

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 11 September 2013 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Tom Holden opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)  
Mr. Tom Holden, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman  
Mr. Bren Haase, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)  
Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)  
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

A copy of the agenda is included as **Encl 1**. A copy of the sign-in sheet is included as **Encl 2**.

2. Mr. Tom Holden called the meeting to order at 9:40 am. He introduced himself and reminded the audience that today is the anniversary of the horrific terrorist attack on September 11, 2001. He asked that the audience remember those who lost their lives on that day and those who are still in harm's way. He then asked the members of the Technical Committee to introduce themselves.

Mr. Holden asked if the Technical Committee had any opening remarks. There were none.

Mr. Holden reviewed the rules of the meeting. He stated that the public will be allowed to comment on each agenda item and asked that they speak clearly into the microphone and state their name prior to commenting.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee regarding the agenda.

Mr. Haase asked to add an agenda item to briefly report on a CPRA document to clarify the meaning of "consistency with the Master Plan." Mr. Holden stated this would be Agenda Item 2b, after the report on the status of CWPPRA Program funds.

**DECISION: Mr. Haase made a motion to approve the agenda with the addition of a status report on CPRA's "Consistency with the 2012 State Master Plan" document. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

3. Agenda Item 2a. Report: Status of CWPPRA Program Funds and Projects (Susan Mabry, USACE). Ms. Mabry provided an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding.

Ms. Mabry presented the CWPPRA Program funds. The Task Force has already approved the Fiscal Year (FY) 14 Planning budget. The total approved Construction budget is estimated to be \$2.4 billion. CWPPRA should receive total funding of \$2.1 billion if the Program is not further affected by sequestration. The funding gap has decreased to \$278 million due to efforts to reprogram funds and properly classify projects.

The Program will be receiving approximately \$68 million in Federal funds for FY14. If all of the recommendations on today's agenda are approved, the Program will have \$52 million available for the next meeting.

CWPPRA currently has 196 projects, including 151 active projects (100 constructed, 33 in Phase I, and 18 in Phase II), 43 de-authorized projects, two transferred projects, and one project in inactive status.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark commented on the effects of sequestration on the CWPPRA Program. The Program started with \$78.3 million for FY14, which was reduced by 11% due to sequestration, but then the government returned the 4.9% that was sequestered in FY13, to arrive at the current total of \$68.3 million in Federal funding, after \$5 million is removed for Planning. Overall, the budget is similar to past budgets, and the sequestration should not present an unusual constraint to the Program or to the Project Priority List (PPL) process.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

4. Agenda Item 2b. (Bren Haase, CPRA). Mr. Haase reported on the status of the CPRA report on the rules for consistency with the 2012 State Master Plan.

Mr. Haase stated that the Task Force has already decided that CWPPRA projects will be consistent with the 2012 State Master Plan. Overall the process for PPL 23 was successful, but there were some concerns and complaints. CPRA is developing a guidance document to give to all CWPPRA stakeholders so that everyone has the same information going into the PPL 24 process. A draft of this document should be sent to the P&E Subcommittee and the Technical Committee by Friday, September 13. It will also be presented to the public at next week's CPRA meeting and at the local coastal programming meetings. CPRA expects much discussion, but hopes to have the final document finished before the next round of Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings. Mr. Haase emphasized coordinating project ideas with the State to confirm that they are consistent with the Master Plan.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman asked for confirmation that the CPRA meeting would be held at the University of New Orleans (UNO). Mr. Haase responded affirmatively.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

5. Agenda Item 3. Report: Request approved by Technical Committee Electronic Vote to Approve a New Method for Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) Land/Water Analyses (Brad Inman, USACE). Mr. Inman reported on an electronic vote by the Technical Committee to approve a new, cost-saving methodology for the Monitoring Work Group to conduct land/water analysis.

