reports to the TF. The TF is charged by the Act to make final decisions concerning issues, policies, and procedures necessary to execute the Program and its projects. The TF makes directives for action to the TC, and the TF makes decisions in consideration of TC recommendations. The District Commander of the USACE, New Orleans District, is the Chairman of the TF. The TF Chairman leads the TF and sets the agenda for action of the TF to execute the Program and projects. At the direction of the Chairman of the TF, the New Orleans District: (1) provides administration, management, and oversight of the Planning and Construction Programs, and acts as accountant, budgeter, administrator, and disbursing officer of all Federal and non-Federal funds under the Act, (2) acts as the official manager of financial data and most information relating to the CWPPRA Program and projects.

The State of Louisiana is a full voting member of the Task Force except for

selection of the Priority Project List [Section 303(a)(2) of the CWPPRA], as stipulated in President Bush's November 29, 1990, signing statement of the CWPPRA. In addition, the State of Louisiana may not serve as a "lead" Task Force member for design and construction of wetlands projects on the priority project list.

(c) Technical Committee: The Technical Committee (TC) is established by the TF to provide advice and recommendations for execution of the Program and projects from a number of technical perspectives, which include: engineering, environmental, economic, real estate, construction, operation and maintenance, and monitoring. The TC provides guidance and direction to subordinate organizations of the program through the Planning & Evaluation Subcommittee (P&E), which reports to the TC. The TC is charged by the TF to consider and shape decisions and proposed actions of the P&E, regarding its position on issues, policy, and procedures towards execution of the Program and projects. The TC makes directives for action to the P&E, and the TC makes decisions in consideration of P&E recommendations. The TC approves changes to this SOP. In the event that such changes would reflect policy-level changes, then these changes must first be approved by the Task Force. Additionally, the TC appoints the chairs of the various workgroups that report to the TC. The State of Louisiana is represented on the TC by DNR. The Chair's seat of the TC resides with the USACE, New Orleans District. The TC Chairman leads the TC and sets the agenda for action of the TC to make recommendations to the TF for executing the Program and projects. At the direction of the Chairman of the TF, the Chairman of the TC guides the management and administrative work charged to the TF Chairman.

(d) Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee: The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee (P&E) is the working level committee established by the TC to form and oversee special technical workgroups to assist in developing policies and processes, and recommend procedures for formulating plans and projects to accomplish the goals and mandates of CWPPRA. The seat of the Chairman of the P&E resides with the USACE, New Orleans District. The P&E Chairman leads the P&E and sets the agenda for action of the P&E to make recommendations to the TC for executing the Program and projects. At the direction of the Chairman of the TC, the Chairman of the P&E executes the management and administrative work directives of the TC and TF Chairs.

(e) Environmental Workgroup: The Environmental Workgroup (EnvWG), under the guidance and direction of the P&E, reviews candidate projects to: (1) suggest any recommended measures and features that should be considered during engineering and design for the achievement and/or enhancement of wetland

benefits, and (2) determine the estimated annualized wetland benefits (Average Annual Habitat Units) of those projects.

(f) Engineering Workgroup: The Engineering Workgroup (EngWG), under the guidance and direction of the P&E, provides engineering standards, quality control/assurance, and support, for the review and comment of the cost estimates for: engineering, environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA, and HTRW), economic, real estate, construction, construction supervision and inspection, project management, operation and maintenance, and monitoring, of candidate and demonstration projects considered for development, selection, and funding under the Act.

(g) Economic Workgroup: The Economic Workgroup (EcoWG), under the guidance and direction of the P&E, reviews and evaluates candidate projects that have been completely developed, for the purpose of assigning the fully funded first cost of projects, based on the estimated 20-year stream of project costs.

(2) October and January Budgeting Meetings: Each year the Task Force shall have two budgeting meetings (referred to below as the October and January budgeting meetings). Phase 2 funding may be approved at the January budgeting meeting at the discretion of the Task Force after considering the recommendations of the Technical Committee. At the October budgeting meeting, the Task Force will select demonstration projects and projects for Phase 1 funding on the annual priority project list, and approve the planning budget, monitoring and O&M funding and Corps administrative costs as recommended by the Technical Committee. Demonstration projects are considered non-cash-flow managed projects. The Task Force will review the process each year to determine the effect on the overall program and may decide at any time to modify the process. The current process for selection of the annual priority list projects is included as Appendix A. The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee will provide a quarterly report on the total funds associated with all phases of approved projects versus the estimated total funding available through the current authorization and estimate at what point these two values would be approximately equal.

(3) Planning:

(a) Each year, no more than \$5.0 million will be set aside from out of the total available annual program allocation for planning, in accordance with Section 306 (a) (1) of PL 101-646. These funds shall remain available for budgeting and reprogramming during any fiscal year after the funds are set aside. At the October budgeting meeting, the Task Force shall review unallocated funds from previous years and may program some or all of these funds in addition to the \$5.0 million for the current year. Nevertheless, in no case will more than \$5.0 million be set aside annually for planning from the total available annual program allocation.

Generally, the planning process shall include the nomination, development and evaluation of proposed projects by the Engineering, Environmental and Economic workgroups.

(b) During the evaluation of Priority Project List Candidate projects, Federal Sponsors will provide cost estimates and spending schedules for each project to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee prior to project ranking³. Spending schedules will be developed through the end of the project life. The cost estimates and schedules will be comprised of the following subcategories:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Subcategory A. | Phase 1 Engineering and Design (includes Engineering and Design, Phase 1 Real Estate Requirements ⁴ , environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA compliance and HTRW) and Permitting, Project Management, and draft OMRR&R Plan (named the Projects Operations and Schedule Manual when referring to Corps projects) Development) |
| Subcategory B. | Phase 1 Pre-construction Biological Monitoring (includes Monitoring Plan Development) |
| Subcategory C. | Phase 2 Construction (includes Phase 2 Real Estate Requirements (including oyster leases), Project Management, Contract Management, and Construction Supervision and Inspection) |
| Subcategory D. | Phase 2 Post-Construction Biological Monitoring (includes Construction-Phase Biological Monitoring) |
| Subcategory E. | Phase 2 OMRR&R |

(c) The Engineering Work Group and Monitoring Work Group will review these estimates for consistency among projects. The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee will provide a table of these subcategories along with the results of

3 Note the previously designated complex projects from PPL 9 are considered candidate projects and may be evaluated in accordance with this paragraph and paragraphs 6.a(3)(c) and (d). Complex projects would then compete at the October budgeting meeting for Phase 1 authorization.

4 Includes Real Estate requirements up to, but not including, the purchase of Real Estate.

the Environmental Work Group's evaluation to the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee will review these results along with the project budget requirements and schedules.

(d) The Technical Committee will determine a recommended cutoff point, based on project cost effectiveness and other criteria to recommend to the Task Force.

(4) Annual Priority List:

(a) The CWPPRA project approval and budgeting process is to be accomplished in two phases as described below. Approval and budgeting of Phase 1 would not guarantee approval and budgeting of Phase 2, which would involve competition among successful projects from Phase 1. At the October budgeting meeting, the Task Force may select projects for Phase 1 funding on the annual Priority Project List, after considering the recommendation of the Technical Committee. In the first year, projects will generally receive budget approval for Subcategories A and B, even though these activities may take 2 to 3 years. During the second and third year the project may not need additional funding (unless Subcategories A and B require additional funds or the project is ready to begin construction). Priority Project Lists for subsequent years will also follow this procedure.

(b) The Corps will provide a status report and update at each Task Force meeting on the six funding subcategories to include expenditures, obligations, and disbursements.

b. **COST SHARING AGREEMENTS**

(1) For non-cash flow-managed projects, prior to requesting permission from the Task Force to proceed with construction of the project, the Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor shall negotiate and execute the necessary Cost Sharing Agreement using their own internal procedures. For cash flow-managed projects, a Cost Sharing Agreement will be negotiated and executed as soon as possible after Phase 1 approval by the Task Force.

(2) Normal Cost Sharing Agreement processing is as follows:

(a) Federal Sponsor, if applicable, forwards draft Cost Sharing Agreement to the Local Sponsor. For cooperative agreements, the Local Sponsor will initiate the agreement.

(b) After review and negotiations, the Local Sponsor, upon approval by the State of Louisiana Office of Contractual Review, signs the Cost Sharing Agreement and forwards document(s) to the Federal Sponsor.

(c) The Federal Sponsor signs and executes the document(s) and forwards copies to the Local Sponsor and forwards a copy to the Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District, ATTN: CEMVN-PM-C, for Task Force records and to aid in managing funds disbursement.

c. ESCROW ACCOUNT AMENDMENT

(1) Once the Cost Sharing Agreement is executed, the Federal Sponsor shall request from the Corps of Engineers, New Orleans District ATTN: CEMVN-PM-C, that an amendment to the escrow agreement be executed.

(2) The Corps of Engineers shall forward to the Local Sponsor, in triplicate, the amendment for the escrow agreement.

(3) After execution by the Local Sponsor and the financial institution, the Local Sponsor shall forward all copies of the amendment to the Corps of Engineers.

(4) After execution by the Corps of Engineers of the escrow agreement amendment, an original copy of each shall be forwarded to the Local Sponsor and the financial institution. A copy of the Escrow Agreement Amendment shall be forwarded to the appropriate Federal Sponsor.

(5) The escrow agreement shall be amended, as required, to incorporate new projects as Cost Sharing Agreements are executed.

(6) The Local Sponsor is required to furnish an estimate of work-in-kind credits for the next State fiscal year of projects for which the corresponding Federal Sponsor or Corps has requested such information.

d. PRE-CONSTRUCTION FUNDS DISBURSEMENT

(1) Upon approval of a Priority List by the Task Force, the Corps of Engineers will set up the necessary accounts for each project-funding category or subcategory and reserve funds in the amount estimated in the Priority List report.

(2) Within 30 days after receipt of a request for initial funds from the Federal Sponsor, the Corps of Engineers will prepare a Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (DD Form 448), hereinafter referred to as MIPR, obligating funds up to a maximum of 85% of the PPL estimate for those pre-construction activities for which funds are being requested (except 5th and 6th list projects, where the maximum is 90%), to each Federal Sponsor in accordance with their request and subject to the availability of funds.

e. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND DESIGN

(1) Workplan Review: Federal and State Sponsors shall develop a plan of work for accomplishing Phase 1. This plan shall include, but not be limited to: a detailed task list, time line with specific milestones, and budget which breaks out specific tasks such as geo-technical evaluations, hydrological investigations, modeling, environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA, and HTRW), Ecological Review (considered if one or both sponsors determine one is necessary) (See APPENDIX B), surveying, and other items deemed necessary to justify the proposed project features. The plans shall be developed within 3 months following Phase 1 approval and shall be reviewed by the P&E Subcommittee.

