

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 16 April 2013 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Brad Inman 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. Brad Inman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman, sitting in for Mr. Tom Holden

Mr. Bren Haase, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA), sitting in for Mr. Kirk Rhinehart

Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

Mr. John Jurgensen, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), sitting in for Mr. Britt Paul

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

2. Mr. Inman introduced himself and announced that he was chairing the Technical Committee meeting in the place of Mr. Tom Holden. He asked the members of the Technical Committee to introduce themselves. Mr. Inman welcomed everyone to the USACE and called for a moment of silence to honor the victims of the bombings in Boston on April 15, 2013.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee regarding the agenda. There was no discussion by members of the Technical Committee.

DECISION: Mr. Jurgensen made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Agenda Item 2. 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 total estimate for the Construction Program is \$2.521 billion to construct every project on the list, including those projects that are still in Phase I and have not yet been approved for Phase II. The allocation for the Construction Program is \$2.123 billion. The total budget for currently approved projects is \$1.572 billion. The current funding available is \$1.425 billion. If projects that are unlikely to be approved are de-authorized and their funds are returned to Program, the funding gap could decrease to \$72 million.

Mr. Clark noted that the current estimate includes fully funded costs for all projects even if they have not been approved for construction.

Ms. Mabry reported that the available funds are negative \$15 million due to a data error and a reduction in the funding allocation from the Department of the Interior because of the sequestration. However, this does not mean that the Program is running a deficit; this is an allocation projection. The Program has not received funding for future fiscal years (FY), and there are some potential de-authorizations which could return \$1.8 million to the Program. The shortfall as of April 2013 is \$12.9 million.

The FY14 Planning budget is \$5.4 million. There is a request on the agenda today for a Planning budget, including Outreach, of \$5.1 million. This will leave a surplus of \$326,000 for Planning.

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

Mr. Hartman noted that CWPPRA has two options to balance the budget: they can relook at projects approved this year, or the funds could come from next year's budget. The funds will likely come from next year's budget, so next year's budget will be slightly reduced.

Mr. Inman noted that funding estimates change frequently based on projections of the amount of gasoline that will be sold. This year's estimated funding was originally \$85 million, it was reduced to \$80 million due to sequestration. CWPPRA cannot predict what Congress will do, but the Program will likely have fewer dollars for construction next year.

Mr. Clark stated that CWPPRA will have \$13 million less in the FY14 construction budget. However, he emphasized that the Program is not spending money that it does not have. There is currently \$106 million promised to projects that have not yet requested the funds, so that money has not been obligated. Two of the projects are USFWS projects – Bayou Bonfouca and Lost Lake – and have construction budgets of \$52 million that were approved in January, but will not go to construction until next year.

Mr. Inman complimented Ms. Mabry on her work for the CWPPRA Program.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 23 (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits of the 23rd Priority Project List (PPL) project and demonstration project nominees listed below. The Technical Committee selected 10 projects as PPL 23 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects that will be approved for Phase I (Planning and Engineering Design).

Mr. Kevin Roy presented the PPL 23 project and demonstration nominees, as nominated by the Regional Planning Team (RPT) and voted on by the Coastwide Voting Team in February. These are listed in the following tables.

| Region | Basin | PPL 23 Nominees |
|--------|------------------|--|
| 1 | Pontchartrain | Shell Beach Marsh Creation |
| 1 | Pontchartrain | New Orleans Landbridge Shoreline Stabilization & Marsh Creation |
| 1 | Pontchartrain | Shell Beach Marsh Creation & Nourishment |
| 2 | Breton Sound | Marsh Creation South of Lake Lery |
| 2 | Barataria | Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 4 |
| 2 | Barataria | Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation |
| 2 | Barataria | Wilkinson Canal Marsh Creation & Nourishment |
| 2 | Barataria | Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh & Ridge Restoration |
| 3 | Terrebonne | Island Road Marsh Creation & Nourishment |
| 3 | Terrebonne | Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection via Oyster Reef Construction |
| 3 | Terrebonne | Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement |
| 3 | Terrebonne | Bayou Terrebonne Ridge Restoration & Marsh Creation |
| 3 | Teche-Vermilion | Southwest Pass Shoreline Protection |
| 3 | Teche-Vermilion | North Marsh Island Shoreline Protection |
| 4 | Calcasieu-Sabine | East Holly Beach Gulf Shoreline Protection |
| 4 | Calcasieu-Sabine | West Cove Marsh Creation & Nourishment |
| 4 | Mermentau | Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation & Freshwater Diversion |
| 4 | Mermentau | South Grand Chenier Marsh Creation – Baker Tract |

| PPL 23 Demonstration Project Nominees | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| DEMO | Artificial Seagrass Bed Shoreline Protection & Sediment Trapping |
| DEMO | Use of Bioengineering Techniques to Strengthen Previously Stabilized Shorelines & Banks |
| DEMO | Stabilized Soil Shorelines |