Mr. Inman reported that the CRMS program is continually evaluating the methods, cost effectiveness, and scientific defensibility of products and monitoring activities conducted within the Program. The Monitoring Work Group and Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee reviewed three methods of conducting land/water analysis, and recommended Option Two, which consists of automated classification with minimal data improvements via manual delineation. This new method would represent a savings of over \$300,000. The Technical Committee approved the request via electronic vote on July 30, 2013.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Ms. McCormick noted that monitoring is expensive, but it is vital to the success of the CWPPRA Program, and she thanked the Monitoring Work Group for consistently searching for ways to conserve funds. Mr. Clark echoed Ms. McCormick's comments. The land/water analysis is conducted at all 391 CRMS sites every three to four years. In the past, the process has required a lot of labor hours to delineate land and water areas. This new method is more automated and will require fewer labor hours to correct errors. The Technical Committee appreciates the process that United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the State used to compare methodology options, and the methodology chosen is within  $\pm 5\%$  of the results from the detailed, labor-intensive analysis.

Mr. Holden remarked that this was a good opportunity for the Program to examine cost saving opportunities and take prudent risks based on actual needs. He suggested that the Monitoring Work Group perform ground-truthing to ensure that this methodology is accurate. He noted that this is a wise investment for the Program.

Mr. Hartman asked if the cost savings would affect FY14's budget. Mr. Holden and Ms. McCormick responded that this cost savings would be seen in future years.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

6. Agenda Item 4. Report/Decision: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Brad Inman, USACE). The P&E Subcommittee presented a report on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects and the Technical Committee considered and voted to de-authorize, inactivate, or transfer five projects.

Mr. Inman reported on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects, as well as projects recommended for de-authorization, inactivation, or transfer. The Federal sponsor for each project provided project details. These projects are presented below. The Technical Committee considered these projects by group and voted on each project separately.

- a. Unconstructed projects recommended by the project team for de-authorization:
  - Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection (TV-20), NRCS
  - Bertrandville Siphon (BS-18), EPA

Mr. Paul noted that NRCS reviewed several options for the Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection project, but was unable to design a project that was agreeable to the Parish. NRCS requested a scope change, but was denied.

Ms. McCormick stated that the EPA has also reviewed many options for the Bertrandville Siphon Project, and while the agency still considers this to be a good project, the project is unlikely to move forward in the CWPPRA Program.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark stated that the Bertrandville Siphon Project Report cites land rights issues as well as other issues as reasons why this project is unlikely to move forward. Ms. McCormick affirmed that there were land rights issues with this project. It is also not consistent with the 2012 State Master Plan.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

- b. Unconstructed project requested by the P&E Subcommittee for transfer to CPRA:
  - River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp (PO-20), EPA

Ms. McCormick thanked the State, USACE, Technical Committee, and Task Force for their assistance provided in advancing the River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp Project. The EPA considers this to be a great project and is pleased that the State is willing to take the transfer. The State has worked diligently on this project. Mr. Haase seconded Ms. McCormick's comments. He thanked CWPPRA for advancing the project to its current condition. It is now poised to move into the construction phase and will potentially be funded through BP oil spill monies.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman asked if the project was currently out for public notice. Mr. Haase answered affirmatively.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

- c. Unconstructed projects requested by the P&E Subcommittee for inactivation:
  - Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration (TE-47), EPA
  - Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses (MR-15), EPA

Ms. McCormick stated that the Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration Project is a good project and should be available for construction if CWPPRA receives more funding. However, the EPA did not want to spend a lot of time or effort on the project based on the current

unlikelihood of construction in CWPPRA. She was excited to have the option to move this project to inactive status so that it can potentially be completed by another agency or program.

Ms. McCormick noted that the Technical Committee had already discussed the Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses Project.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark asked if the Ship Shoal Project is currently on the State's list of projects to be funded by BP monies. Mr. Haase stated that Whiskey Island is on their list.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to de-authorize the Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection (TV-20) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to de-authorize the Bertrandville Siphon (BS-18) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to transfer the River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp (PO-20) Project to CPRA. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to move the Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration (TE-47) Project to inactive status. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to move the Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses (MR-15) Project to inactive status. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

7. Agenda Item 5. Report: CRMS Report (Dona Weifenbach, USGS). Ms. Weifenbach provided a report on CRMS.

Ms. Weifenbach provided the Technical Committee with an overview of the CRMS program. CRMS consists of 391 sites across the Louisiana coast. Data is collected at these sites every year. She thanked the Technical Committee for approving the new methodology for land/water analysis. She noted that CPRA always performs Quality Assurance/Quality Control on this data, which is provided by USGS, and they have access to the sites and to the contractors to investigate if any of the data seems unreasonable.

