

**STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
COASTAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE PLAN**

Governor Ronnie Musgrove

(seal)

**Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality
Charles Chisolm, Executive Director**

**Jayne Buttross, J.D., Senior Advisor to the Director,
CIAP Coordinator
July 20, 2001**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The State of Mississippi and the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality wish to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of the Hancock, Harrison and Jackson County Boards of Supervisors, their designated contacts, the Gulf of Mexico Program Office, the State Agency Advisory Team, and all participants who put the health of the coastal ecology before self.

I. GOVERNOR'S CERTIFICATION (43 U.S.C. Section 1356a(e))

I, Ronnie Musgrove, Governor of the State of Mississippi, hereby certify to the United States Secretary of Commerce that to the best of my knowledge and belief the uses of Coastal Impact Assistance Funds proposed by the Hancock, Harrison and Jackson Counties, and by the State of Mississippi, are consistent with the requirements of the law, specifically 43 U.S.C. Section 1356a (1970). I further certify that ample opportunity has been accorded for public participation in the development of the state's plan.

Certified on this the ____ day of July, 2001.

RONNIE MUSGROVE, GOVERNOR
STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

II. POINTS OF CONTACT

A. State Point of Contact

According to 43 U.S.C. Section 1356a(e)(1)(A), the governor of each Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) qualified state is required to designate a "State agency that will have the authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary for purposes of this section." Each political subdivision subject to CIAP is also required to designate a point of contact. 43 U.S.C. Section 1356a(e)(1)(C).

On March 5, 2001, Governor Ronnie Musgrove designated the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) as the lead agency to act on the state's behalf for purposes of CIAP. The MDEQ coordinated and led the development of this CIAP Plan and will continue to serve as the lead agency for purposes of administering the Plan and CIAP

The point of contact for the State of Mississippi is:

Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality
Attention: Jayne Buttross, J.D., Senior Advisor to the Director
Post Office Box 20305
Jackson, Mississippi 39289-1305

office (601)961-5277
facsimile (601)961-5715
cellular (601)573-3200
pager (877)808-2332
email page www.arch.com
email address jayne_buttross@deq.state.ms.us

B. County Points of Contact

Shortly after the March 5, 2001, designation of MDEQ as the state's lead agency, the three coast counties, as specified in 43 U.S.C. Section 1356a(e)(1)(C), designated their points of contact for purposes of CIAP. The current points of contact are:

Hancock County

Jenell Tompkins, CIAP Coordinator
Hancock County Board of Supervisors
Post Office Box 429
Bay Saint Louis, Mississippi 39502-0008

office (228)467-0172
facsimile (228)466-5994
email address jvt@co.hancock.ms.us

Harrison County

The Harrison County contact for plan development was Mike Olivier, the Director of the Harrison County Development Commission. For implementation of the Harrison County Plan,

the Board of Supervisors has re-designated itself, through President of the Board, Larry Benefield, with Brown and Mitchell Consultants directly handling implementation. Both should be contacted on behalf of Harrison County.

Larry Benefield, President
Harrison County Board of Supervisors
Post Office Drawer CC
Gulfport, Mississippi 39502-0860

office (228)865-4001

Larry Lewis, CIAP Coordinator
c/o Brown and Mitchell, Inc.
521 34th Street
Gulfport, Mississippi 39507-2935

office (228)864-7612
facsimile (228)864-7676
email address llewis@brownandmitchell.com

Jackson County

George W. Sholl, CIAP Coordinator
Jackson County Board of Supervisors
Post Office Box 998
Pascagoula, Mississippi 39568

office (228)769-3089
facsimile (228)769-3348
cellular (228)324-2531
pager (228)865-8307
email address george_sholl@co.jackson.ms.us

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

On March 5, 2001, the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality was designated the state's lead agency for purposes of CIAP legislation. Immediately after that designation, MDEQ made a public commitment to create as open a process as time would reasonably allow. The state's process for public participation was a dynamic one that forged willing partnerships that stand to have long term positive effects for Mississippi's Gulf Coast and the coastal ecology.

A. Collaboration

One premise for developing Mississippi's open and collaborative process included a recognition that as much intellectual capital in the State of Mississippi as possible should be leveraged, whether from public, private or non-profit entities. Another premise of Mississippi's public process was that collaboration would be a prerequisite to funding. In order to make meaningful long term changes, changes that would not end with the completion of a project, parties would have to work together. Realizing the challenge of meaningful, applied collaboration, MDEQ worked extensively with potential applicants to facilitate collaboration through actions such as project specific meetings, facilitated project development meetings, mediation, and peer advice.