(2) 30% Design Review: In order to resolve problems, anticipate cost growth, and identify the best project alternative to meet intended project goals, at the earliest possible point, a 30% Design Review shall be performed upon completion of a Preliminary Design Report. The Preliminary Design Report shall include: 1) Recommended project features, 2) Engineering and Design surveys, 3) Engineering and Design Geotechnical Investigation (borings, testing results, and analysis), 4) Draft Modeling Report (if applicable), 5) Analysis of alternatives to reduce long-term maintenance costs while maintaining project features to function as originally intended (i.e., sponsors should investigate the potential cost savings from investing more in initial construction (over-designing/over-building) in an effort to reduce future maintenance requirements, 6) Draft Ecological Review for cash flow-managed projects (if one or both project sponsors determine one is necessary for more complex projects, projects with little precedent for success, or other projects if necessary) (See APPENDIX B), 7) Land Ownership Investigation, 8) Preliminary Cultural Resources Assessment, 9) Revised project construction, OMRR&R, monitoring, and administrative cost estimates based on the current selected preliminary design, 10) Description of changes from Phase 0 approval, and 11) Map prepared by the Local Sponsor and provided to the Federal Sponsor indicating any oyster leases potentially impacted by the proposed project and a data sheet listing: lease number, lease acreage, lessee name, and other pertinent data.

The Federal Sponsor shall hold a "30% Design Review Conference" with the Local Sponsor to obtain their concurrence to continue with design. However, if the Local Sponsor has responsibility for the design of the project, then both Local and Federal Sponsors shall hold a "30% Design Review Conference" to obtain concurrence to continue with design. The other Agencies shall be notified by the Federal Sponsor at least four weeks prior to the conference of the date, time and place and invited to attend. Any supporting data shall be forwarded to the other Agencies for their review, with receipt two weeks prior to the conference. Invitations and supporting data shall be sent to agency representatives of the Technical Committee, Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, Project Manager of the Local Sponsor and the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities. Agencies shall have 15 days after the 30% Design Review Conference to submit written comments. Project Sponsors shall provide a written response to 30% Design Review comments within 30 days following the end of the commenting period.

The design review will verify the viability of the project and whether or not the Federal and Local Sponsors agree to continue with the project. This review must indicate the project is viable before there are expenditures of additional Phase 1 funds.

After the conference, the Federal Sponsor shall forward a letter (or e-mail) to the Technical Committee with a copy to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee along with the revised estimate, a description of project revisions from the previously authorized project, agency and a letter of concurrence from the Local Sponsor, informing them of the agreement to continue with the project. The Technical Committee may make a recommendation on whether or not to continue with the project.

For cash flow-managed projects, if the estimate indicates that the Phase 1 cost will exceed the original approved amount, the Federal Sponsor may, with local sponsor concurrence, request approval from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force for additional funds to continue at a quarterly meeting. For non-cash flow-managed projects, if the revised estimate indicates that the total project cost will exceed 125% of the original PPL estimate, the Federal Sponsor shall request approval from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force, at any Task Force meeting, to continue with the project.

In some cases, the Task Force may require an additional formal review, involving all the Agencies, of the project design at an intermediate level to ensure that optimum benefits to wetlands and associated fish and wildlife resources are achieved. In those cases the Federal Sponsor shall be responsible for coordinating the review with the other Agencies and the Local Sponsor.

(3) Changes in Project Scope: If a project undergoes a major change in scope or a change in scope resulting in a variance of 25 percent from the original approved design, in either: (1) the total project cost, (2) the number of acres benefited, or (3) the ratio of the total project cost to the number of acres benefited, the Federal or Local Sponsor will submit a report to the Technical Committee explaining the reason(s) for the scope change, the impact on cost and benefits, and a statement from the Local Sponsor endorsing the change. The Technical Committee will review the report and recommend to the Task Force approval or rejection of the change. Changes in project scope resulting in an increase in total project cost are discussed in paragraph 5.d.

f. PRE-CONSTRUCTION MONITORING

For monitoring plan development and by the preliminary 30% design review, the Federal Sponsor shall provide at a minimum project-specific goals and strategies that the Local Sponsor will use to prepare a monitoring plan and a budget. The monitoring plan and budget must be submitted to the Technical Committee for review and subsequent approval by the Task Force.

g. REAL ESTATE

(1) General

- (a) Each Federal or Local Sponsor shall follow the real estate procedures in use by that agency.
- (b) During preliminary engineering and design, the Federal or Local Sponsor shall identify all real estate potentially impacted by the project.
- (c) After determining the property rights required, the Federal or Local Sponsor shall obtain an estimated value of the real estate interest to determine the value of the lands, easements, and rights-of-way to be acquired.
- (d) For cash flow-managed projects, real estate purchase will take place only during Phase 2.
- (e) For cash flow-managed projects, between the 30% and 95% design reviews, the Local Sponsor will have any potentially impacted oyster leases appraised and will forward to the Federal Sponsor the projected acquisition costs, as well as the supporting documentation for these cost projections except for legally proprietary information. In the case of non-cash-flow projects, this information will be provided prior to soliciting construction approval from the Task Force.

(2) Section 303(e) Approval:

- (a) In accordance with Section 303(e) of the CWPPRA, the Federal Sponsor shall, prior to acquiring any lands, easements or rights-of way for a CWPPRA project, obtain Secretary of the Army, or his designee, approval that the "project is subject to such terms and conditions as necessary to ensure that the wetlands restored, enhanced or managed through that project will be administered for the long-term conservation of such lands and waters and dependent fish and wildlife populations."
- (b) In order to obtain approval in accordance with paragraph 6.g(2)(a), the Federal Sponsor shall furnish the Corps of Engineers the following information before requesting approval to proceed to construction for non-cash flow-managed projects or before requesting approval to proceed with Phase 2 for cash flow-managed projects:
 - (c) Plan showing project limits and type of land rights required.
 - i. Language of land rights.

ii. Certification that land acquisition is in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations.

iii. Statement that all standard real estate practices will be followed in acquiring land rights.

iv. Overgrazing determination:

- Statement as to whether overgrazing in the project area is a problem and whether easements restricting grazing are required.
- The Corps of Engineers, in the review of the determination, may request concurrence from the Natural Resource Conservation Service as to the need for any grazing restricting easements.

(d) All requests for Section 303(e) approval shall be sent to the below address with a copy to CEMVN-PM-C for tracking purposes:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
ATTN: CEMVN-OC
P.O. Box 60267
New Orleans, LA 70160-0267

(3) Real Estate for Non-Cash-Flow Managed Projects: Federal Sponsors shall ensure that real estate acquisition of easements requiring a significant expenditure of funds and pre-construction monitoring are not begun until the Engineering and Design is substantially completed and there is a reasonably high level of certainty that the project will proceed to the next phase.

(4) Real Estate for Cash-Flow Managed Projects: The purchasing of real estate shall not occur until Phase 2. Preliminary real estate investigations, including preliminary ownership determination, should be initiated early in the project design activities.

h. FINAL ENGINEERING AND DESIGN

(1) 95% Design Review: A “95% Design Review Conference”, shall be held at least four weeks prior to the Technical Committee meeting by the Local Sponsor and the Federal Sponsor to review and mutually agree to a Final Design Report. The Final Design Report shall include: 1) a revised project cost estimate (fully-funded, approved by the Economic Work Group); 2) a Wetland Value Assessment (WVA), reviewed/approved by the Environmental Workgroup; 3) constructability; and 4) a draft OMRR&R Plan (named the Projects Operations and Schedule Manual when referring to Corps projects).

The other Agencies shall be notified by the Federal Sponsor at least four weeks prior to the conference of the date, time and place and invited to attend. The Federal Sponsor shall forward the Final Design Report (95%) and a set of Plans and Specifications to the other Agencies and the Local Sponsor for their review and comment, for receipt at least two weeks prior to design review conference. The Final Design Report shall include all supporting data, along with a description of how the project differs in cost, features, and environmental benefits from the project approved during Phase 0. It should also include a response to the comments brought up at the 30% Design Review Conference. Invitations and supporting data shall be sent to agency representatives of the Technical Committee, Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, Project Manager of the Local Sponsor, and the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities. However, if the Local Sponsor has responsibility for the design of the project, then the Local Sponsor shall forward to the other Agencies and the Federal Sponsor those items listed above.

After the conference, a letter of concurrence from the Local Sponsor indicating their willingness to continue with the project shall be sent to the Technical Committee and the P&E Subcommittee.

(2) Changes in Project Scope: Changes in project scope will be addressed as stated in paragraph 6.e(3).

i. CONSTRUCTION APPROVAL FOR NON-CASH-FLOW MANAGED PROJECTS.

For non-cash flow-managed projects, prior to advertising for bids for the first construction contract, the Federal Sponsor shall request permission from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force, at any Task Force meeting or by fax vote, to proceed to construction. The request shall be addressed to the Technical Committee and P&E Subcommittee.

The request to proceed to construction will include at a minimum:

(1) Description of the project to include an easily reproducible PPL/Fact Sheet scale map which clearly depicts the current project boundary and project features, detailed description of project features/elements, updated assessment of benefits, and an updated fact sheet suitable for inclusion in the formal PPL documentation. In cases of substantial modifications/scope changes to original conceptual design or costs, describe the specific changes both qualitatively and quantitatively.

(2) Section 303(e) Certification from the Corps of Engineers.

(3) Overgrazing determination statement.

(4) Revised fully funded cost estimate, approved by the Economic Work Group; and a Wetland Value Assessment (WVA), reviewed and approved by the Environmental Work Group.

(5) A statement that the Cost Sharing Agreement between the Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor has been executed.

(6) A statement that:

(a) a draft Environmental Assessment of the Project, as required under NEPA has been completed; and,

(b) a hazardous, toxic, and radiological waste (HTRW) assessment, if required, has been performed⁵.

j. PHASE 2 APPROVAL FOR CASH-FLOW MANAGED PROJECTS

For cash flow-managed projects, at the end of Phase 1 the Federal Sponsor may request permission from the Technical Committee with subsequent approval by the Task Force to proceed to Phase 2. Permission to proceed to Phase 2 implies permission to proceed to construction. The request to proceed to Phase 2 will be in accordance with APPENDIX C – Information Required in Phase 2 Authorization Requests.

(1) Phase 2 approval and funding requests will usually be evaluated at the January budgeting meeting, in accordance with Section 6.a.(2). Federal Sponsors should provide a list of projects eligible for Phase 2 approval. Projects shall not be eligible for Phase 2 approval and funding until the requirements listed in APPENDIX C are satisfied. Approval to proceed to Phase 2 implies permission to proceed to construction. Due to limited funding, approval and budgeting of Phase 2 would involve competition among successful projects from Phase 1.