CRMS also collects vegetation, hydrology, and soils data every year. This year CRMS also performed a coast-wide vegetation helicopter survey. The last helicopter survey was performed in 2007. This effort was a collaboration between Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries, Louisiana State University, and the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. The results of this survey should be ready to present at the State of the Coast Conference in March 2014.

Ms. Weifenbach discussed the usefulness of data provided on the CRMS website. The CRMS website has data dating back to 1949. The public can use the CRMS website to identify areas in need of restoration for nomination at RPT meetings. This data can be used to show how much land has been lost over time, what has caused the changes, and how to create a project to address the problem. Users can review water level and salinity data to set goals for a project and to adaptively manage a project to ensure it meets stated targets. Proper management is particularly important for diversions and hydrologic restoration projects. For marsh creation projects, stakeholders can use the CRMS website to research marsh elevations, including average elevations and the latest survey reports. After storm events, contractors visit each CRMS site to evaluate the damage at the site so that project managers can determine whether land loss or other damage is the result of a project, ongoing loss, or a storm event. This information can also help planners evaluate what types of projects and particular methods are more likely to withstand storm conditions. At the end of a project's life, project managers can evaluate report cards for each project and compare them with conditions at other sites coast-wide.

CPRA has 13 operations, maintenance, and monitoring (OM&M) reports in progress for 2013. Nine have been delivered to the Federal sponsors for review and the other four should be ready for review before the October Task Force Meeting. The 2012 coast-wide aerial photography has been completed and USGS is working on the analysis. CRMS is also still working with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to be reimbursed for damages to CRMS sites caused by Hurricane Isaac.

CRMS will hold website training in September. This is open to the public and Ms. Weifenbach encouraged everyone to attend. Ms. Weifenbach is currently working with the CWPPRA Outreach Committee to develop a CRMS education document. Also, CRMS is planning a coast-wide elevation survey for 2014. The Monitoring Work Group has approved a submergence vulnerability index, which is now available on the CRMS website. The team is also working on a vegetation quality index. CRMS will make presentations at several conferences over the next few months, including the Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation in November and the State of the Coast Conference in March.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman asked if the CRMS 2012 aerial photography analysis is using the new methodology for land/water analysis and whether the Program would experience the previously discussed \$300,000 savings.

Ms. Weifenbach responded that the expected savings has not been subtracted from the current budget. CRMS is in the process of planning a very expensive elevation survey, so keeping the savings in the CRMS budget will allow for unexpected costs. Ms. Weifenbach has not yet gotten

cost estimates from engineering firms for this event. Like other CWPPRA projects, if a project or program experiences a cost savings for a particular event, that money is not immediately removed from the project's budget. At the end of the project life, any excess funds would be returned to the Program. Ms. Weifenbach is using that methodology for current budgeting.

Mr. Clark stated that he understands that there is uncertainty in the cost of the elevation surveys, but the surveying effort is very important to the Program. The actual funding request for this item is Agenda Item 8.

Mr. Holden asked if Hurricane Isaac repairs are complete. Ms. Weifenbach stated that all repairs are complete. Funds for those repairs were taken from regular CRMS funds and they are waiting to be reimbursed by FEMA. Mr. Holden asked if CRMS services had to be reduced because of those increased repair costs. If that is the case, then recouping those funds from FEMA will help the budget.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

8. Agenda Item 6. Decision: Annual Request for Incremental Funding for FY16 Administrative Costs for Cash Flow Projects (Susan Mabry, USACE). The USACE requested funding approval in the amount of \$26,834 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request for funds.

Ms. Mabry stated that the USACE was requesting funding approval in the amount of \$26,834 for administrative costs.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark expressed CWPPRA's appreciation for Ms. Mabry's efficiency at transferring funds between agencies and ensuring that the accounting is correct.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve incremental funding for the USACE for FY16 in the amount of \$26,834. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

9. Agenda Item 7. Decision: Request for Funding for the CWPPRA Program's Technical Services (Michelle Fischer, USGS). The USGS and CPRA requested funding for technical services for the CWPPRA Program in the amount of \$171,410. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the request for funding for technical services in the amount of \$171,410.