While Mississippi's commitments to an open process and to applied collaboration were ambitious, they are the foundation for a highly successful process and plan outcome. Public meetings were essential to actually collect and exchange valuable information and ideas, but collaboration applied that public involvement. Collaboration has resulted and will result in the exchange of information between diverse but related associates, the development of common goals and the potential for meaningful influence over implementation of projects.

Mississippi committed early on to providing three public meetings, one in each coast county. There were numerous other open or widely attended meetings. All meetings began with a presentation that explained the state's expectations and goals for CIAP and potential applicants, for the coastal environment, for the counties and municipalities, and for the state.

All three public meetings and most other meetings were staffed by and facilitated by MDEQ and the Gulf of Mexico Program Office (GMPO), a non-regulatory office of the Environmental Protection Agency located in Hancock County Mississippi at the Stennis Space Center. All three coast counties participated in each meeting.

In addition to the MDEQ's and the coast counties' actions on behalf of CIAP, the GMPO was extensively engaged with the MDEQ and the three coast counties to provide professional and administrative support and assistance. Additionally, the GMPO facilitated a number of meetings and, with MDEQ, worked to build a highly collaborative and engaged public participation process.

B. State Agency Advisory Team

One of the first actions taken by the MDEQ to develop Mississippi's CIAP Plan was to establish the State Agency Advisory Team comprised of state agencies with missions most

relevant to the coastal ecology. The key agencies identified were the Department of Agriculture (MDAC), the Emergency Management Agency (MEMA), the Forestry Commission (MFC), the Department of Health (DoH), the Department of Marine Resources (DMR), the Secretary of State (SOS), and the Department of Wildlife Fisheries and Parks (DWFP). Each agency head or statewide official dedicated staff time to participating in the process and providing any support within its expertise or at its disposal.

C. MDEQ Contacts

The CIAP coordinator's office number, cellular number, pager number, email address and physical address were provided at public meetings, by mail and through individual contact. To further encourage public information and participation, a link on MDEQ's web page was posted which also displayed the CIAP coordinator's contact information. The web site address is www.deq.state.ms.us.

D. Formal Public Meetings

The three formal public meetings held in each of the coast counties were publicized by legal or public notices in the statewide newspaper, the Clarion Ledger, and in the largest coast paper, the Sun Herald. The meetings were also publicized by way of press releases to the Associated Press; all non-daily papers across the coast; the Hattiesburg American published roughly 75 miles from the coast counties; the coast television outlet; and statewide radio stations.

E. Mailings

The MDEQ disseminated two mailings to the Coastal Resource Management Planning Initiative participants (CRMP), including a copy of Mississippi's general guidance and information from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The CRMP Initiative mailings included approximately 250 participants.

F. Public Participation Summaries

Below are summaries of the MDEQ's records and the coast counties' records of public participation. The MDEQ was involved in much of the counties' public activities through telephone conversations held before, after, and often during meetings, and through MDEQ's personal representation at meetings. Since this dynamic process moved quickly and constantly, a complete history of public contacts could not be kept.

MDEQ ACTIVITIES

March 5	MDEQ Designated Lead Agency
March 13	Meeting with Audubon & The Nature Conservancy Telephone Conference with Department of Marine Resources Staff
March 14	Address Coastal Resource Management Planning Meeting - Biloxi (approximately 150 attendees) Meeting with Coastal Plain Land Trust (approximately 20 attendees)
March 15	Meeting with DMR Staff; Executive Director
March 16	Meeting with Harrison County consultant Call to DWFP Executive Director
March 19	Meeting with Secretary of State and staff