(2) At the time that a Federal Sponsor requests Phase 2 approval, the Federal Sponsor shall provide an estimate of the project based on the 5 subcategories along with a spending schedule. The Task Force shall approve the total funds necessary for Phase 2 implementation, but shall only allot funds on an as needed basis and will therefore generally fund the entire amount of Subcategory C (Construction) and the first 3 years of both Subcategory D (Post-Construction Monitoring) and Subcategory E (OMRR&R) upon Phase 2 approval.

⁵Note: Agencies are cautioned to review the requirements for the “innocent landowner defense” under CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. 9601(35)(B), in cases involving the discovery of HTRW on lands, easements, servitudes and/or rights-of-way acquired for a project.

At subsequent September Technical Committee and October Task Force meetings, the Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor should request approval to maintain 3 years of Subcategory D and E funding for each approved project; however, any additional funding (after the initial 3-year funding) shall not be allotted until project construction is completed. Individual project requests will be grouped with other requests and submitted for approval. Requests should be consistent with the previously approved budget for the project, unless additional information can be provided to justify the need for additional funds. When the request is more than the amount in the approved project's budget, the Technical Committee should review each specific request to determine if the amount should be approved. This programming procedure will ensure that, at any one time, an approved project has sufficient funds for about 3 years of Subcategories D and E.

(3) Subsequent to the October and January budgeting meetings, Federal Sponsors may make a request to the committees at any time for additional funding that is needed for the current fiscal year when there is evidence that the project is progressing faster than expected, as long as those funds are utilized for the current phase of the project. Federal Sponsors shall specify under which subcategory additional funding is being requested.

(4) If construction award has not occurred within 2 years of Phase 2 approval, the Phase 2 funds will be placed on a revocation list for consideration by the Task Force at the next Task Force meeting. Requests to restore these funds may be considered at subsequent January budgeting meetings.

k. CONSTRUCTION FUNDS DISBURSEMENTS:

(1) Upon approval to begin Engineering and Design (E&D) by the Task Force, the Corps of Engineers will issue to the Federal Sponsor a MIPR in the amount requested to cover up to a maximum of 75% of the E&D phase (85 percent after the Conservation Plan is approved except 5th and 6th list projects for which the percentage is 90 percent), as described in paragraph 6.d(2).

(2) Upon approval to begin construction for non-cash flow-managed projects or upon approval to begin Phase 2 for cash flow-managed projects by the Task Force and deposit by the Local Sponsor of the required funds into the escrow account, the Federal Sponsor shall request that the Corps of Engineers issue a MIPR in the amount sufficient to cover the total construction and related costs of the project.

(3) In those cases where the Local Sponsor's annual work-in-kind plus cash contribution exceeds the project expenditures required cost sharing percentage, and at the request of the Federal Sponsor, the Corps of Engineers will disburse funds directly to the Local Sponsor to bring the project expenditures to the required cost sharing. The Federal Sponsor must approve the "work-in-kind" exceedance in advance.

(4) Annually, agencies shall review all projects approved for funding in Phases 1 or 2, identify excess funds in those phases, and make a recommendation to the Task Force as to how much of these funds to return at that time. Returned funds shall be available for reprogramming. At the October and January budgeting meetings, the Task Force may also consider reprogramming excess funds that have not yet been returned to the Task Force. Agencies may return funds by returning a MIPR to the Corps of Engineers with a request to deobligate funds.

1. PROJECT BID OVERRUNS

Pre-award (Amended by Task Force on 21 Oct. 98):

(1) Statement of Problem: Occasionally bids on CWPPRA projects may exceed the project cost limits. When bids exceed the project cost limits, the options are:

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

(2) Discussion:

- (a) Option 1): is not an acceptable option if the project is needed.
- (b) Option 2): may be required if the bids are obviously so far over the available funding that the Technical Committee and/or Task Force would not consider additional funding requests.
- (c) 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.

(3) Required Procedure:

(a) The final engineers cost estimate must have been reviewed and updated within 90 days prior to advertisement.

(b) If the final estimate, prior to advertising, equals or slightly exceeds the project cost limits, the bid package should contain a base bid, and additive or deductive alternatives that would allow the project to be awarded within the project cost limits. The base bid with additive or deductive alternates provides additional flexibility if the base bid is lower than anticipated.

(c) 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 project cost limits, the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local 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 Federal 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.

(d) 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 project cost limits, the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local Sponsor, would apply deductive alternates to get the project within available funds. In no case should the Federal Sponsor implement, without Task Force approval and Local Sponsor concurrence, a deductive alternative that would reduce the original project's cost-effectiveness by more than 25%; this will require prior consultation with the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee and the appropriate work groups. If after taking deductive alternatives the base bid still exceeds the project cost limits, the Federal Sponsor, with the concurrence of the Local 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 Federal 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.

(4) Mandates:

(a) The State of Louisiana must agree to cost share in the additional funds requested prior to bid acceptance.

(b) If a project has already received approval for a cost increase above project cost limits then it must stay within the budgeted amount for construction.

m. MONITORING:

(1) The Monitoring Plan and OMRR&R Plan (named the Projects Operations and Schedule Manual when referring to Corps projects) shall be developed in conjunction with the engineering and design to ensure that the plan will be completed prior to the Task Force granting approval for construction in accordance with paragraphs 6.i and 6.j.

(2) Project monitoring shall be accomplished following the monitoring plan developed for the project by the Technical Advisory Group and as specified in the Cost Sharing Agreement. Funding for the monitoring activities shall be as required in paragraphs 5.c(2), 6.a(4)(a), 6.j(2), and 6.k

(3) Federal Sponsors shall maintain oversight over the Local Sponsor's expenditure of Post-Construction Biological Monitoring funds. The Local Sponsor shall submit invoices, requests for work-in-kind credits, etc., to the Federal Sponsor for its review. Subsequent to its review and approval of the expenditures, and within 90 days of receipt from the Local Sponsor, the Federal Sponsor shall forward the appropriate documentation to the Corps for payment.

(4) Monitoring contingency funds are available for both project-specific and programmatic activities as outlined in "Monitoring Contingency Fund - Standard Operating Procedure" dated December 8, 1999. The P&E Subcommittee has authority to approve or disapprove requests submitted by the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Monitoring Program Manager.

n. OMRR&R

Project OMRR&R shall be as specified in the project's Cost Sharing Agreement. Funding for OMRR&R activities shall be as required in paragraphs 5.c(2), 6.j(2), and 6.k.

(1) Federal Sponsors shall maintain oversight over the Local Sponsor's expenditure of OMRR&R funds. The Local Sponsor shall submit invoices, requests for work-in-kind credits, etc., to the Federal Sponsor for its review. Subsequent to its review and approval of the expenditures, and within 90 days of receipt from the Local Sponsor, the Federal Sponsor shall forward the appropriate documentation to the Corps for payment.

(2) From time to time there will be projects that have completed construction, but that need modification to ensure their success, cover a design deficiency, or to handle some critical unanticipated requirement. Federal Sponsors may make a request through the Technical Committee to the Task Force for funding of such modifications. In its

recommendation to the Task Force, the Technical Committee will make a determination whether the funds are needed to meet a time critical requirement or whether funding could be postponed for consideration during the October budgeting meeting.

(3) For those non-cash-flow projects that require additional O&M funding above the approved 20-year estimate, the Task Force will treat the O&M cost increase in a similar manner as cash flow approvals for O&M. The Task Force will consider requests for 3-year incremental O&M funding at their October budgeting meeting.

o. PROJECT CLOSEOUT

(1) The Local Sponsor and the Federal Sponsor shall keep books, records, documents, and other evidence pertaining to costs and expenses incurred by the project to the extent and in such detail as will properly reflect total project costs. The Local Sponsor and Federal Sponsor shall maintain such books, records, documents and other evidence for a minimum of three (3) years after completion of construction, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, and monitoring of the project and resolution of all relevant claims arising therefrom, and shall make available at their offices at reasonable times, such books, records, documents, and other evidence for inspection and audit by authorized representatives of the Local Sponsor and Federal Sponsor.

(2) Upon completion of all work and certification by the Federal Sponsor of the final accounting on the project, the Corps of Engineers shall release any excess project funds from the escrow account and/or reimburse the Local Sponsor for any overpayment of their cost sharing requirements, provided funds are available, in accordance with the provisions of the applicable Cost Sharing Agreement and the Escrow Agreement.

(3) If the Corps of Engineers advances funds to a Federal Sponsor for a project, any excess funds identified at the completion of the project shall be returned to the Corps of Engineers for credit to the CWPPRA accounts.

(4) Any excess funds in an escrow account shall be returned to the Local Sponsor, or at its option, transferred to another project in accordance with paragraph 5.c(4).

p. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATION OR TRANSFERS TO OTHER PROGRAMS

(1) If the Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor agree that it is necessary to deauthorize a project prior to construction, then they shall submit a letter to the Technical Committee requesting approval by the Task Force to deauthorize the project and explaining the reasons for the request.

If the Federal Sponsor and the Local Sponsor do not agree to deauthorize a project prior to construction, then either party may submit a letter to the Technical Committee requesting approval by the Task Force to deauthorize the project and explaining their reasons for the request.

If circumstances warrant transfer of a project to an alternate authority, either as directed by programmatic Congressional authorization or voluntarily requested by a separate authority, then that receiving authority, in coordination with the Federal and Local Sponsors, shall submit a letter to the Technical Committee requesting the transfer and explaining the reasons for the transfer.

(2) The Technical Committee will forward to the Task Force a recommendation concerning deauthorization or transfer of the project. Nothing herein shall preclude the Federal Sponsor, Local Sponsor, or a receiving authority from bringing a request for deauthorization or transfer to the Task Force irrespective of the recommendation of the Technical Committee.

(3) Upon submittal of a request for deauthorization or transfer to the Technical Committee, all parties shall suspend all future obligations and expenditures as soon as practicable, until the issue is resolved.

(4) Upon receiving preliminary approval from the Task Force to deauthorize or transfer a project, the Chairman of the Technical Committee shall send notice to the Louisiana Congressional delegation, the State House and Senate Natural Resources Committee chairs, the State Senator (s) and State Representative (s) in whose district the project falls, senior parish officials in the parish (es) where the project is located, any landowners whose property would be directly affected by the project, and any interested parties, requesting their comments and advising them that, at the next Task Force meeting, a final decision on deauthorization or transfer will be made.