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

Mr. Inman commented that the work groups met on all projects and decided that this year no demonstration projects should move forward.

Mr. Hartman commented on the West Cove Project. He noted that, were this project to be approved for construction, the CWPPRA Program would be paying the additional cost of beneficially using dredged material from the Calcasieu Ship Channel. However, the Calcasieu Ship Channel has an approved Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) and much of the material is already earmarked for beneficial use. The sponsor for this project should clearly articulate where the material would be used with and without the CWPPRA project. Mr. Clark responded that, although the DMMP is approved, it is not funded and does not appear likely to be funded in the near term. Although it does include beneficial use, it also includes upland disposal. He opined that the West Cove Project would not be duplicative of DMMP beneficial uses. Mr. Hartman reiterated that he would still like an explanation of how the material would be used in the absence of the CWPPRA project.

Mr. Hartman also commented on the use of hard structures in the CWPPRA Program. Projects that are approved for Phase 0 in 2013 would not be constructed until 2016 at the earliest. There is no certainty that funds will be available to maintain these structures after 2019, if CWPPRA

will have to pay to remove them, or who would be liable for them. He expressed particular concern about maintaining hard structures in aquatic environments.

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

Mr. Archie Chaisson, parish administrator for Lafourche Parish Government, commented on the Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation Project. He stated that this would be a great project to add another level of protection to Port Fourchon. He also expressed support for the Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement Project. He admitted that calculating benefits can be difficult for this type of project, but introducing freshwater to this area would help make the marsh in the area more sustainable.

Mr. Nic Matherne, Director of Coastal Restoration and Preservation for Terrebonne Parish, stated that their top priority is the Island Road Marsh Creation Project. This project does not contain hard structures. It is in an area that sees horrific deterioration and shoreline retreat every year. Additionally, the project would protect the only way to and from Isle de Jean Charles, which is a historically Native American community. Terrebonne Parish's second priority is Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement. They hope that this project could make the area more sustainable, and thus eligible for consideration for projects in the 2017 Master Plan Update. He noted that this project would work in conjunction with Ducks Unlimited projects in the same area.

Mr. Ryan Bourriaque, representing the Cameron Parish Police Jury, spoke in support of the East Holly Beach Project. This project would complement a \$40 million sand nourishment project that is being built using State surplus funds. It will also help protect other CWPPRA projects in the area. With the strong south wind that occurred last week, waters from the Gulf of Mexico were only 15 feet from the highway. CWPPRA has been trying to protect the area across that highway for the past 15 to 20 years. He noted that Calcasieu Parish also submitted a letter to support this project. Mr. Bourriaque thanked CWPPRA for their past support.

Ms. Caroline Lanford, an Orleans Parish resident and employee of Atkins, asked the Technical Committee to consider the importance of the Shell Beach projects and protecting the Lake Borgne landbridge from connecting with the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO). She also noted that there would be important ecosystem consequences if the landbridge were to breach.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, representing Ducks Unlimited and the ConocoPhillips Ducks Unlimited Restoration Partnership, stated that their top two priorities are Island Road and Bayou Terrebonne Bank Stabilization, which CPRA has sponsored. Both would provide marsh habitat. The Island Road Project would complement other ongoing projects that Ducks Unlimited is constructing in the area. It will also give additional protection to the Wildlife Management Area and ongoing Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) work in the area and will enhance the mitigation efforts that Terrebonne Parish is undertaking as part of the Morganza to the Gulf Project. Ducks Unlimited is also interested in the Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement Project. Ms. Suazo admitted that it is difficult to calculate the benefits for this type of project, but it would complement terracing and marsh creation projects that Ducks Unlimited is evaluating in that area, and those projects would be a priority for their 2014 project year.