March 20	Meeting with DWFP
March 21	Meeting with MEMA Executive Director
March 23	Presentation by DMR and Mississippi State University staff
March 26	Meeting with Dupont plant manager
March 27 attendees)	Harrison County Development Commission Meeting - (approximately 100
	Meeting with Gulf of Mexico Program Office (GMPO) & Hancock County
March 28	Meeting with Harrison County Consultant
	Meeting with GMPO
March 30	Meeting with Miss. Municipal League and Supervisors Association staff
April 3	Meeting with University of Southern Mississippi Scientists
April 9 (approximately 40 attendees)	Presentation to Jackson County Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting
April 11 executive	Meeting with Moss Point Eco. Dev. Director, Land Trust & Chevron
April 12	Meeting with DMR staff person
April 16	Hancock County Public Meeting - (approximately 55 attendees)
April 17	Meeting with Dupont Plant Manager
April 18	Harrison County Public Meeting - (approximately 65 attendees)
April 19	Jackson County Public Meeting - (approximately 80 attendees)
April 24	Meeting with Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Chief and Attorney
General	
April 26	MDEQ Commission Meeting - Briefing (approximately 30 attendees)
	Meeting with Harrison County Port Commission attorney
	Meeting with Department of Health
May 1,	Meeting with DMR Staff
May 3	Coast wide meeting at GMPO Office (approximately 35 attendees)
May 7 City and County Fire	Meeting with Mississippi Forestry Commission, The Nature Conservancy, Chiefs, USFW, Local Civil Defense
	Presentation to Harrison County Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting
	Lunch meeting with Harrison County Supervisors
	Meeting with Marine Mammal Institute
May 9 attendees)	Harrison County Development Commission Meeting (approximately 50
May 10	Meeting with Dupont plant manager and Harrison County Consultants
May 11	Meeting with Harrison County consultants
May 13 - 15	Meetings in Washington D.C.
May 18	Meeting with Harrison County
May 21	Presentation to Harrison County Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting
	Lunch meeting with Harrison County Supervisors
May 22	Tri-County Meeting (approximately 50 attendees)
May 24	MDEQ Commission Meeting - Briefing (approximately 30 attendees)
May 31	Proposed Projects Delivered to MDEQ by Coastal Counties
June 4	Teleconference with EPA - Big Hills Project Proposal

June 13-15	Agency Advisory Team Review of Proposals
June 20	Meeting with County Teams
June 21	Meeting with Dupont Plant manager
July 3	Meeting with Applicants to Refine Abstracts (approximately 50 people)
July 12	Meetings with Jackson County Board of Supervisors President and CIAP
Coordinator	

HANCOCK COUNTY ACTIVITIES

March 14	Brief Board of Supervisors (HCBS) Request GMPO Assistance
April 02	Brief Board of Supervisors / GMPO Agreed to Assist
April 03	Meet with Jackson County CIAP Contact & Board of Supervisors
April 06	Meet with Jackson County Planning Team
April 16	Hancock County Public Meeting Held by DEQ
April 18	Harrison County Public Meeting Held by DEQ
April 19	Jackson County Public Meeting Held by DEQ
April 24	Meet with Harrison and Jackson County CIAP Contacts
April 25	Meet with Bay St. Louis and Waveland Planning Teams
May 01	Meet with DMR, DEQ, USM, and TNC to Coordinate and Delegate Project Abstracts
May 02	Meet with Bay St. Louis and Waveland Contacts
May 03	Meet with State and Federal Representatives
May 07	Present CIAP Abstracts to Board of Supervisors
May 07	Brief Bay St. Louis on Project Abstracts
May 08	Present CIAP Abstracts to City of Bay St. Louis for Approval
May 14	Meet with DMR and USM
May 14	Brief City of Waveland on Project Abstracts
May 16	Present Project Recommendations to Waveland for Approval
May 21	Hancock County Public Information Meeting on all 4 Tiers
May 22	Meet with USM, GRPC, and Tri-County Team to Prioritize Tier 4 Projects
May 24	Meet with Corps of Engineers and Tri-County Team to Discuss Regional Dredge Disposal Project
May 25	Meet with Harrison and Jackson Co. Points of Contacts to Coordinate Tri-County Plan Format Resolution
May 31	Submit CIAP Projects to MDEQ

HARRISON COUNTY ACTIVITIES

April 23	Brief Harrison County Board of Supervisors (HCBS)
April 24	Coordinate with County and Local Agencies
April 24	Meet with Hancock and Jackson County CIAP Teams
May 1	Meet with DMR, DEQ, USM, and TNC to coordinate and delegate project abstracts
May 4	Mail blank abstract forms and instructions to potential