(5) If the Task Force determines that a project should be transferred to another authority, the Federal Sponsor and Local Sponsor shall provide a chronological summary of all work completed to date; identify any outstanding issues; and provide all project information to the receiving authority, including acquired data, engineering and design analyses, and project documents. In cases where the project has undergone significant engineering and design efforts, it is anticipated that significant quantities of hard copy and digital information will be provided. The Federal and Local sponsors shall host an information transfer meeting with appropriate representatives of the receiving authority. The purpose of the meeting is to review project status and details regarding work accomplished to date. Expenditures of CWPPRA funds to re-package project information, conduct additional analyses, or acquire new data or information are not anticipated and shall require explicit approval by the CWPPRA Task Force.

(6) When the Task Force determines that a project should be abandoned or no longer pursued because of economic or other reasons or transferred to another authorization, all expenditures shall cease immediately or as soon as practicable if the project is deauthorized or after information is transferred according to paragraph 6.p(5) to another authority. The Technical Committee will notify Congress and the State House and Senate Natural Resources Committee chairs of the decision.

(7) Once a project is deauthorized or transferred by the Task Force, it shall be categorized as "deauthorized" or "transferred" and closed-out as required by paragraph 6.o.

q. STORM RECOVERY PROCEDURES CONTINGENCY FUND

(1) The Task Force created a "Storm Recovery Procedures Contingency Fund" under the Construction Program, in the amount of \$303,358.92 on October 18, 2006 with immediate approval of \$203,358.92 in support of Katrina/Rita expenditures, leaving a remaining balance in the contingency fund of \$100,000.

(2) The contingency fund would maintain a balance of \$100,000 at all times to cover the cost of assessments of future storm damage. Expenditure of funding in excess of \$100,000 would require a fax vote by the Task Force.

r. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES AMENDMENTS AND TRACKING

An official, current version of these Standard Operating Procedures shall be maintained by the COE New Orleans District as part of their support of the Technical Committee. This document shall be available on the internet, and shall be appended with sufficient documentation so that the origin and approval of amendments can be traced. Approval will involve, at a minimum, formal acceptance by the Technical Committee at a regularly scheduled meeting. If the changes involve policy-level decisions, then any such changes must also be ratified by the Task Force. Amendments to the SOP are tracked in APPENDIX H.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

PRIORITY LIST 19 SELECTION PROCESS

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act Guidelines for Development of the 19th Priority Project List

I. Development of Supporting Information

A. COE staff prepares spreadsheets indicating status of all restoration projects (CWPPRA PL 1-18; Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Feasibility Study, Corps of Engineers Continuing Authorities 1135, 204, 206; and State only projects). Also, indicate net acres at the end of 20 years for each CWPPRA project.

B. DNR/USGS staff prepares basin maps indicating:

- 1) Boundaries of the following projects types (PL 1-18; LCA Feasibility Study, COE 1135, 204, 206; and State only).
- 2) Locations of completed projects,
- 3) Projected land loss by 2050 with freshwater diversions at Caernarvon and Davis Pond and including all CWPPRA projects approved for construction through January 2009.
- 4) Regional boundary maps with basin boundaries and parish boundaries included.

II. Areas of Need and Project Nominations

A. The four Regional Planning Teams (RPTs) meet, examine basin maps, discuss areas of need

and Coast 2050 strategies, and accept nomination of projects by hydrologic basin. Nominations for demonstration projects will also be accepted at the four RPT meetings. The RPTs will not vote at their individual regional meetings, rather voting will be conducted during a separate coast-wide meeting. At these initial RPT meetings, parishes will be asked to identify their official parish representative who will vote at the coast-wide RPT meeting.

B. One coast-wide RPT voting meeting will be held after the individual RPT meetings to vote for nominees (including demonstration project nominees). The RPTs will select three projects in the Terrebonne, Barataria, and Pontchartrain Basins based on the high loss rates (1985-2006) in those basins. Two projects will be selected in the Breton Sound, Teche/Vermilion, Mermentau, Calcasieu/Sabine, and Mississippi River Delta Basins. Because of low land loss rates, only one project will be selected in the Atchafalaya Basin. If only one project is presented at the Regional Planning Team Meeting for the Mississippi River Delta Basin, then an additional nominee would be selected for the Breton Sound Basin. A total of up to 20 projects could be selected as nominees. Each officially designated parish representative in the basin will have one vote and each federal agency and the State will have one vote. The RPTs will also select up to six demonstration project nominees at this coast-wide meeting. Selection of demonstration project nominees will be by consensus, if possible. If voting is required, officially designated representatives from all coastal parishes will have one vote and each federal agency and the State will have one vote.

C. Prior to the coast-wide RPT voting meeting, the Environmental and Engineering Work Groups will screen each demonstration project nominated at the RPT meetings. Demonstration projects will be screened to ensure that each meets the qualifications for demonstration projects as set forth in Appendix E.

D. A lead Federal agency will be designated for the nominees and demonstration project nominees to assist LDNR and local governments in preparing preliminary project support information (fact sheet, maps, and potential designs and benefits). The Regional Planning Team Leaders will then transmit this information to the P&E Subcommittee, Technical Committee and members of the Regional Planning Teams.

III. Preliminary Assessment of Nominated Projects

A. Agencies, parishes, landowners, and other individuals informally confer to further develop projects. Nominated projects should be developed to support one or more Coast 2050 strategies. The goals of each project should be consistent with those of Coast 2050.

B. Each sponsor of a nominated project will prepare a brief Project Description (no more than one page plus a map) that discusses possible features. Fact sheets will also be prepared for demonstration project nominees.

C. Engineering and Environmental Work Groups meet to review project features, discuss potential benefits, and estimate preliminary fully funded cost ranges for each project. The Work Groups will also review the nominated demonstration projects and verify that they meet the demonstration project criteria.

D. P&E Subcommittee prepares matrix of cost estimates and other pertinent information for nominees and demonstration project nominees and furnishes to Technical Committee and Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA).

IV. Selection of Phase 0 Candidate Projects

A. Technical Committee meets to consider the project costs and potential wetland benefits of the nominees. Technical Committee will select ten candidate projects for detailed assessment by the Environmental, Engineering, and Economic Work Groups. At this time, the Technical Committee will also select up to three demonstration project candidates for detailed assessment by the Environmental, Engineering, and Economic Work Groups. Demonstration project candidates will be evaluated as outlined in Appendix E.

B. Technical Committee assigns a Federal sponsor for each project to develop preliminary Wetland Value Assessment data and engineering cost estimates for Phase 0 as described below.

V. Phase 0 Analysis of Candidate Projects

A. Sponsoring agency coordinates site visits for each project. A site visit is vital so each agency can see the conditions in the area and estimate the project area boundary. Field trip participation should be limited to two representatives from each agency. There will be no site visits conducted for demonstration projects.

B. Environmental and Engineering Work Groups and the Academic Advisory Group meet to refine project features and develop boundaries based on site visits.

C. Sponsoring agency develops Project Information Sheets on assigned projects, using formats developed by applicable work groups; prepares preliminary draft Wetland Value Assessment Project Information Sheet; and makes Phase 1 engineering and design cost estimates and Phase 2 construction cost estimates.

D. Environmental and Engineering Work Groups evaluate all projects (excluding demos) using the WVA and review design and cost estimates.

E. Engineering Work Group reviews and approves Phase 1 and 2 cost estimates.

F. Economics Work Group reviews cost estimates and develops annualized (fully funded) costs.

G. Corps of Engineers staff prepares information package for Technical Committee and CPRA. Packages consist of:

- 1) updated Project Information Sheets;
- 2) a matrix for each region that lists projects, fully funded cost, average annual cost, Wetland Value Assessment results in net acres and Average Annual Habitat Units (AAHUs), and cost effectiveness (average annual cost/AAHU).

3) qualitative discussion of supporting partnerships and public support; and

I. Technical Committee hosts two public hearings to present information from H above and allows public comment.

VI. Selection of 19th Priority Project List

A. The selection of the 19th PPL will occur at the Winter Technical Committee and Task Force meetings.

B. Technical Committee meets and considers matrix, Project Information Sheets, and public comments. The Technical Committee will recommend up to four projects for selection to the 19th PPL. The Technical Committee may also recommend demonstration projects for the 19th PPL.

C. The CWPPRA Task Force will review the TC recommendations and determine which projects will receive Phase 1 funding for the 19th PPL.

19th Priority List Project Development Schedule (dates subject to change)

December 2008	Distribute public announcement of PPL19 process and schedule
December 3, 2008	Winter Technical Committee Meeting, approve Phase II New Orleans)
January 21, 2009	Winter Task Force Meeting (New Orleans)
January 27, 2009	Region IV Planning Team Meeting (Rockefeller Refuge)
January 28, 2009	Region III Planning Team Meeting (Morgan City)
January 29, 2009	Regions I and II Planning Team Meetings (New Orleans)
February 18, 2009	Coast-wide RPT Voting Meeting (Baton Rouge)
February 19-	
March 13, 2009	Agencies prepare fact sheets for RPT-nominated projects
March 24-25, 2009	Engineering/ Environmental work groups review project features, benefits & prepare preliminary cost estimates for nominated projects (Baton Rouge)
March 26, 2009	P&E Subcommittee prepares matrix of nominated projects showing initial cost estimates and benefits
April 15, 2009	Spring Technical Committee Meeting, select PPL19 candidate projects (New Orleans)

May/June/July Candidate project site visits

June 3, 2009 Spring Task Force Meeting (Lafayette)

July/August/
September Env/Eng/Econ work group project evaluations

September 9, 2009 Fall Technical Committee Meeting, O&M and Monitoring funding recommendations (Baton Rouge)

October 14, 2009 Fall Task Force meeting, O&M and Monitoring approvals, announce PPL 19 public meetings (New Orleans)

October 14, 2009 Economic, Engineering, and Environmental analyses completed for PPL19 candidates

November 17, 2009 PPL 19 Public Meeting (Abbeville)

November 18, 2009 PPL 19 Public Meeting (New Orleans)

December 2, 2009 Winter Technical Committee Meeting, recommend PPL19 and Phase II approvals (New Orleans)

January 20, 2010 Winter Task Force Meeting, select PPL19 and approve Phase II requests (New Orleans)

APPENDIX B

ECOLOGICAL REVIEW

Project Ecological Review (revised 6/3/09)

“The requirement to perform an Ecological Review is removed for most projects with the exception that the State or Federal project sponsors have the option of conducting an ER for more complex projects or projects with little precedent indicating that they will be effective, or for other projects as deemed necessary.”