Mr. Ordis Smith, ConocoPhillips, voiced support for the Island Road and Terrebonne Shoreline Projects. Both projects would be on ConocoPhillips property and have full landowner support.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke on behalf of St. Bernard Parish in favor of Shell Beach Marsh Creation, which is St. Bernard Parish's #1 project. This project would protect their fishing fleet, and it is in the State Master Plan. Plaquemines Parish's #1 project is Bayou Grand Cheniere; it protects Highway 23, and an existing siphon would help nourish the project area. There are a large number of oil and gas companies that use Highway 23 regularly. Plaquemines Parish's #2 project is Bayou Dupont, #3 is Marsh Creation South of Lake Lery, and #4 is Wilkinson Canal.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, voiced support for the Bayou Grand Cheniere Project.

Mr. Martin Miller, Rellim Surface Management, stated that the Baker Tract Project would have the full support of the landowner, the Miller family. Cameron Parish is currently working on other projects in this area which would complement this CWPPRA project. Without protection, this area could develop similar problems to the ones that are occurring at Holly Beach. This project is in the State Master Plan.

Mr. Kevin Sagrera with the Vermilion Parish Police Jury stated that their top project is Southwest Pass Shoreline Protection. Also, the Southeast Pecan Island Project is in an area where marsh is deteriorating rapidly.

Mr. John Hebert, a resident of the west bank of Orleans Parish and a landowner in Jefferson Parish, urged the Technical Committee to consider the Marsh Creation South of Lake Lery Project. That area currently contains a lot of sediment, and if it is not used quickly, it will erode due to tidal activity. Also, the Bayou Dupont Project would be a great project to help build the landbridge on the Westbank. Mr. Hebert also commented that the Bayou Grand Cheniere Project would help protect Highway 23 and areas behind it.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Corporation, expressed full support for the Southwest Pass Project. He stated that Southwest Pass is the barrier island of southwest/south central Louisiana. It is the opening to the Gulf of Mexico. Southwest Point is very narrow, and Mr. Edwards stated that he is watching it disappear. If Southwest Point disappears, the surface area of Southwest Pass will double. He also expressed support for the marsh creation project south of Pecan Island. He noted that there is an abandoned pipeline in the area, and he has had conversations with the owner about using the pipeline as a dedicated delivery source to reduce project costs.

Regarding demonstration projects, Mr. Edwards stated that CWPPRA should be investigating alternatives to rock protection. CWPPRA should be adding tools to the coastal restoration and protection toolbox. Mr. Edwards stated that CWPPRA should be using a larger portion of the budget to encourage engineers and the public to develop creative solutions to Louisiana's problems. He stated that he can see in nature that the concept of the artificial seagrass bed would work; they just need to prove that it can be built artificially. He expressed concern about stabilizing an already-stabilized shoreline, but gave his full support to the Artificial Seagrass

Demonstration and the Stabilized Soil Shorelines Demonstration. He encouraged the Technical Committee to reconsider their decision about not funding any demonstration projects this year.

Mr. Hartman responded that NRCS is investigating four alternatives in a Non-Rock Demonstration Project, and Mr. Jurgensen noted that the Non-Rock Demonstration Project is going to construction this summer. Mr. Edwards reiterated that CWPPRA should be investigating non-rock alternatives that private landowners and other stakeholders could implement.

Mr. Ben Langlinois, Iberia Parish Levee and Conservation District, stated that their #1 project is the Marsh Island Shoreline Protection Project. They also support the Southwest Pass Shoreline Protection Project because Vermilion Bay is a complex system and Iberia Parish realizes that they cannot just protect Iberia Parish in isolation. Both of these projects have a good chance of success due to the sediment source.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that their #1 project is the Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery Project. There have been two successful projects in the area using sediment from the Mississippi River. The timing of the project could be coordinated so that it could use the Long Distance Sediment Pipeline, which could allow for reduced costs.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing the Rainey Conservation Alliance, expressed support for the Southwest Pass Shoreline Protection Project.

Mr. Donald Sagrera, representing the Teche-Vermilion Fresh Water District, stated that his agency's main objective is to supply freshwater to Iberia, Vermilion, Lafayette, and St. Martin Parishes. They operate a series of freshwater control structures to help achieve this mission. The Southwest Pass, Marsh Island, and Southeast Pecan Island Projects would all help alleviate the saltwater problems in this area. The Southwest Pass Project would also offer surge protection.