	Harrison County applicants
May 7	Meet with HCBS to coordinate CIAP Abstracts
May 9	Hold CIAP Abstract Workshop for Applicants
May 10	Meet with DMR to discuss their Project Abstracts
May 11	Harrison County CIAP Abstracts Due to HCDC and BMI
May 14	Present CIAP Abstracts to HCBS
May 18	Evaluate and Rank CIAP Projects with Screening Team
May 21	Submit Project Recommendations to HCBS for approval
May 22	Meet with USM, GRPC, and Tri-County Team to prioritize Tier 4 projects
May 24	Meet with Corps of Engineers and Tri-County Team to Discuss Regional Dredge Disposal Project
May 25	Meet with Hancock and Jackson Co. Points of Contact to coordinate Tri-County Plan Format and Resolution
May 29	Submit Tier 4 Projects to HCBS for approval
May 31	Submit CIAP projects to MDEQ

JACKSON COUNTY ACTIVITIES

Beginning March 5	Standing Item on All Regularly Scheduled Board of Supervisors Meetings
March 13, 30, April 6	CIAP Workgroup Meetings
April 9	DEQ Briefing – Jackson County Board of Supervisors
April 19	DEQ Public Meeting – Jackson County Fairgrounds
April 20	CIAP Workgroup Meeting
May 4	CIAP Workgroup Meeting
May 7	Jackson County Water Issues Task Force Briefing
May 24	George County Supervisors Briefing
May 28	Supervisors Approval of Jackson County Plan and Tri-County Resolution
May 31	Submit CIAP projects to MDEQ

IV. PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND STATE GOALS

Mississippi's goals for CIAP were, and remain, multifaceted, systemic and ambitious. Under the basic provisions of the law, Mississippi's obligation, along with the obligation of the three coast counties, was to fund \$24.3 million in projects in ways consistent with the categories established in CIAP. CIAP requires that each participating state have some form of pre-plan opportunity for public participation and a draft plan public comment period.

Mississippi's objective in developing a plan was to try to create a CIAP legacy that would stand on its own long after the money had been spent and the projects had been completed. Working in tandem with the three coast counties, the state's goal was and is to make systemic impacts on how Mississippi's coastal ecology is perceived, protected and utilized.

Mississippi began its CIAP plan development process on three fundamental premises: that Mississippi has one Gulf of Mexico to protect, that environmental issues do not respect geopolitical boundaries, and that proposals should seek to improve the health of the coastal ecology by conservation, protection, enhancement or restoration. The coast counties acknowledged these fundamental premises and made a threshold commitment to collaborate with one another, with other governmental agencies, with non-governmental organizations, and with local industry, in order to submit projects that would improve the health of the coastal ecology.

While only 35% of CIAP funds were to be shared and controlled by the three coast counties, with 65% controlled by the state, Mississippi took the position that focusing on the specific needs and interests of the coast counties was paramount. The underlying premise for what is hoped to be the maiden voyage of CIAP was that the state should focus on building the process and model first with the three coast counties and on dealing with coastal ecological health issues closest to that ecology. Since CIAP is not a grant program, the state and counties were given great latitude.

To build a model process for CIAP and for future projects on the coast, the MDEQ asked the three coast counties to consider and submit to MDEQ projects that would propose to spend 100% of the CIAP funds. For equity's sake, each county was asked to consider and submit proposals for its pro rata share of the state funds. Coastal counties were also asked to think regionally. Applications could come from state and local governments, colleges and universities, and non-profits. While projects could be submitted directly to MDEQ, applicants were encouraged to work with the counties and submit their proposals through the counties so the counties could determine which projects they wished to endorse and propose to MDEQ. MDEQ was intimately involved in the counties' proposal process.

Though the state has limited legal authority over the county funds, the counties agreed to operate in tandem with the state for all proposals and to use the same standards for success. Enthusiastic commitment from the coast counties resulted in consistency in reviewing proposals. Because the process was open and accessible, project selections evolved through intense dialogues, discussions and negotiations to reach a beneficial consensus.

Approximately 150 projects totaling nearly \$67 million were submitted for CIAP funds. Of those, eighty-one projects are being submitted in this plan. Some of the projects that are not being proposed to the Secretary of Commerce may be reconsidered in the event there are future CIAP funds available. Other projects will be revamped if the proponent is interested in making the projects consistent with state and federal goals for any future CIAP funds. As a result of the open and collaborative process used by Mississippi, some applications will be referred for funding under other state, federal or non-governmental programs.

Under the state's guidance and with agreement from the counties, a number of basic components were emphasized by the state, components which were not required by the federal law or guidelines. Most of these items are found in the general guidance while others developed through the process.