Ms. Fischer reported that this funding request is for FY14 reanalysis for phased projects and data analysis.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman asked if the amount was similar to last year. Ms. Fischer responded that this amount is less than the amount requested in FY13. Mr. Clark commented that Ms. Fischer, Scott Wilson, and their team do an excellent job and worked very hard during the PPL 23 process. He expressed CWPPRA's appreciation for Ms. Fischer's work.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

**DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to fund USGS and CPRA technical services to the CWPPRA Program in the amount of \$171,410. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

10. Agenda Item 8. Decision: Request for Monitoring Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (Chris Allen, CPRA). The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY16 incremental funding in the amount of \$10,008,316.

Mr. Allen presented four groups of projects for incremental funding and funding increases. These projects are listed below and were discussed and voted on by group.

- a. PPL 9+ projects requesting approval for FY16 incremental funding in the total amount of \$639,283 for the following projects:
  - Grand Lake-White Lake Landbridge Protection (ME-19), PPL 10, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$29,000
  - Coast-wide Planting Project (LA-39), PPL 20, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$76,686
  - Coast-wide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL 11, NRCS  
Incremental Funding amount: \$96,109
  - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection (BA-27c), PPL 9, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$8,648
  - Pass Chalant to Grand Bayou Pass (Bay Joe Wise) Barrier Shoreline Restoration (BA-35), PPL 11, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount: \$102,738
  - Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge (BA-36), PPL 11, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$88,179
  - Pelican Island and Pass La Mer to Chalant Pass Restoration (BA-38), PPL 11, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount: \$147,657
  - Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation (BA-42), PPL 15, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$31,027
  - Delta Management at Fort St. Philip (BS-11), PPL 10, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$16,736
  - Timbalier Island Dune & Marsh Creation (TE-40), PPL 9, EPA



Incremental funding amount: \$13,297

- Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL 9, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount: \$29,206

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman asked for clarification on what activities are associated with each cost. Mr. Clark agreed that while the overall budget has been approved and this is next three-year increment, more information in the agenda or meeting binder would be useful for the Technical Committee. Mr. Allen responded that more information could be provided in the future. For the NMFS projects, the funds are for aerial, vegetation, and elevation surveys.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

- b. PPL 1-8 projects requesting approval for FY16 incremental funding in the total amount of \$135,501:
  - East Mud Lake Marsh Management (CS-20), PPL 2, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$130,071
  - Naomi Outfall Project (BA-03c), PPL 5, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$5,430

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark asked about the activities included in the funding request for the East Mud Lake Marsh Management Project. Mr. Allen responded that it is for the last three years of monitoring and the maintenance of sondes.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

Mr. Allen reported that the next funding request is for one PPL 1-8 project and is a request for a funding increase and incremental funding. The funding increase is to cover the cost of the final project report and a final survey.

- c. PPL 1-8 projects requesting approval for a budget increase and incremental funding:
  - Vermilion River Cutoff Bank Protection (TV-03), PPL 1, USACE  
Funding increase amount: \$24,492  
Incremental funding amount: \$24,492

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark noted that the funding request description in the meeting binder was good. It appears that there was an analysis done in 2006 using GPS for shoreline survey, and although the analysis appears to have been successful, the report could not quantify to what extent. Mr. Allen responded that additional monies will attempt to quantify this. The project team intends to conduct one more detailed survey of the shoreline. Mr. Clark asked the USACE to explain why the previous survey was inconclusive.

Ms. Leigh Anne Sharp, CPRA monitoring supervisor in Lafayette, explained that the 2006 survey showed that the rocks were working and that there was less erosion in the project area than in the reference area, but they cannot quantify the final erosion rate until they have the last survey. She added that data is available from a survey conducted in 2011, but the project does not have the funds necessary to analyze that data.

Mr. Hartman asked why a survey is necessary in 2014 if one was performed in 2011. Ms. Sharp responded that surveys in 2011 and 2014 were in the original monitoring plan, but the Technical Committee and Task Force could vote to change that. Removing the 2014 survey would reduce the requested funding increase by approximately \$6,000.