The transition to a planning-phase/phase-one/phase-two approach was done to ensure a higher standard of project development and evaluation prior to the decision to commit construction dollars. It is essential that more complex proposed projects or projects with little precedent for success are well designed and evaluated and can demonstrate a high probability of successfully achieving the purpose as assigned by Congress in CWPPRA, i.e. “...significantly contribute to the long-term restoration or protection of the physical, chemical and biological integrity of the coastal wetlands in the State of Louisiana...” While there exists clear guidance as to how planning efforts develop proposed projects prior to Phase One, there is little in the way of a clear rationale for how a proposed project’s biotic benefits will be assessed during Phase One. The following approach will allow for a consistent, clear, and logical assessment, should a project sponsor choose to perform an ER. The goal, strategy and goal-strategy relationship should have been worked out prior to Phase One. They are listed again in this Phase One process in order to ensure that these vital links between planning and Phase One are stated in a consistent manner and readily available to those responsible for Phase One project E&D and evaluation. The Project Feature Evaluation and Assessment of Goal Attainability would be Phase One activities - these are being done to varying degrees already; however, not on a consistent, standardized basis.

I. Phase 0 activities:

A. **Goal statement.** What is (are) the main biotic goal(s) of the proposed project?

State the biotic response desired from the project, *e.g. restore intermediate marsh acreage, increase marsh sustainability, reduce loss rates, increase productivity and or biodiversity, restore barrier island plant communities, etc.* The goal should be determined in the planning phase (pre-Phase One).

B. **Strategy statement.** What is (are) the strategy(ies) for achieving the goal stated in step “I. -A”?

Describe the physical factors that will cause the desired biotic responses, *e.g. periodically expose water bottoms, reduce water and/or salinity levels, create sheet-flow over the marsh in designated areas, use rock rip-rap along the canal bank to reduce erosion rates, reintroduce alluvial sediments, create a barrier island platform that after settlement will support the desired habitat, etc.* The strategy(ies) should be determined in the planning phase.

C. **Strategy-goal relationship.** How will the strategy(ies) achieve the goal(s)?

Describe how the physical factors affected by the project will cause the desired biotic response, *e.g. by reducing the average salinities and tidal amplitudes the marsh loss rate will be reduced in this predominantly intermediate marsh, by reducing edge erosion the marsh will be protected, by creating a stable platform from dredged material a barrier island plant community can be reestablished.* The strategy-goal relationship should be defined in the planning phase.

II. Phase 1 activities:

A. **Project Feature evaluation.** Do quantitative, engineering evaluations of specific project features such as weirs, culverts, siphons, etc. support the contention that the intended strategy will be achieved? If so, to what degree?

Quantitatively evaluate the project features and evaluate them in terms of the desired physical causal factors, *e.g. compute how many cfs of river water the culverts will discharge into the project area, and how much sediment will be associated with it over the course of an average twelve-month period, quantify average water level or salinity reduction, etc.* If there are more than one design alternative, this step should be performed on each alternative. This evaluation would be conducted during the initial E&D of Phase One with the results being reviewed during the 30% design conference.

B. Assessment of goal attainability. Does the relative degree of the project’s physical effects, as determined in step “II.A”, support the contention that the project will achieve the desired biotic goal(s) stated in “I.A”?

Assess the degree to which the project features would cause the stated biological goal: based on expert judgment, assisted with appropriate statistical and other computational tools, such as computer models, and a review of monitoring data and other scientific information. This would also be the appropriate time to identify and assess the potential risks associated with the project. Again, if more than one design alternatives are involved, step “II.B” should be performed on each alternative. Steps “II.A” and “II.B” may be used in an iterative fashion, such that if designs do not support biological goal attainment other designs could be developed and reassessed. This step evaluates the desired project biotic response based on the level of physical changes induced by the project, e.g. determine the results are associated with projects that have caused similar hydrological responses in similar marsh settings, evaluate the evidence that supports the contention that a barrier island platform with the predicted after-settlement profile and grain-size composition will sustain the desired plant community, etc. This evaluation would be conducted during the initial E&D of Phase One with the results being reviewed during the 30% design conference.

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN PHASE 2 AUTHORIZATION REQUESTS

I. Description of Phase One Project

Describe the candidate project as selected for Phase One authorization, including PPL/Fact Sheet scale map depicting the project boundary and project features, written description of the conceptual features of the project as authorized for Phase One, a summary of the benefits attributed to the Phase One project (e.g., goals/strategies, WVA results and acreage projections) and project budget information as estimated at Phase One authorization (e.g., anticipated costs of construction, O&M, monitoring, etc.).

II. Overview of Phase One Tasks, Process and Issues

Brief description of Phase One analyses and tasks (engineering, land rights, environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA, and HTRW), etc.), including significant problems encountered or remaining issues.

III. Description of the Phase Two Candidate Project

- Easily reproducible, PPL/Fact Sheet scale map which clearly depicts the current project boundary and project features, suitable for inclusion in the formal PPL documentation.

- Detailed description of project features/elements, updated assessment of benefits, current cost estimates, and updated Fact Sheet suitable for inclusion in the formal PPL documentation. In cases of substantial modifications to original conceptual design or costs, describe the specific changes both qualitatively and quantitatively.

IV. Checklist of Phase Two requirements:

A. List of Project Goals and Strategies.

B. A Statement that the Cost Sharing Agreement between the Lead Agency and the Local Sponsor has been executed for Phase I.

C. Notification from the State or the Corps that landrights will be finalized in a short period of time after Phase 2 approval.

D. A favorable Preliminary Design Review (30% Design Level). The Preliminary Design shall include completion of surveys, borings, geotechnical investigations, data analysis review, hydrologic data collection and analysis, modeling (if necessary), and development of preliminary designs.

- E. Final Project Design Review (95% Design Level). Upon completion of a favorable review of the preliminary design, the Project plans and specifications shall be developed and formalized to incorporate elements from the Preliminary Design and the Preliminary Design Review. Final Project Design Review (95%) must be successfully completed prior to seeking Technical Committee approval.
- F. A draft of the Environmental Assessment of the Project, as required under the National Environmental Policy Act, must be submitted two weeks before the Technical Committee meeting at which Phase 2 approval is requested.
- G. A written summary of the findings of the Ecological Review if completed (See APPENDIX B).
- H. Application for and/or issuance of the public notices for permits at least two weeks before the Technical Committee meeting at which Phase 2 approval is requested.
- I. A hazardous, toxic and radiological waste (HTRW) assessment, if required, has been prepared.
- J. Section 303(e) approval from the Corps.
- K. Overgrazing determination from the NRCS (if necessary).
- L. Revised fully funded cost estimate, reviewed and approved by the Engineering Work Group prior to fully funding by the Economic Work Group, based on the revised Project design and the specific Phase 2 funding request as outlined in below spreadsheet.
- M. A Wetland Value Assessment, reviewed and approved by the Environmental Work Group.

REQUEST FOR PHASE II APPROVAL

PROJECT: _____

PPL: _____ **Project No.** _____

Agency: _____

Phase I Approval Date: _____

Phase II Approval Date: _____ **Const Start:** _____

	Original Approved Baseline (100% Level) (Col 1 + Col 2)	Current Approved Baseline (Col 3 + Col 4)	Original Baseline Phase I (100% Level) 1/	Original Baseline Phase II (100% Level) 2/	Current Baseline Phase I 3/	Recommended Baseline Phase II (100% Level) 4/	Recommended Baseline Phase II Incr 1 (100% Level) 5/
Engr & Des	-	-					
Lands	-	-					
Fed S&A	-	-					
LDNR S&A	-	-					
COE Proj Mgmt	-	-					
Phase I	-	-					
Ph II Const Phase	-	-					
Ph II Long Term	-	-					
Const Contract	-	-					
Const S&I	-	-					
Contingency	-	-					
Monitoring	-	-					
Phase I	-	-					
Ph II Const Phase	-	-					
Ph II Long Term	-	-					
O&M - State	-	-					
O&M - Fed	-	-					
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Project				-		-	-
Percent Over Original Baseline							

Prepared By: _____ **Date Prepared:** _____

NOTES:

APPENDIX D

CALENDAR OF REQUIRED ACTIVITIES

January 1	Agencies return updated copy of Project Status Report to Corps of Engineers.
January 15	Agencies send quarterly Project Fact Sheet to Local Sponsor.
January 20	Corps of Engineers sends report on financial status of Projects to Agencies and Local Sponsor.
March 10	Corps of Engineers sends copy of Project Status report to Agencies for updating.
April 1	Agencies return updated copy of Project Status Report to Corps of Engineers.
April 15	Agencies send quarterly Project Fact Sheet to Local Sponsor.
April 20	Corps of Engineers sends report on financial status of Projects to Agencies and Local Sponsor.
June 10	Corps of Engineers sends copy of Project Status report to Agencies for updating.
June 15	Corps of Engineers informs Local Sponsor of funds required to be placed in escrow account for each Project by July 1.
July 1	Agencies return updated copy of Project Status Report to Corps of Engineers.
July 1	State fiscal year starts. Local Sponsor receives funds. Funds placed in escrow account.
July 15	Agencies send quarterly Project Fact Sheet to Local Sponsor,
July 20	Corps of Engineers sends report on financial status of Projects Agencies and Local Sponsor.
Aug 31	The Corps of Engineers and the Local Sponsor forwards the Agency a tabulation of actual project expenditures for the last State fiscal year.

September 10	Corps of Engineers sends copy of Project Status report to Agency for updating.
September 30	Agencies forward to the Local Sponsor a report on all project expenditures for the last State fiscal year.
October 1	Agencies return updated copy of Project Status Report to Corps Engineers.
October 1	Federal fiscal year starts. Federal funds received.
October 9	Agencies send quarterly Project Fact Sheet to Local Sponsor.
October 20	Corps of Engineers sends report on financial status of Projects Agencies and Local Sponsor
November 1	For budgetary purposes, the Agencies furnish the Local Sponsor estimate of funds required for next State fiscal year.
November 30	Priority List submitted to HQUSACE or ASA (CW).
December 10	Corps of Engineers sends copy of Project Status report to Agency for updating.
December 31	Corps of Engineers furnishes MIPR to Agencies for Preliminary Engineering and Design

APPENDIX E

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT SOP

Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

Standard Operating Procedures for

Demonstration Projects

I. Introduction:

Section 303(a) of the CWPPRA states that in the development of Priority Project List, “. . . [should include] due allowance for small-scale projects necessary to demonstrate the use of new techniques or materials for coastal wetlands restoration.”

The CWPPRA Task Force on April 6, 1993, stated that: “The Task Force directs the Technical Committee to limit spending on demonstration projects to \$2,000,000 annually. The Task Force will entertain exceptions to this guidance for projects that the Technical Committee determines merit special consideration. The Task Force waives the cap on monitoring cost for demonstration projects.”

On April 12, 2006, the CWPPRA Task Force passed a motion stating that they would: “consider funding, upon review, at least one credible demonstration project annually with estimates not to exceed \$2 million.”