Ms. Marietta Greene, Madison Land Company, stated that as a landowner in the Lafitte/Barataria area, she has seen what sediment delivery can do. Grass grows and wildlife uses the newly created land. She urged the Technical Committee to consider the Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery Project.

Mr. Hartman and Mr. Clark expressed a desire to discuss the Technical Committee demonstration project recommendation with the Task Force.

Mr. Jurgensen explained that the work groups discussed the demonstration projects extensively and had concerns about all three potential projects. There were concerns about the hazardousness of the material for the Stabilized Soil Project. There was agreement that the Artificial Seagrass Project would have benefits, but the work groups questioned whether this methodology would have an application in place of rocks. He noted that NRCS still supports the use of hard structures. No one felt strongly enough about any of the proposed demonstration projects to justify moving forward with them.

Mr. Clark added that CWPPRA gave \$6 million in funding to the Non-Rock Demonstration Project last year. Also, a number of studies have been conducted on the use of artificial seaweed in Florida, and the materials did not withstand storm events.

Mr. Edwards responded that Florida has a different substrate, and that it should be expected that some of the material would be washed onto the shore in a storm event. He admitted that he did not know if it would work in Louisiana, but that that is supposed to be the purpose of a demonstration project. Someone should investigate whether or not the technique works, and CWPPRA is the best-suited program for this type of experimentation. Without experimentation, we will never learn anything. Mr. Hartman noted that the State also has a program for demonstration projects, which is run by the Water Institute for the Gulf. CWPPRA invested \$6 million in a demonstration project this year. Mr. Edwards opined that CWPPRA should be investing \$6 million in demonstration projects every year.

The Technical Committee proceeded to vote for the ten PPL 23 candidate projects. The projects that will move forward into Phase 0 are:

- Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh & Ridge Restoration
- Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement
- West Cove Marsh Creation & Nourishment
- Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation & Freshwater Diversion
- Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation
- Wilkinson Canal Marsh Creation & Nourishment
- New Orleans Landbridge Shoreline Stabilization & Marsh Creation
- Island Road Marsh Creation & Nourishment
- South Grand Chenier Marsh Creation – Baker Tract
- Southwest Pass Shoreline Protection

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend to the Task Force that no demonstration projects move forward. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision: FY14 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 24 Process, and Presentation of FY14 Outreach Budget (process, size, funding, etc.) (Brad Inman, USACE) Mr. Inman reported on changes recommended by the Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee for the PPL 24 Process. Mr. Scott Wilson, United States Geological Survey (USGS), made FY14 funding requests for the Outreach budget.

Mr. Inman reported that the P&E Subcommittee reviewed the PPL 23 process and suggested minor changes for PPL 24, as follows:

- All projects that are inconsistent with the State Master Plan would be removed from consideration for PPL 24.
- The RPTs will decide if projects are sufficiently similar to combine into one project to move forward.
- Demonstration projects will be screened by the work groups early in the process, and the Technical Committee will decide whether to move them forward.

Mr. Inman stated that all of the Technical Committee members should have had a chance to review the changes in detail.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. There was no discussion by members of the Technical Committee.

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

Mr. Scott Wilson, USGS, presented the Outreach budget request for FY14. The budget request was \$445,800, which was a slight reduction from FY13's Outreach budget. This includes salaries for Outreach staff, the newsletter, website, fact sheets, videos, and other items.

The FY14 Planning budget request was \$5,064,238, a reduction from the last two years due to the reduction in the Outreach budget.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. There was no discussion by members of the Technical Committee.

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

DECISION: Mr. Haase made a motion to recommend that the Task Force accept changes as presented for the PPL 24 Process. 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 approve a FY14 Outreach budget of \$445,800. Mr. Jurgensen seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve a FY14 Planning budget of \$5,064,238. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

6. Agenda Item 5. Report/Decision: 20-Year Life Decision Matrix (John Jurgensen, NRCS). Mr. Jurgensen presented the 20-Year Life Decision Matrix developed by the P&E Subcommittee in response to direction from the Task Force. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force on the path forward for the Bayou LaBranche Wetland Creation (PO-17) and Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge (ME-09) projects, based on the decision matrix presented by Mr. Jurgensen.