There was some discussion among the Technical Committee about whether or not a 2014 survey was required to determine the success of the project. Ms. Sharp noted that a change to the original monitoring plan should be discussed with the Federal sponsor.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

- d. Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) requesting approval for FY16 incremental funding in the total amount of \$9,209,040:  
Incremental funding (FY13 – FY15): \$9,209,040

Mr. Holden noted that the Technical Committee discussed this issue under a previous agenda item.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

**DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve FY16 incremental funding for PPL 9+ projects in the total amount of \$639,283. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve FY16 incremental funding for PPL 1-8 projects in the total amount of \$135,501. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve a budget increase of \$24,492 and incremental funding of \$24,492 for the Vermilion River Cutoff Bank Protection (TV-03) Project. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve incremental funding for FY16 for CRMS in the amount of \$9,209,040. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

11. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (Chris Allen, CPRA). The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY16 incremental funding in the amount of \$5,903,032 and O&M budget increases totaling \$1,754,749.

Mr. Allen presented three groups of projects for O&M incremental funding and budget increases. These projects are listed below and were discussed and voted on by group.

- a. PPL 9+ projects requesting approval for FY16 incremental funding in the total amount of \$3,359,605:
  - Little Lake Shoreline Protection/ Dedicated Dredging Near Round Lake (BA-37), PPL 11, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$12,253  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$1,604
  - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection, Phase 3 (BA-27c), PPL 9, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount \$5,882
  - North Lake Mechant Landbridge Restoration (TE-44), PPL 10, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$95,367
  - West Lake Boudreaux Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation (TE-46), PPL 11, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$15,801
  - GIWW - Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30), PPL 9, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$413,252
  - South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22), PPL 12, USACE  
Incremental funding amount: \$11,871  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$3,957
  - Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection (PO-30), PPL 10, EPA  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$88,400  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$1,180
  - Delta Management at Fort St. Philip (BS-11), PPL 10, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$5,666
  - Pass Chalant to Grand Bayou Pass Barrier Shoreline Protection (BA-35), PPL 11, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$224,790  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$4,178
  - Pelican Island and Pass La Mer to Chalant Pass Restoration (BA-38), PPL 11, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$142,707  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$10,861
  - Mississippi River Sediment Delivery System Bayou Dupont (BA-39), PPL 12, EPA  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$3,726  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$3,726
  - Goose Pt., Pt. Platte Marsh Creation (PO-33), PPL 13, USFWS

Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$3,650  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$3,399

- Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL 11, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$2,307,335

Mr. Allen noted that the numbers in the agenda sent to the Technical Committee prior to the meeting are incorrect, but the amounts in the agenda provided at the meeting are accurate. The Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project had a transcription error, and the original agenda stated that the incremental funding request for that project was \$888,400. The correct amount of incremental funding for that project is \$88,400. This reduced the total for Group 9a by \$800,000, from \$4,150,129 to \$3,359,605.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman asked about the discrepancies between numbers for inspections for different projects. Mr. Allen responded that different projects have different inspection costs due to the size and type of the project. Mr. Clark noted that the funds have already been budgeted for these projects, and they are only requesting incremental funding. Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, confirmed. Mr. Allen added that the timeframe for this incremental funding request is not consistent between projects because of budgeting differences between the federal agencies. Mr. Kinler stated that it is most project managers' practice to not request monies until they are needed, and that some projects budget for major O&M events at certain scheduled times.

Mr. Clark noted that any money left in the project budget at the end of a project's life will be returned to the Program.

Mr. Holden stated that in the future, he would like to see a graphic in the Technical Committee binder that separates the projects.

Mr. Clark asked if the funding for the Coast-wide Nutria Control Program is for payments to hunters and trappers for nutria tails. Mr. Allen responded affirmatively.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

b. PPL 1-8 projects requesting approval for FY16 incremental funding in the amount of \$850,544:

- Point Au Fer Canal Plugs (TE-22), PPL2, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$14,127  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$2,430
- Lake Chapeau Sediment Input and Hydrologic Restoration, Point Au Fer Island (TE-26), PPL 6, NMFS  
Incremental funding amount (FY16) (O&M and State Insp.): \$13,904  
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$2,459
- Brady Canal Hydrologic Restoration (TE-28), PPL 3, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$172,706
- West Belle Pass Headland Restoration (TE-23), PPL 2, USACE

- Incremental funding amount: \$42,111
- Cameron-Creole Maintenance (CS-04a), PPL 3, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$248,439
- East Mud Lake Marsh Management (CS-20), PPL 2, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$38,877
- Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration (CS-21), PPL 2, NRCS  
Incremental funding amount: \$171,450
- Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully (CS-23), PPL 3, USFWS  
Incremental funding amount: \$144,041

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Allen to explain the purpose of the funding for the Cameron-Creole Maintenance Project. Mr. Darrell Pontiff, CPRA Lafayette, responded that the amount is for the remaining life of the project, which ends in 2016. CPRA was tasked with operating this project, so they have an operations contract, and this is the amount budgeted for that contract.