II. What constitutes a demonstration project:

- A. Demonstration projects contain technology that has not been fully developed for routine application in coastal Louisiana or in certain regions of the coastal zone.
- B. Demonstration projects contain new technology which can be transferred to other areas of the coastal zone.
- C. Demonstration projects are unique and are not duplicative in nature.

III. Submission of candidate demonstration projects:

- A. Demonstration projects are nominated each year at the four Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings. At that time, the RPTs will not vote on which demonstration projects will become official demonstration project nominees. One coast-wide RPT voting meeting will be held after the individual RPT meetings to present and vote for demonstration project nominees. At that meeting, the RPTs will select up to six demonstration project nominees. A lead Federal agency will be assigned to each demonstration project nominee to prepare preliminary supporting information (fact sheet, figures, drawings, etc.). Demonstration project nominees

will be reviewed by the Environmental and Engineering Work Groups to verify that they meet demonstration project criteria. Subsequent to Work Group review, the Technical Committee will select up to three demonstration project candidates for detailed assessment by the Work Groups.

B. The Engineering and Environmental Work Groups will evaluate all candidate demonstration projects (see item IV below). At the time of the project evaluation, an information packet must be submitted which includes the following: 1) a possible location for the project; 2) the problem or question being addressed; 3) the goals of the project; 4) the proposed project features; 5) the monitoring plan to evaluate the project's effectiveness; 6) costs for construction and monitoring; and 7) a discussion of the Demonstration Project Evaluation Parameters (see below). No Wetland Value Assessments (WVA) will be performed on candidate demonstration projects.

C. CWPPRA projects are designed and evaluated on a 20-year project life. However, demonstration projects are unique and each project must be developed accordingly. A specific plan of action must be developed, and operation and maintenance (if applicable) and project monitoring costs included. Monitoring plans are developed to evaluate the demonstration project's technique and the wetland response. Monitoring plans should provide sufficient details of the status of all constructed features of the project such that the performance of all engineered features can be determined. Monitoring should be only long enough to evaluate the demonstration project's performance and may be less than 20 years.

IV. Evaluation of candidate demonstration projects:

A. The Engineering and Environmental Work Groups will conduct a joint meeting, during the annual evaluation of candidate projects, to evaluate all demonstration projects. The lead Federal agency will present the information packet described in III.B above to the CWPPRA work groups. Each candidate demonstration project will be evaluated and compared to other demonstration projects based on the following evaluation parameters:

B. Demonstration Project Evaluation Parameters

1. **Innovativeness** – The demonstration project should contain technology that has not been fully developed for routine application in coastal Louisiana or in certain regions of the coastal zone. The technology demonstrated should be unique and not duplicative in nature to traditional methods or other previously tested techniques for which the results are known. Techniques which are similar to traditional methods or other previously tested techniques should receive lower scores than those which are truly unique and innovative.
2. **Applicability or Transferability** – Demonstration projects should contain technology which can be transferred to other areas of the coastal zone. However, this does not imply that the technology must be applicable to all areas of the coastal zone.

Techniques, which can only be applied in certain wetland types or in certain coastal regions, are acceptable but may receive lower scores than techniques with broad applicability.

3. **Potential Cost-Effectiveness** – The potential cost-effectiveness of the demonstration project’s method of achieving project objectives should be compared to the cost-effectiveness of traditional methods. In other words, techniques which provide substantial cost savings over traditional methods should receive higher scores than those with less substantial cost savings. Those techniques which would be more costly than traditional methods, to provide the same level of benefits, should receive the lowest scores. Information supporting any claims of potential cost savings should be provided.

4. **Potential Environmental Benefits** – Does the demonstration project have the potential to provide environmental benefits equal to traditional methods? Somewhat less than traditional methods? Above and beyond traditional methods? Techniques with the potential to provide benefits above and beyond those provided by traditional techniques should receive the highest scores.

5. **Recognized Need for the Information to be Acquired** – Within the restoration community, is there a recognized need for information on the technique being investigated? Demonstration projects which provide information on techniques for which there is a great need should receive the highest scores.

6. **Potential for Technological Advancement** – Would the demonstration project significantly advance the traditional technology currently being used to achieve project objectives? Those techniques which have a high potential to completely replace an existing technique at a lower cost and without reducing wetland benefits should receive the highest scores.

The Work Groups will prepare a joint evaluation for submission to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee outlining the merits of each project and stating how well each project meets each of the evaluation parameters.

C. The Engineering Work Group will review costs to ensure consistency and adequacy; address potential cost-effectiveness; compare the cost of the demonstration project to the cost of traditional or other methods of achieving project objectives, when such information is available; and report the pros and cons of the demonstration vs. traditional or other methods. The Engineering Work Group will check monitoring costs with the Monitoring Work Group Chairman.

D. The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee will present information on the demonstration projects at the public meetings that are held to present the results of the annual evaluation of candidate projects, including any such meetings of the Technical Committee or the Task Force.

V. Funding approval:

Demonstration projects shall be considered for funding on an annual basis as (a) part(s) of a priority project list (i.e., October budgeting meeting). Demonstration projects follow non-cash flow procedures and are capped at 100%. However, agencies may choose to employ cash flow procedures if they believe it is necessary to maintain consistent accounting procedures or if they believe it would improve dissemination of project information to the Task Force and public.

VI. Engineering and design:

A. Project Workplan:

Federal and State Sponsors shall develop a plan of work for accomplishing all engineering and design tasks. This plan shall include, but not be limited to: a detailed task list, time line with specific milestones, and budget which breaks out specific tasks such as geo-technical evaluations, hydrological investigations, modeling, environmental compliance (cultural resources, NEPA, and HTRW), surveying, and other items deemed necessary to justify the proposed project features. The plans shall be developed within 3 months following funding approval and shall be reviewed by the P&E Subcommittee.

B. Design Review Conference:

The Federal and Local Sponsors shall hold a "Design Review Conference" with the other Agencies upon completion of a Preliminary Design Report (PDR), to allow the other Agencies an opportunity to comment on the proposed design of the project. The other Agencies shall be notified by the Federal Sponsor at least four weeks prior to the conference of the date, time and place and invited to attend. The PDR shall be forwarded to the other Agencies for their review, with receipt two weeks prior to the conference. Invitations and supporting data shall be sent to agency representatives of the Technical Committee, Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, Project Manager of the Local Sponsor and the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities.

The Preliminary Design Report shall include; 1) recommended project features, 2) a discussion of the project location reviewed/approved by the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups, 3) engineering and design surveys, 4) engineering and design geotechnical investigation (borings, testing results, and analysis), 5) land ownership investigation, 6) preliminary cultural resources assessment, 7) revised project construction cost estimates based on the current design, 8) description of changes since funding approval, and 9) a detailed monitoring plan.

This review will verify the viability of the project and whether or not the Federal and Local Sponsors agree to continue with the project. This review must indicate the project is viable before there are expenditures of additional funds.

After the conference, the Federal Sponsor shall forward a letter (or e- mail) summarizing the results of the Design Review Conference to the Technical Committee with a copy to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee. It should include the revised estimate, a description of project revisions from the previously authorized project, and a letter of concurrence from the Local Sponsor agreeing to continue with the project. The Technical Committee may make a recommendation on whether or not to continue with the project.

C. Final Design Report:

A Final Design Report and a set of Plans and Specifications shall be submitted to the Technical Committee and Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee prior to requesting permission from the Technical Committee (with subsequent approval by the Task Force) to proceed to construction. The Final Design Report shall include; 1) project features and location, 2) a revised project cost estimate (fully-funded, approved by the Economic Work Group), 3) a description of how the project differs in cost and features since funding approval, 4) final monitoring plan, 5) responses to comments brought up at the Design Review Conference, and 6) all supporting data.

VII. Reporting of results:

The sponsoring agency will prepare a report for the Technical Committee as soon as meaningful results of the demonstration project are available. The report will describe the initial construction details, including actual costs and the current condition of all constructed features. The report will summarize the results and assess the success or failure of the project and its applicability to other similar sites. The sponsoring agency will prepare follow-up reports for the Technical Committee if and when more information becomes available.

APPENDIX F

CWPPRA - CIAP PARTNERSHIP SOP

Coastal Wetlands Planning Protection Act and Coastal Impact Assistance Program

A Concept for Partnership

18 Oct 2006

I. INTRODUCTION

The Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) Program has developed a partnership with the State of Louisiana (the State) to: 1) allow the Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) to construct CWPPRA Priority Project List (PPL) projects that are currently eligible for Phase II approval, using CIAP funds; 2) use CWPPRA funds to perform operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and replacement (OMRR&R) and monitoring on CWPPRA projects constructed with CIAP funds; and 3) outline a process to obtain CWPPRA funds for OMRR&R and monitoring for other non-CWPPRA projects.

The Technical Committee (TC) has discussed the above concept and has found it to be generally acceptable. However, it is recognized that sufficient funds may not be available and that it may not be in the interest of the CWPPRA program to operate, maintain, and monitor all projects eligible for Phase II approval. It is also recognized that the opportunity for other programs to request OMRR&R and monitoring funding through CWPPRA for non-PPL projects exists through the normal CWPPRA Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for selecting annual PPL projects. Therefore, a separate process is not necessary.

Under the proposed partnership, CWPPRA projects constructed with CIAP funds would be considered for OMRR&R and monitoring funds (allocated for three years) along with other constructed CWPPRA projects during the CWPPRA annual budget meetings, according to the CWPPRA SOP.

II. BACKGROUND

As of the FY 06 funding cycle, there are currently 10 CWPPRA PPL projects eligible but not funded for Phase II construction (See attached table for list). The most current estimated Phase II total cost for all 10 projects is approximately \$221 million. The current total estimated cost to construct these projects under the CIAP is approximately \$176 million, and the total estimated cost for the first increment of OMRR&R and monitoring (three years) is approximately \$18 million. The current total estimated cost for the remaining long-term OMRR&R and monitoring (17 years) is approximately \$25

million. Additional projects are expected to become eligible for Phase II funding by December 2006. Also, project cost estimates will be revised before the December 2006 TC meeting. Therefore, these reported costs are expected to increase markedly.

The CWPPRA Program does not have sufficient funds readily available to immediately construct the above referenced projects. Although the CWPPRA Program receives additional construction funds annually, more PPL projects are expected to become eligible for Phase II construction funding every year.

Currently, it is estimated that the State will receive up to \$523 million between fiscal years 2007-2010, of which 35 percent (\$183 million) will be dedicated to the coastal parishes. At least 77% of CIAP funds are to be used for conservation, restoration and protection of Louisiana coastal areas and to implement a federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation management plan. The State is developing a CIAP funding plan and is considering funding construction of one or more CWPPRA projects eligible for Phase II approval. Program and project funding under CIAP is restricted by the appropriated four year term and is not conducive to developing projects with long term OMRR&R and monitoring .

