Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council

Initial Funded Priorities List (FPL)

Lessons Learned and Path Forward Webinar
Goals:

• Seek public input on Initial FPL Process
• Identify key lessons
• Inform the update of the Comprehensive Plan
• Improve future FPLs
• Overview of RESTORE Act & funding

• Initial Comprehensive Plan & Funded Priorities List Process

• FPL Review – Key Questions
  • FPL Process
  • Public Involvement
  • Science & Measuring Success
RESTORE Act: Passed in 2012

Allocation of Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund

- Clean Water Act Penalties
- 20% Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund

80% Gulf Coast Restoration Trust Fund

- 35% Equally distributed to 5 Gulf States (AL, FL, LA, MS, TX)
- 30%* Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council for ecosystem restoration
- 30% Impact based distribution to 5 Gulf States (AL, FL, LA, MS, TX)
- 2.5%* Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Science, Observation, Monitoring, and Technology Program
- 2.5%* Centers of Excellence

*Supplemented by interest generated by the Trust Fund (50% to Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Council, 25% to Science Program, 25% to Centers of Excellence)
Settlement with Transocean for $1 Billion Clean Water Act (CWA) civil penalties

- $800 Million plus interest available in Trust Fund

On November 30, 2015 Anadarko Petroleum, Inc. was ordered to pay $159.5 Million CWA Civil Penalties

- $127.7 Million has been paid into the Trust Fund

On April 4, 2016, the court in the Eastern District of Louisiana entered a Consent Decree resolving civil claims against BP

- $5.5 Billion CWA penalty
- $4.4 Billion plus interest to Trust Fund
- Payable over a 15-year period
Council to restore the Gulf “without regard to geographic location”

4 Priority Criteria from the Act:
- Greatest contribution to restoring & protecting natural resources
- Large-scale
- Build upon existing restoration plans or programs
- Long-term resilience to areas most impacted by the DWH oil spill
1. Restore and Conserve Habitat

2. Restore Water Quality

3. Replenish and Protect Living Coastal and Marine Resources

4. Enhance Community Resilience

5. Restore and Revitalize the Gulf Economy
FPL Development Process

Comprehensive Plan

Solicitation To Members

50 Proposals Submitted = 380 components

Vetting:
- Science Evaluation
- Environmental Compliance
- Priority & Commitment to Plan Evaluation

Development of portfolios of projects leading to publication of Draft FPL for public review and comment

Draft Funded Priorities List
- 10 watersheds
- Gulf-wide Foundational Projects
- $156.6M
Available for comment from August 13 through September 28, 2015.

7 Public meetings and a Tribal engagement session.

Previous Public Meetings on Draft FPL

- Corpus Christi, TX
- New Orleans, LA
- Morgan City, LA
- Biloxi, MS
- Mobile, AL
- Panama City, FL
- St. Petersburg, FL
Draft FPL Public Input

- Vast majority of public comments were supportive

- Public comments focused on:
  - Watershed/Estuary Approach
  - Implementation-Ready Projects
  - Habitat Conservation
  - Water Quality and Quantity
  - Science and Monitoring
  - Specific Projects and Programs
  - Comprehensive Plan Update
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Initial Funded Priorities List – December 2015

- $156.6m in restoration activities
  - 10 key watersheds
  - Gulf-wide programs
  - Foundational
  - Highly-Leveraged

- Prioritizes 12 activities for possible future funding ($26.6m)
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In 2016, the Council will:

- Consider amending the Initial FPL to include more implementation-ready projects
- Begin issuing grants and interagency agreements for FPL activities
- **Review Initial Comprehensive Plan & FPL process/initiate the update of the Comprehensive Plan**
• **Two Components:**
  - Member Feedback
  - Public Webinars

• Today the Council is seeking your feedback on questions that review the work done up until now

• Council staff will evaluate member and public input for use in future FPL processes
Feedback Polling Instructions

To solicit feedback from the webinar audience we will now ask a series of multiple choice questions. Registered webinar attendees can provide answers via interactive polling through the computer.

- Following this screen, the first question will appear.
- Council staff will read the question out loud, and then the polling period will begin.
- Please select the option (or options) that best fits your answer.
- Press Submit.
- You will have 2 minutes to respond to each question.
- You will not be able to change your response once you have pressed submit.
In addition to selecting from the multiple choice poll options, you may also submit additional comments in the “Question” box in your GoToWebinar Control Panel. This panel is likely on the top right corner of your screen. An example of where to enter comments is shown below.

**Note:**
- Other attendees will not be able to view your comments.
- Council staff will read some of the comments (anonymously).
- Council staff will track polling and keep a record of all comments provided.
• How would you characterize the Council’s FPL development process?  
  (Select one)
  __ Adequate for future FPLs/no change needed
  __ Minor adjustments needed
  __ Major overhaul needed
  __ Unsure/No opinion

• What are some areas where the FPL process could have been improved?  
  (Please select all that apply)
  __ Project development
  __ Best Available Science
  __ Public input/transparency
  __ Project selection
  __ No improvement needed
• The Council used a watershed- and estuary-based approach for this FPL. Should the Council use this approach for future FPLs? (Select one)
  __ Yes
  __ No
  __ Other
  __ Unsure/No opinion

• In the future, what factors should Council members consider as they develop proposals? (Please select all that apply)
  __ Integration with other Gulf restoration programs
  __ Opportunities for larger-scale restoration
  __ Areas of greatest ecosystem need
  __ Opportunities to partner with other Council members
  __ Other
Public Engagement

• Was the process for involving the public in the FPL process effective?  
  (Select one)  
  __ Yes  
  __ No  
  __ Partially (please use Questions box to clarify)  
  __ Unsure/No opinion

• What other actions could have been taken to create a more open and transparent process?  
  (Please select all that apply)  
  __ More time for public review of the draft FPL  
  __ Additional opportunities for public review and comment  
  __ More effective writing and on-line materials  
  __ Other  
  __ Unsure/No opinion
• How would you characterize the Council’s science review process? (Select one)
  __ Adequate for future FPLs/no change needed
  __ Minor adjustments needed
  __ Major overhaul needed
  __ Unsure/No opinion

• How could the process be improved? (Please select all that apply)
  __ More effective reviewer questions
  __ Score/rank projects scientifically, e.g., high, medium, low
  __ Use an Expert Panel or Committee
  __ More effectively identify potential project interactions
  __ Unsure/No opinion
• How should the Council show its work has been effective? (Please select all that apply)
  __ Measure success at the project level
    (e.g. # of acres created, acres of oyster reef, etc.)
  __ Measure cumulative impacts of projects at a larger scale
    (e.g. watershed, estuary, or ecoregion, etc.)
  __ Other
  __ Unsure/No opinion
• What important question(s) have not been asked?

• What key lesson is missing?
• Do you like this webinar and polling format for providing feedback on Council activities?
  __ Yes
  __ No (please use Question box to provide comments)
  __ Some/Other (please use Question box to provide comments)
Thank You