Mr. Clark then asked about the funding request for the Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration Project. Mr. Pontiff responded that there is a breach in the levee which will require approximately 700 cubic yards to repair. Additionally, the inland channel from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) to Structure 1 has become clogged with silt and CPRA would like to clear that waterway.

Mr. Hartman asked about the amount budgeted for the Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully Project. Mr. Pontiff explained that these monies will fund maintenance, engineering, and monitoring and that there has been overspending in the past and additional funds are required to balance the books for the project. Mr. Clark added that this project has electronic water level and salinity monitors, and that USFWS receives monthly reports from the Sabine National Wildlife Refuge manager noting that the project is working very well. In response to a question from Mr. Hartman, Mr. Clark noted that even when target salinity levels are exceeded, one or two of the bays remain open to allow organisms to move between marsh and lake areas.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

- c. PPL 1-8 project requesting approval for an O&M budget increase of \$1,754,749 and FY16 incremental funding in the amount of \$1,692,883:
  - GIWW to Clovelly Hydrologic Restoration (BA-02), PPL 1, NRCS  
Budget Increase amount: \$1,754,749  
Incremental Funding amount: \$1,692,883

Mr. Allen expounded briefly on the requested budget increase. This project is a very large 14,000 acre hydrologic restoration project, consisting of bank restoration, lake rim restoration, shoreline protection, rock plugs, and weirs. The first maintenance event was small and only occurred because of a barge collision with the project timber dolphins. For the second

maintenance event, there was a breach in a levee and FEMA contributions covered part of the cost. The current budget increase is for a third maintenance event and the cost estimate is \$1.7 million. It would connect two rock features which have separated due to a breach. This breach renders the hydrologic portions of this project completely ineffective. Also, land loss has increased where the breach occurred.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Ms. McCormick asked if FEMA funding is a possibility for this maintenance event. Mr. Allen responded that he is unsure, but that it is unlikely. Mr. Kinler stated that this project was initially primarily a hydrologic restoration project. The lake rim was constructed to close a large opening and allow for reestablishment of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) and to protect some shoreline. Structures 2 and 4 are rock weirs which were initially constructed across two bayous. The lakeshore has eroded over time; some of this was caused by storm events, but it is also just occurring over the entire life of the project. The shoreline has retreated enough so that Structure 2 is at risk of breaching, and if this occurs the project would not be meeting project goals. The shoreline is retreating, and the current proposal is to control the erosion so that CWPPRA does not have to go back over and over again to fix all the structures. The retreat of this shoreline has been ongoing for over a decade. He stated that it is exceedingly unlikely that FEMA would agree to pay for this maintenance event.

Mr. Hartman observed that, after reading through the document discussing how the project has performed, the project has reduced shoreline erosion by less than a foot. If that figure is correct, Mr. Hartman expressed doubts about whether CWPPRA should spend \$1.7 million to maintain this project.

Mr. Kinler responded that this is a complicated issue. Part of the lake rim that was constructed was 1,000 feet from the existing shoreline, and the shoreline erosion rate for the project is not actually measured near the area of the project being discussed for maintenance. The original goal of the project was to eliminate erosion throughout the whole bay area, but unfortunately that goal has not been achieved. When a storm event occurs and the lake rim is under water, the area behind it erodes. The rock shore protection structures would be more effective if they were closer to the area that CWPPRA is attempting to protect. The proposal for this maintenance event is to build a rock revetment much closer to the existing shoreline. Projects throughout the Barataria Basin have demonstrated that when structures are built close to the shoreline, CWPPRA has been able to halt erosion and actually begin to build land. Mr. Kinler expressed his confidence in the ability of this maintenance event to halt erosion in an area that desperately needs protection.

Mr. Holden commented that Mr. Kinler's briefing does not match the written report in the Technical Committee binder.