III. PARTNERSHIP OVERVIEW

Since the CWPPRA Program does not have sufficient funds readily available to construct all projects eligible for Phase II, and since the State will have sufficient funds available to construct conservation, restoration and protection projects over a relatively short term, the State and local interests have proposed to use CIAP funds to construct eligible CWPPRA PPL projects with subsequent OMRR&R and monitoring to be funded by the CWPPRA program.

A. CWPPRA-CIAP Partnership, Procedures: A CWPPRA-CIAP partnership to fund construction, and OMRR&R and monitoring of a CWPPRA PPL project would consist of the following measures:

1. Following the annual CWPPRA January budgeting meeting, the TC would provide the State CIAP administrators with a list of all CWPPRA projects eligible, but not approved, for Phase II funding. The TC would also provide basic information for these projects, including maps, fact sheets, and fully funded cost estimates. Upon request, the CWPPRA project sponsors would provide State CIAP administrators with additional available project-specific information.
2. By August 1, State CIAP administrators would advise the TC of any CWPPRA PPL projects that they propose to construct using CIAP funds. The TC would identify CWPPRA federal agencies willing to sponsor and coordinate proposed CWPPRA-CIAP Partnerships on individual projects. Existing sponsors for the CWPPRA projects would be given the opportunity to sponsor and coordinate a CWPPRA-CIAP partnership.

3. The State shall notify the TC with a letter of intent that identifies any projects they wish to construct using CIAP funds and perform OMRR&R and monitoring using CWPPRA funds four weeks prior to the annual December TC meeting. The CWPPRA TC would make recommendations to the TF to approve CWPPRA OMRR&R and monitoring funds for PPL projects to be constructed with CIAP funds, according to the CWPPRA SOP for Phase II approvals. The TC would vote at the annual December TC meeting to recommend to the TF whether or not the CWPPRA Program should enter into a CWPPRA-CIAP partnership, which would include immediate CWPPRA funding for Increment I (three years after construction is complete) of OMRR&R and monitoring. At the subsequent annual January TF meeting, the TF would render a decision on whether or not to enter into a CWPPRA-CIAP partnership as described in this paragraph for any recommended projects. For any project that the Task Force decides not to enter into a CWPPRA-CIAP partnership, the state may elect to proceed with the project coordinating as needed with the federal sponsor to finalize the design, landrights and environmental compliance as well as close out and formally transfer the project from the CWPPRA program.

4. For any project that the TF decides to enter into a partnership, the CWPPRA project sponsors shall provide state CIAP administrators with completed Engineering and Design (E&D), Plans and Specifications (P&S) and any other requested related supporting data and documents. It shall be the State's responsibility under CIAP to coordinate with the CWPPRA federal sponsor to complete and/or modify project requirements, including but not limited to Cost Share Agreements, Real Estate, permitting and National Environmental Policy act requirements prior to construction, to ensure that the near and long term requirements of both programs are met.

5. When CWPPRA OMRR&R and monitoring funding for CIAP-constructed projects is involved, any proposed changes in project designs shall be approved by the TC and TF according to the CWPPRA SOP for changes in project scope (Section 6(e)(3)). If it appears that the State through CIAP will not construct a CWPPRA-designed project in a reasonable amount of time, the TF may take measures to construct the project with CWPPRA funds.

6. Funding for OMRR&R and monitoring requirements beyond increment one would be considered by the TF along with other CWPPRA constructed projects during CWPPRA annual budget meetings, according to the CWPPRA SOP.

B. Rights of Way, Rights of Entry, Easements and other project related Real Estate Interests:

1. For CWPPRA projects constructed with CIAP funds that the State would normally conduct OMRR&R and monitoring, the State shall acquire all lands, easements, rights of way, rights of entry and disposals (LERRDs) according to State requirements.

2. For CWPPRA projects constructed with CIAP funds that the CWPPRA Federal sponsor would conduct OMRR&R and monitoring, the State shall acquire all lands, easements, rights of way, rights of entry and disposal (LERRDs) according to the Federal sponsoring agency's requirements.

C. Project Cost Share Agreements: Cost share agreements between the State and the federal sponsor for CWPPRA projects to be constructed using CIAP funds and have OMRR&R and monitoring performed using CWPPRA funds shall be modified and/or finalized before CWPPRA OMRR&R and/or monitoring begins.

APPENDIX G
MONITORING CONTINGENCY FUND SOP
MONITORING CONTINGENCY FUND
Standard Operating Procedure
December 8, 1999

On July 23, 1998, the Breaux Act Task Force approved 1.5 million dollars out of construction funds to be used as a contingency for the Breaux Act Monitoring Program. The Task Force provided authority to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee to approve or disapprove all requests. Requests for use of contingency funds are either based on project-specific activities or programmatic activities. Project-specific relates to changes in project designs, timetables, goals or impacts and programmatic relates to changes in monitoring techniques, analyses or approaches [specific examples identified in (4) below]. The procedures to be followed in requesting contingency funds are as follows:

- (1) Upon identification of an activity that would require monitoring contingency funds, the Department of Natural Resources Monitoring Program Manager will solicit the Lead Agency on project specific requests and the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee on programmatic requests. The solicitation will be a letter outlining and justifying the request with an attached budget. Lead Agencies shall respond to such requests within 10 working days of the State's request. Responses not received within 10 days may be deemed by the State as Lead Agency approval.
- (2) Upon approval from the Lead Agency on project specific requests, the Department of Natural Resources Monitoring Program Manager will send a letter to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee stating concurrence of the Lead Agency and will request approval for use of contingency funds. A copy of the initial solicitation to the Lead Agency will be attached. Letters to the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee for project-specific and programmatic requests will include a running total of contingency funds provided to date.
- (3) Upon approval for use of contingency funds by the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee, the New Orleans District will prepare MIPR's to the State and/or other participating agencies (National Wetlands Research Center) in the amount requested. MIPR's to the State for project-specific activities will be cost-shared in accordance with approved cost-share agreements. MIPR's to the State for programmatic activities will be cost-shared at 85% Federal and 15% State.
- (4) Activities that are appropriate for use of contingency funds include, but are not limited to:

Project-specific

- a) Changes in project designs such as revised boundaries, structures or goals may require extra TAG meetings, revising monitoring plans, additional preconstruction aerial photography acquisition and analysis and additional preconstruction monitoring.
- b) Delays in project construction may require additional preconstruction aerial photography acquisition and analysis and additional preconstruction monitoring.
- c) Damage to monitoring stations due to human or natural causes such as stolen or vandalized equipment, marsh burning and storm damage may require replacement.
- d) Project-specific impacts that might surface during routine monitoring such as increasing the duration and frequency of flooding.

Programmatic

- e) Cost increases in technologic advances such as habitat mapping, land:water analyses, surveying, shoreline change analysis, lidar, and hyperspectral imagery.
- f) Planning and engineering requests to monitor specific variables or evaluate specific questions such as structure effectiveness.
- g) Storm event monitoring to evaluate influences and impacts of storms.
- h) Coastwide data collection and evaluations to address cumulative effects of projects.

APPENDIX H

TRACKING OF CHANGES

Revisions 1-5 of this document were maintained in a “draft” format that utilized redline and strikeout text in an attempt to track changes. Because of the extensive changes that had been made throughout the years, this “draft” format made it very difficult to follow the intent of the procedures. Beginning with Revision 6 (15 Apr 03), the document will be maintained in a “clean” format. This appendix was added in Revision 7 to track the origin and approval of amendments made to the document in all future revisions of the SOP. The table below outlines all amendments to the SOP, beginning in Revision 7 (approved by the Technical Committee on 30 Sep 03).

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
1	7	All instances where the words “OMRR&R Plan” occur, replace with “Project Operations & Schedule Manual” when referencing the Corps of Engineers. Change was requested to satisfy the requirements of Corps’ attorneys. The name change is only applicable to the Corps.	Proposed by LDNR, Dr. Bill Good.	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #8).	16 Jul 03
2	7	During the 15 Apr 03 meeting to modify the SOP, it was agreed that the Corps would provide suggested language in order to clarify the funding cap for cash flow and non-cash flow projects. The Corps-suggested revisions to all of Section 5.d. were incorporated into the SOP.	Requested by USACE, Ms. Gay Browning, as a clarification of the baseline estimate. At the 10 Dec 02 Technical Committee meeting, the Engineering Workgroup was tasked with looking at this issue and developing a proposal for consideration by the Technical Committee. At the 26 Mar 03 Technical Committee meeting (Agenda Item F), the Technical Committee accepted the Engineering Workgroup recommendation that the most current Phase 2 estimate should	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #8).	16 Jul 03

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
			be used as the baseline estimate and that there was no basis for changing the currently-allowable 25% cap above the baseline estimate.		
3	7	Incorporation of language to allow Phase 2 authorizations at any regular quarterly Task Force meeting into the SOP.	Originally proposed by USFWS, Mr. Darryl Clark. Approved by the Technical Committee at the 16 Jul 03 meeting (Agenda Item #8), for recommendation to the Task Force.	Task Force, at a regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #4)	14 Aug 03
4	7	Incorporation of language into the SOP regarding updates to the Prioritization Criteria scoring of un-constructed projects at the 95% design review. Incorporation of language into the SOP regarding prioritization of candidate projects as part of the Phase 0 analysis.	Originally proposed by the Engineering/ Environmental Workgroups. Approved by the Technical Committee at the 16 Jul 03 meeting (Agenda Item #1), for recommendation to the Task Force.	Task Force, at a regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #5)	14 Aug 03
5	7	Incorporation of language into the SOP	Originally proposed by the USACE,	Task Force, at a	14 Aug 03

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		outlining the process for requesting approval for OM&M funding beyond the first three years.	Ms. Julie Z. LeBlanc, in order clarify the procedure for the monitoring funding request under consideration at the 14 Aug 03 Task Force meeting. Approved by the Technical Committee via email vote on 13 Aug 03 (LDNR abstaining), for recommendation to the Task Force.	regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #5)	
6	8	Incorporation of clarifications to 30/95% design review requirements, as recommended by the Engineering and Environmental Workgroups.	At the 30 Sep 03 Technical Committee meeting, the Technical Committee tasked the Engineering and Environmental Workgroups with providing clarifications on what is included in 30/95% design reviews. Following a joint workgroup meeting on 13 Nov 03, the workgroups recommended changes to the language.	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #9). In accordance with Section 6.a (1)(b), these changes are not “policy-level” and therefore are at the discretion of the Technical Committee for review and	10 Dec 03