IV.A. State Goals

1. Collaboration

Mississippi's CIAP process requires collaboration. Under Mississippi's model, collaboration does not necessarily mean a collaborator will share CIAP funds under a project. Nor does it necessarily mean that a collaborator will contribute funds to the project. What it does mean is that any entity that can contribute to a project should be included in the project. For example, every wastewater project proposal includes the MDEQ and the State Department of Health as collaborators. These agencies will not receive funding for this collaboration since these activities fall within their missions and expertise.

The strategy of requiring collaboration resulted essentially in an idea factory that gave certain projects the probability of success when they might have otherwise had little. As can be seen throughout the list of projects, collaborators include state agencies, federal agencies, non-profit entities and private industry. These collaborative agreements are substantive commitments to help the project applicants achieve the most success with the best fiscal return.

2. Education

Mississippi has several projects that are submitted under the CIAP category for educational projects. To protect the coastal ecology for now and in the long term, Mississippi has required that each and every proposal include a project specific education component. Every applicant must indicate how its project will improve future practices and how it will alleviate future problems of the kind addressed in the proposal. While every project included in Mississippi's plan is expected to benefit the health of the coastal ecology, simply completing a project was not deemed sufficient to protect coastal resources. The projects must be made relevant to the public and vice versa.

3. Avoiding Duplication or Redundancy

Consistent with the collaboration piece of Mississippi's goals for CIAP was the decision that duplicitous proposals would not be approved. If multiple applications were submitted for a meritorious concept, the applications were blended together with the consent and support of the applicants. Not only does this strategy propose to spend CIAP dollars without duplicating information or actions, it saves CIAP dollars by lowering the costs of implementation and administration. *E.g.*, Project Number MS.24.15; MS.R.06.

4. Best Management for Environmental Purposes

For purposes of Mississippi's CIAP Plan, BMPs are those BMPs for environmental purposes that use the methodologies that can complete the purpose of the project and protect the health of the coastal ecology. To properly employ BMPs for environmental purposes, applicants or their contractors will be expected to consult and confer with professional resources. The State Agency Advisory Team will also be a major resource on how to employ BMPs for environmental purposes. Using BMPs for environmental purposes reduces the regulatory risks, saves money in the short term and long term, serves as a model for BMPs, and protects coastal resources for a healthier ecology and economy. BMPs also maximize the state's education and collaboration components.

5. Implementation - Information Collection, Management and Application Projects

Every CIAP project in Mississippi's plan had to have an implementation component. Information collection, management and distribution projects are not an exception. Applicants were asked to commit that their projects would result in actual implementation and that implementation was expected to occur before information collected became obsolete.

IV.B. State Administration

1. MDEQ's Project Applications

From the inception of MDEQ's designation as lead agency, MDEQ stated publicly that it would not seek funding for anything other than program administration, unless requested to do so.

There are three projects that MDEQ was asked to submit. Two projects are air monitoring projects. *See*, Project #s MS.23.06 and MS.R.05. Both air projects were requested by Hancock County but will inure to the benefit of the coastal region. Hancock County is funding the first project through its county share with the balance being funded from the state's funds.

The third project is a Bay of Saint Louis water monitoring project. This project also was proposed by Hancock County to be funded from state funds. *See*, MS.23.13.

2. Regional Projects

At the inception of the CIAP process, the state asked the three coast counties to consider how their actions might impact the coast region, not just their counties. The counties embraced the regional concept and acknowledged their dependency on one another for a healthy coastal ecology. The counties proposed that \$5 million from the state's fund be considered exclusively for regional projects. The counties agreed that only coast-wide projects would be proposed to the state for spending this \$5 million.

IV.C. Administrative Costs

When each county submitted its proposed projects for administration costs, the calculation methods for each proposal were quite different and were based on early estimates of administrative costs. MDEQ had informed all parties that its administrative costs had not been factored and that projects funded from the state's allocation would be subject to a reduction to cover the MDEQ's administrative costs.

To help reconcile the disparity between the counties and to provide funds for MDEQ's administration, a single methodology was created for figuring all administrative costs. Following the lead of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's, the federal

agency responsible for implementing CIAP legislation, an amount equal to 5% of all Mississippi CIAP funds was established for all CIAP administration. That number was prorated according to CIAP percentages. Thirty-five was prorated for each county. The remaining 65% was earmarked for MDEQ's administrative costs.