Mr. Kinler reiterated his explanation that part of the lake rim was constructed 1,000 feet from the existing shoreline and the erosion has not been eliminated in these areas. But the proposal for this maintenance event is to build a rock revetment much closer to the existing shoreline and this type of feature has been very effective throughout the Barataria Basin. The proposed

maintenance event addresses the erosion rate between Structures 2 and 4; it does not address the erosion rate behind the lake rim feature. Mr. Holden understood the explanation.

There was some discussion about the age of the project. Mr. Kinler stated that the project is in Year 13. Mr. Hartman stated that it depends on what year is defined as the construction year. The project was constructed in two units, and the second was not completed until approximately 2002. However, the CWPPRA website states that Phase I was completed in 1997. Mr. Kinler stated that the project sponsor considers the end of construction to be the end of Phase II construction.

Mr. Paul asked if this maintenance event would maintain the structures in place for the remainder of the project life. Mr. Kinler answered affirmatively.

Mr. Hartman asked questions about the project spreadsheet. Mr. Kinler responded that due to the complicated nature of the spreadsheet, he has tried to simplify it. The 2013 figure includes all costs through 2013. Mr. Kinler noted that several project features are well-lit due to the close proximity of commercial navigation, and most of the annual costs are for maintenance of navigation aids.

Mr. Clark asked if the proposed event would consist of gabions or foreshore dikes. Mr. Kinler responded that it would include both. He explained that the area in need of maintenance is in close proximity to a power line, which will have to be de-energized for the work to occur. The gabions can be built with smaller equipment which would require that the power line be de-energized for less time. The current cost is based on a combination of methods, but this is subject to change as the design proceeds. Mr. John Jurgenson, NRCS, noted that gabions may require more maintenance than foreshore dikes. Mr. Kinler responded that the project team will investigate this issue further and will try to recommend the most efficient techniques.

Mr. Holden introduced the issue of project disposition at the end of the project life. Due to the hard structures and proximity to navigation, this project seems to be a high risk project. Mr. Clark responded that, for this particular stretch of the project, they do not see any navigation concerns and do not anticipate the project sponsors removing the rock that would be installed as part of this maintenance event.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public.

Mr. Mike Turley, Wayfarer Environmental, offered to provide a third alternative for this project. Wayfarer has shallow water access which could eliminate shutting down the power.

Mr. Randy Moertle, Little Lake Land Company, identified himself as the manager for this piece of property. This area contains four major waterways, and once they coalesce, the area will have significant ingress and egress and a lot of transfer of water. The goal of hydrologic restorations is to increase SAV, and Mr. Moertle assured the Technical Committee that the area within the rock structures of this project is filled with SAV and is one of the best duck hunting areas on the property. However, there is no SAV outside the rock structures. If this breach occurs, the whole project will be for naught.

**DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve FY16 incremental funding for PPL 9+ projects in the amount of \$3,359,605. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve FY16 incremental funding for PPL 1-8 projects in the amount of \$850,544. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

**DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force vote to approve an O&M budget increase of \$1,754,749 and FY16 incremental funding of \$1,692,883 for the GIWW to Clovelly Hydrologic Restoration (BA-02) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

12. Agenda Item 10. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE).

The additional agenda item proposed by Mr. Haase was discussed as Item 2b.

Ms. Mabry asked to clarify that the funding request for Agenda Item 9a was \$3,359,605, and the total for Agenda Item 9 was \$5,903,032.

13. Agenda Item 11. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE).

Ms. Sara Piazza, USGS, stated that USGS recently completed the coast-wide helicopter survey and she thanked Charles Sasser, Edmond Mouton, Jeb Linscomb, and Jenneke Visser for their hard work to complete this task.

14. Agenda Item 12. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE).

The next Task Force Meeting will be held October 17, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana in the District Assembly Room (DARM).

15. Agenda Item 13. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Dedication Event (Brad Inman, USACE).

The CWPPRA Dedication Ceremony will be held on October 18, 2013 to celebrate the progress on CWPPRA projects in southeastern Louisiana. The ceremony will begin at 10:00 a.m. at ConocoPhillips, 806 Bayou Black Drive, Houma, Louisiana.

16. Agenda Item 14. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE).

October 17, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
November 13, 2013	7:00 p.m.	PPL 23 Public Comment Meeting	Baton Rouge
December 12, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge



17. Agenda Item 15. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Clark made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Holden seconded. Mr. Holden adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:40 a.m.