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
				approval.	
7	8	Revision of SOP language to clarify that requests for Phase 2 funding, construction approval, and other funding approvals must first be obtained from the Technical Committee prior the requesting same from the Task Force. In practice, this is how the process is currently working (requests before the Task Force must first be recommended by the Technical Committee), but it is not clearly reflected in the SOP.	Originally proposed by Dr. Bill Good to more clearly define the CWPPRA approval process.	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #9). In accordance with Section 6.a (1)(b), these changes are not “policy-level” and therefore are at the discretion of the Technical Committee for review and approval.	10 Dec 03
8	8	Revision of SOP language to require successful 95% design review prior requesting funding approval from the Technical Committee. The previous	Requested during 10 Dec 03 Technical Committee meeting.	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda	10 Dec 03

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		revision of the SOP allowed completion of 95% design review after the Technical Committee recommendation, but prior to Task Force approval. This change allows the Technical Committee to take the material provided as part of the 95% design review into account in making their recommendation.		Item #9). In accordance with Section 6.a (1)(b), these changes are not “policy-level” and therefore are at the discretion of the Technical Committee for review and approval.	
9	8	Include Demonstration SOP and most recent Prioritization Criteria as appendices to the CWPPRA SOP.	Originally proposed by the Corps of Engineers to consolidate the location of other procedures used by the CWPPRA agencies.	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #9). In accordance with Section 6.a (1)(b), these changes are not “policy-level” and therefore are at the discretion of the	10 Dec 03

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
				Technical Committee for review and approval.	
10	9	Modify SOP language to reflect 14 Apr 04 Task Force decision to move to an annual cycle for Phase 1/ Phase 2 funding (September Technical Committee/October Task Force). The exception is that Phase 1 funding for PPL14 will be approved in January 2005	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #4). Revisions approved by Technical Committee during regularly scheduled meeting on 14 Jul 04 (Agenda Item #2).	14 Apr 04
11	9	Replaced Appendix A language to include PPL15 process. In addition to only making changes to the dates, the process was modified to move Phase 1 funding approval up to October (in lieu of January).	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #4). Revisions approved by Technical Committee	14 Apr 04

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
				during regularly scheduled meeting on 14 Jul 04 (Agenda Item #2).	
12	10	Modify SOP language to reflect Aug 04 Task Force decision to limit new Phase I and II approvals to 100%, and modify SOP language to reflect Oct 04 and Feb 05 Task Force decisions to limit existing Phase I and II costs to 100% (previously allowed to increase to 125% without Task Force approval)	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item # 4), Oct 04 (Agenda Item #5), and Feb 05 (Agenda Item #3). Revisions approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 16 Mar 05 (Agenda Item #3). Changes drafted by P&E Subcommittee on 10 Mar 05.	18 Aug 04 13 Oct 04 12 Feb 05

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
13	10	Modify SOP language to reflect Oct 04 Task Force decision to limit request for approval of O&M funding increases above the 20-year cost for non-cash-flow projects to 3-year increments	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #6). Revisions approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 16 Mar 05 (Agenda Item #3). Changes drafted by P&E Subcommittee on 10 Mar 05.	13 Oct 04
14	10	Modify SOP language to reflect Feb 05 Task Force decision to hold two yearly funding meetings in Oct and Jan. Oct funding meetings would consider demonstration project approvals, PPL Phase 1 approvals, planning budget approval, O&M and monitoring approvals and Corps administrative cost approvals. January funding meetings	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly schedule meeting (Agenda Item #9). Revisions approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 16 Mar 05 (Agenda Item #3). Changes drafted	17 Feb 05

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		would consider Phase 2 approvals.		by P&E Subcommittee on 10 Mar 05.	
15	10	Modify SOP language in main body, Appendices C and E to clarify project requirements related to annual funding meetings. Suggested changes were compiled as part of an After Action Review (AAR) following the Sept/Oct 2004 funding meeting.	Technical Committee	Technical Committee, at regularly schedule meeting (Agenda Item #3) on 16 Mar 05. P&E Subcommittee met to discuss and draft language on 10 Mar 05.	16 Mar 05
16	11	Corps changed the submission address for all 303(e) approval requests (from CEMVN-RE-L to CEMVN-OC). Corps revised Phase II approval spreadsheet in Appendix C to match version emailed out to the agencies on	Corps' administrative changes	N/A	N/A

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		17 Nov 05 (G. Browning).			
17	11	Replacement of Appendix E – Demo SOP: - Incorporated implementation procedures /clarifications initially discussed at the 10 Mar 05 P&E Subcommittee meeting and remanded to the WG chairmen - Incorporation of the final PPL16 process pertaining to demo nomination, evaluation, and selection as outlined in the PPL16 process approved by the Task Force on 27 Jul 05	Procedures/clarifications originally discussed at the 10 Mar 05 P&E meeting. Changes to demo nomination, evaluation, and selection as outlined in final PPL16 process.	Technical Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #8)	19 Oct 05
18	11	Replaced Appendix A - PPL15 process with the final PPL16 process approved by the Task Force on 27 Jul 05. In addition, modified the final approved PPL16 process to incorporate the 2 Nov 05 Task Force decision to allow automatic re-nomination of PPL15 projects not selected for Phase I funding	Task Force/Technical Committee	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting on 27 Jul 05 (Agenda Item 4) Task Force, at	27 Jul 05

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		by the Task Force as PPL16 nominees. These projects will be considered at the coastwide voting meeting, along with other nominated projects. This change is in reaction to the delay in Phase I selection for PPL15 until after the PPL16 RPT meetings (selection delay due to Hurricane Katrina).		regularly scheduled meeting on 2 Nov 05 (Agenda Item 3d)	2 Nov 05
19	12	Revised SOP language under Section 6p (previously entitled "Project Deauthorizations") to include project transfers to other programs.	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #5). Revisions approved by Technical Committee during regularly scheduled meeting on 14 Jun 06 (Agenda Item #6).	12 Jul 06
20	12	Replaced Appendix A - PPL16 process	Task Force	Task Force, at	12 Jul 06

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		with the final PPL17 process approved by the Task Force on 12 Jul 06. Subsequently, in Revision #13, revised meeting dates in the appendix to reflect changes to 2 Task Force meeting dates) – Corps administrative action.		regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #4). Revisions approved by Technical Committee via email (29 Jun 06).	
21	13	Revised language in Appendix E, <i>Demonstration Project SOP</i> , to incorporate the Task Force’s 12 Apr 06 decision to fund, upon review, at least one credible demo annually.	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #5). SOP changes drafted by P&E Subcommittee via email. SOP changes approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 14 Mar 07 (Agenda Item #3).	12 Apr 06
22	13	Revised language in Appendix C,	Technical Committee	Technical	13 Sep 06

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		<i>Information Required in Phase 2 Authorization Requests</i>, to clarify that the Engineering Work Group must review and approve agency's revised Phase II cost estimates prior to fully funding.		Committee, at regularly scheduled meeting (Agenda Item #14). In accordance with Section 6.a (1)(b), these changes are not "policy-level" and therefore are at the discretion of the Technical Committee for review and approval. SOP changes drafted by P&E Subcommittee via email. SOP changes approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 14 Mar 07 (Agenda Item #3).	

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
23	13	Changed the <i>Tracking of Changes</i> Appendix from “G” to “J” (so it remains last in SOP). Added new Appendix “G”, <i>CWPPRA – CIAP Partnership</i> , as approved by the Task Force at their 18 Oct 06 meeting.	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting on 18 Oct 06 (Agenda Item #14). SOP changes drafted by P&E Subcommittee via email. SOP changes approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 14 Mar 07 (Agenda Item #3).	18 Oct 06
24	13	Revised SOP language to incorporate the “Storm Recovery Procedures Contingency Fund” approved by the Task Force at their 18 Oct 06 meeting. This was done by inserting a new section “6.q.”. and revising the existing Section 6.q. to 6.r.	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly scheduled meeting on 18 Oct 06 (Agenda Item #10). SOP changes drafted by P&E Subcommittee via email. SOP changes	18 Oct 06

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
				approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 14 Mar 07 (Agenda Item #3).	
25	13	Added Appendix H, <i>Transitioning Projects to Other Authorities</i> , as approved by the Task Force at their 15 Feb 07 meeting	Task Force	Task Force, at regularly schedule meeting on 15 Feb 07 (Agenda Item #8). Appendix approved by Technical Committee at their 6 Dec 06 meeting. SOP changes approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 14 Mar 07 (Agenda Item #3).	15 Feb 07
26	13	Added Appendix I, Monitoring	Corps administrative change	Appendix approved 8	14 Mar 07

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		Contingency Fund SOP. Inserted previously approved SOP, dated 8 Dec 99.		Dec 99. SOP changes approved by Technical Committee during meeting on 14 Mar 07 (Agenda Item #3).	
27	14	Changed Section 6e(2) to include language to make it a priority of the 30% Design to reduce long term maintenance costs of projects			
28	14	Eliminate Appendix H, retitle subsequent Appendices to reflect the deletion of Appendix H.			
29	14	Replace Section 6(p) with new language			
30	14	Non-substantive editing changes to clean up and correct inconsistent			

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
		formatting and paragraph numbering, grammatical, readability, typographical, and spelling errors.			
31	14.1	Replaced Draft Appendix A with final version	Corps Administrative change		08 Feb 08
32	15	Replaced Appendix A PPL 18 process with PPL 19. Eliminated language from the SOP regarding Prioritization Criteria Scoring for unconstructed projects and candidate projects during Phase 0 analysis.	P&E Subcommittee at 09 October 08 Tech Committee meeting.	Task Force Meeting (Agenda item #9)	05 Nov 08
33	15	Eliminated language from the SOP regarding Prioritization Criteria Scoring for unconstructed projects and candidate projects during Phase 0 analysis. Removed Appendix F Prioritization Procedure.	Tech Committee (initiated by Rick Hartman) at 03 December 2008 meeting.	Task Force Meeting (Agenda item #8)	21 Jan 09

#	First Appears in Revision #	Requested Change/Reason for Requested Change	Amendment Requested by?	When Amendment Was Approved	Approval Date
34	16	Added language to section 6(e) and Appendix B, that eliminates Ecological Review requirement for unconstructed projects, unless requested by project sponsors for complex projects, or projects with little precedent for success. Added language to Appendix C that acknowledges this change.	Tech Committee (initiated by Darryl Clark) at 15 Apr 2009 meeting	Task Force Meeting (Agenda item #13)	3 Jun 09
35	16	Establishes time period for submitting written comments and responding to comments on 30% design reviews.	Tech Committee (initiated by Darryl Clark) at 29 Sep 2009 meeting	Task Force Meeting (Agenda item #17)	28 Oct 09