Mr. John Jurgensen presented the 20-year life decision matrix developed by the P&E Subcommittee as directed by the Task Force. Several projects will reach the end of their 20-year lives within the next few years. Some project types, such as marsh creation, CWPPRA can easily abandon. Some projects include hard structures, which will continue to pose liabilities if they remain in place. The questions that each project team should ask are: is the project still serving its purpose, and do we want to leave hard structures in place? The matrix has four decision possibilities: continue funding within CWPPRA; transfer to another sponsor; close out

the project; and close out the project and remove project features. This matrix will be used when projects reach Year 15 of their life. Continuing a project will require monitoring data to support that decision, and the Task Force will have to vote to extend the project's life in CWPPRA. If the data does not warrant continuing, the Task Force does not vote to extend the project, and there is no other sponsor willing to take the project, then the project team will need to decide whether or not to recommend removal of features. Aspects that would influence this decision are whether there are hazards to navigation and whether the landowner wants features removed. CWPPRA will need to compare the cost of removing the features to the potential risks of leaving them in place. The project team will propose an action at the spring Technical Committee meeting. Based on direction from the Technical Committee and Task Force, the project team will prepare a final report, reconcile the budget, and prepare any necessary legal documents.

Mr. Clark thanked the P&E for developing this process.

Two projects will reach the end of their 20-year life in 2014. The project sponsors presented these projects, using the results from the 20-year life decision matrix.

Bayou LaBranche Wetland Creation (PO-17), PPL 1, USACE

Mr. Scott Wandell, USACE, presented the Bayou LaBranche Wetland Creation (PO-17) Project. This is a PPL 1 project, and it was the first project constructed in the CWPPRA Program. Marsh was created in the project area using Lake Pontchartrain as a borrow source. Construction was completed in April 1994. The cost of the project was \$3.8 million. The most recent monitoring report was completed in 2011. The project appears to be reaching and possibly even exceeding its goal of a 70/30 marsh to open water ratio. The project has used all of its funding. Monitoring of the project has been performed by CRMS since 2006. Mr. Wandell requested that the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force a budget increase of \$138,227 for monitoring and closeout activities, including a site visit, final site inspection, vegetation survey, topographic survey, and final monitoring report. The project team does not believe that a project extension is justified and does not anticipate a transfer. They are recommending proceeding to closeout. The project does not have any hard features to be removed. After the site inspection and surveys, the State will draft a final monitoring report, they will notify the public that the project has reached the end of its 20-year life, there will be a final accounting of project funds, and the project team will request Task Force approval for final project closeout.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. There was no discussion by members of the Technical Committee.

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

Mr. Edwards asked for confirmation that the cost of the Bayou LaBranche Project was \$3.8 million and created 205 net acres. He noted that the cost of marsh creation has increased 10 fold over the last 20 years. No other costs have increased this much. Mr. Wandell responded that the cost increase is a combination of inflation, fuel, and cost of materials. Mr. Inman added that dredging costs have increased dramatically. Mr. Edwards asked if this was a result of supply and demand, and if so, how the Program could increase competition for dredging contracts? Mr. Jurgensen also noted that the location of the borrow source in comparison to the project area is a

cost factor; in this project, the borrow site was less than two miles from the marsh creation site. This project cost about \$1/cubic yard. Today, the same exact project would cost about \$4/cubic yard. However, if the borrow area is further away, the cost could increase to \$10/cubic yard. Mr. Hartman and Mr. Inman added that Federal laws prohibit the use of foreign dredges for national security purposes. Mr. Edwards suggested working to change this law. Mr. Jurgensen stated that the source of borrow, inland or exterior, is a very controversial topic, not only in the CWPPRA Program, but also in academia. Exterior borrow does increase the cost of projects, but there are legitimate environmental concerns about some interior borrow sources.

Mr. Clark noted that the funding request is for \$138,000 for monitoring and field investigation. However, the area is likely impounded; he asked Mr. Wandell if there would be another request to remove certain features prior to closeout. Mr. Wandell responded that this is not in the current plan, but that may change after the site investigation.

Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge (ME-09), PPL 1, USFWS

Mr. Clark gave a presentation on the Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge (ME-09) Project. This project was constructed in August 1994. It consists of 2.5 miles of rock protection along the north bank of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) within the Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge. The rock structure is between 0 and 50 feet from the shoreline and is not in the navigation channel. The cost of the project was \$1.2 million and it protects 247 acres on the Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge. This project has been very successful, and the shoreline has accreted to the rock. There is approximately \$2,800 left in the project budget for monitoring and \$173,000 for maintenance, for a total remaining budget of \$175,969. This figure likely will decrease to approximately \$175,000 once in-kind credits are calculated for work performed by the State. This project has not required maintenance for the past 19 years, although the USACE did install navigation warning signs in 2001. The cost of removal of the rock would be \$7.4 million. The project team is recommending closeout without removal of features. The likelihood of required maintenance in the future is low, and the risk of leaving the features in place should be low. A closeout report will be prepared, any remaining funds will be returned to the Program, and the project will remain part of the Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge.

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

Mr. Jurgensen noted that the costs of removal will always be more than the cost of placement, because the rock would need to be removed and then placed somewhere else. Another issue that has been raised is whether mitigation would be required for the lost protection.

Mr. Inman 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 accept the use of the 20-year life decision matrix as presented by Mr. Jurgensen. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Jurgensen made a motion to recommend that the Task Force increase the budget for the Bayou LaBranche Wetland Creation (PO-17) Project by \$138,227 for monitoring and closeout efforts. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Jurgensen made a motion to recommend that the Task Force closeout the Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge (ME-09) Project. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 6. Report: Final Report on the Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration (TE-53) (Dr. Mark Hester, University of Louisiana at Lafayette (ULL)). Dr. Hester provided a final report on the project.

Ms. McCormick introduced Dr. Mark Hester, ULL. Dr. Hester presented the findings from the Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration Project. Dr. Hester stated that barrier island projects are very expensive, but they provide important benefits to the coastal environment. They are the first line of defense against storm surges, but as such they are very vulnerable. The goal of the Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration Project was to research ways to increase vegetation to promote island longevity. This demonstration project involved experiments in the greenhouse and in the field as part of the Whiskey Island Marsh, Dune, Swale Restoration (TE-50) Project. The project team investigated the effects of plant density, fertilization, and humic acid on several types of plant species common in barrier island environments. Plant species included sea oats and bitter panicum in a dune environment; salt grass, marshhay, baccharis, and seashore paspalum in the swale marsh; and black mangrove and smooth cordgrass in the backbarrier marsh. Dr. Hester presented the results of selected experiments and presented the conclusions of the project. Conclusions include:

- High density planting is most beneficial to sea oats and marshhay cordgrass;
- A fertilization regime is beneficial to all species;
- The most stress-tolerant species showed the least benefit from humic acid;
- Unfertilized conditions resulted in more humic acid benefit, except for marshhay cordgrass;
- Environmental stressors reduced the benefits of humic acid in the field;
- Broadcast seeding of coastal Bermuda grass should be reevaluated;
- Planting schedules need to incorporate flexibility for increased success, so that planting is conducted when environmental conditions are most suitable;
- Herbaceous species should be planted first, with woody species the following year; and
- Maintenance can increase plant success.

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

Mr. Clark thanked Dr. Hester. Mr. Clark asked for confirmation that part of the project feature was to broadcast Bermuda grass. Ms. Rachel Sweeney, NMFS, responded that that is no longer frequently practiced.

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

8. Agenda Item 7. Report: Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) Report (Dona Weifenbach, CPRA). Ms. Weifenbach provided a report on CRMS.

Ms. Weifenbach reported on CRMS activity since the last meeting. Thirteen Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring (OM&M) reports are in progress for 2013, and drafts should be available before the September Technical Committee meeting. The results from CRMS 2012 coast-wide photography should be available shortly. CRMS participated in an adaptive management workshop at the Water Institute of the Gulf with other CWPPRA partners. CRMS also conducted roadshows for the Federal partners to present and explain how to use CRMS website features. Ms. Weifenbach is in discussions with the LDWF to integrate their nutria datasets and make them available on the CRMS website. The CRMS system was also presented to the Deepwater Horizon Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) Trustees as part of a discussion on a programmatic approach to project development and monitoring Gulf-wide. A coast-wide elevation survey of all CRMS sites is scheduled for 2014. A vegetation helicopter survey is scheduled for the summer of 2013. Ms. Weifenbach also reported working with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to request reimbursement of damage costs for CRMS sites damaged from Hurricane Isaac. Ms. Weifenbach discussed the multiple uses of CRMS data for the CWPPRA community, including as a basis for 20-year project life closeout reports and decisions. She discussed different reports and datasets that are available on the CRMS website. She presented several indices (Vegetative Volume Index and Vegetation Community Salinity Index) that CRMS is currently developing to help users determine project success. These will be discussed at the Monitoring Work Group meeting this summer.