In deciding which projects should be reduced to fund the administrative costs of CIAP, MDEQ and the counties agreed to not make any additional reductions in the counties' 35% share of CIAP or any reductions in any infrastructure project. That decision meant that roughly 8% would have to come from the remaining projects in order to reach the figure equal to 5% of all CIAP funds. Eight percent was deducted across the board from the state's non-infrastructure projects and from the regional projects. As a result of this methodology, each county will have all or part of its administrative costs coming from the state's funds, meaning MDEQ will be administering and auditing part of each county's administration project.

V. DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES AND/OR CATEGORIES TO BE FUNDED
ESTIMATE OF SPENDING IN EACH CATEGORY

Below are descriptions of 13 general categories the State and the counties will be funding and an estimate of the amount that will be spent in each category. These categories are general since many projects could appropriately fall into several categories.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATE AND COUNTY PLANS

Of the 81 projects making up Mississippi's integrated state plan, 15 are proposed for Hancock County, 18 for Harrison County, and 18 for Jackson County. Of the 51 county funded projects, 36 of them propose to leverage and apply funds from the state's allocation of CIAP funds. Additionally, there are 30 regional projects funded totally from the state's allocation of funds. Every project submitted under Mississippi's Plan references an implementation process which will be more fully developed after United States Department of Commerce approval.

The three coast counties and the state have projects providing for the administrative and implementation functions. Those projects are MS.23.08, MS.24.18, and MS.30.09, MS.R.30. These projects, like all projects, are continuing to be developed but all governmental authorities will closely work with one another and with fund recipients to facilitate project success. The MDEQ will not simply evaluate projects but will stand as a resource to facilitate the success of the approved projects.

VII. PRELIMINARY OVERALL STATE BUDGET BY OBJECT CLASSES

The following spreadsheet indicates the total sums preliminarily estimated for each object class.

VIII. COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES AND PROGRAMS

Coordination with federal agencies has been ongoing and will continue. The Gulf of Mexico Program Office has been a valuable support agency in this process. Other federal agencies were sent notices from MDEQ by virtue of their participation in the Coastal Resource Management Planning Initiative, managed by the Department of Marine Resources. Those agencies include the United States Environmental Protection Agency, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the United States Coast Guard, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Numerous CIAP proposals include federal collaborators and several more are expected to be included.

Mississippi will assure consistency with federal programs and grants by submitting approved projects through the Mississippi Department of Finance and Administrations federal-state grants clearinghouse. Federal agencies will have access to Mississippi's proposed plan and other contacts will be welcomed. MDEQ will take any other appropriate measures to include federal agencies.

IX. SPECIFIC PROJECTS

TIERED PROJECT SUBMISSION

On March 27, 2001, Hancock County officials, including a representative of the Gulf of Mexico Program Office, met with MDEQ officials to discuss their CIAP strategy.

On Hancock County's behalf, the GMPO presented a brief power-point presentation of a tiered process that was being considered for project submission. Under the tiered process, Hancock County had divided the CIAP funds into three categories: (1) the county's share proposed for infrastructure; (2) the county's share proposed for non-infrastructure; (3) projects proposed for funding under the state's allocation.

MDEQ endorsed the tiered model which evolved and changed throughout this process. MDEQ also asked Hancock County and the GMPO to share the model with the other two coast counties and work with them in developing their models. Following several briefings by MDEQ and GMPO, Harrison and Jackson Counties agreed to use the tiered model. The three counties worked extensively in developing the shared model while also personalizing their individual approaches to develop their proposed projects.

The tiered format provided in this plan includes the following tiers:

Tier 1	County Funded Infrastructure and Non-Infrastructure Project Proposals
Tier 2	State Funded Infrastructure Project Proposals
Tier 3	State Funded Non-Infrastructure Project Proposals
Tier 4	State funded Regional/Coast-Wide Project Proposals

The tiered model used by the three coast counties was a logical way to organize and prioritize the proposed projects and it facilitated the collaboration component of the State of Mississippi's Plan.

The following spreadsheet briefly describes each project and the tiers from which the funding of the project will come. The column titled "PROJECT TOTAL" indicates the total value of the project, cash or in-kind, including CIAP funds and any other sources from collaborators. The column titled "CIAP SUPPORT" indicates the total amount of CIAP funds requested to fund the project