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

Mr. Clark thanked Ms. Weifenbach, and particularly thanked CRMS for addressing the Vegetative Quality Index. He noted that the prior index did not make sense for the Mississippi and Atchafalaya areas and he expressed hope that CRMS would continue to work to solve this issue.

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

9. Agenda Item 8. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope and Name for the PPL 10 – Mississippi River Reintroduction into Northwestern Barataria Basin Project (BA-34) (Ken Teague, EPA). The EPA and CPRA requested approval for a change in the scope and name of the project by eliminating the siphon, due to limited ability to reintroduce Mississippi River water at reasonable cost (i.e. high cost, small flows), and instead focus on restoring hydrology within part of the original approved project area by gapping spoil banks and installing culverts, which would be highly cost-effective. Mr. Teague proposed to change the project name to Hydrologic Restoration and Vegetative Planting in the Lac des Allemands Swamp (BA-34-2).

Mr. Teague requested a scope and name change for the Mississippi River Reintroduction Into Northwestern Barataria Basin (BA-34) Project, PPL 10. Approved features of the project include two six-foot diameter siphon pipes and vacuum pipes over the Mississippi River levee at Pikes Peak. Early in the project design and formulation, the project team recognized that Bayou Chevreuil is a very hydraulically efficient water transport system, and almost all of the water

from the project would be captured by Bayou Chevreuil and transported out of the area to Lac des Allemands. Project Area 1 is impounded and needs the most protection/restoration. After hydrologic modeling, the project team found that Dredge Boat Canal would not carry the amount of water needed in this area without expensive modification. However, gapping spoil banks in impounded areas would have a considerable benefit for much less cost. The project team is requesting a scope change to eliminate the siphon and change the focus of the project to the hydrologic restoration, which was a component of the project originally, but was not the main focus. They would also like to add nutria and tallow control to the project. Due to the change in scope, the team would also like to change the name to the Hydrologic Restoration and Vegetative Planting in the Lac des Allemands Swamp (BW-34-2) Project. If the scope change is approved, project features would include 21 large gaps in the Bayou Chevreuil spoil bank, three gaps in Board Road, three culverts under Board Road, breaching or removing an aquaculture impoundment dike, and removal of internal spoil banks. This project would work in conjunction with two other projects in the area that have been funded by the Parish. A detailed cost estimate is currently in development, and the project team will send that information to the Engineering Work Group soon.

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

Mr. Clark asked for a change in benefits and costs. The costs will decrease, but the exact cost estimate is not yet available. He suggested that the project team speak to the chairman of the Engineering Work Group to get an estimate of the fully funded cost, so that the cost can be properly accounted for within CWPPRA. Mr. Jurgensen noted that this process could easily be done before the Task Force meeting in June.

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

Mr. Jody Chenier, St. James Parish, thanked CWPPRA for the time and effort spent on this project. St. James Parish fully supports this project; the Parish has purchased 3,000 acres and has agreements to purchase the remaining 2,000 acres necessary.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force accept the scope and name change as presented by Mr. Teague. Mr. Jurgensen seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

10. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope for the PPL 10 – Rockefeller Refuge Gulf Shoreline Stabilization Project (ME-18) (John Foret, NMFS). NMFS and CPRA requested a project scope change to proceed with the design to 30% and 95% for the project. NMFS and CPRA proposed to scale down the project from 9.2 miles to 2.0 miles. The net acres protected are estimated at 198 acres, while the original concept was targeting 920 net acres protected. NMFS and CPRA also requested a fully funded cost estimate decrease from the original \$95,988,680 to an estimated \$28,082,507. In 2009, the NMFS de-obligated \$877,476 Phase I funds; NMFS and CPRA requested that \$502,842 of the project's de-obligated funds be returned to complete the project design.

Dr. John Foret, NMFS, presented the request for scope change for the Rockefeller Refuge Gulf Shoreline Stabilization (ME-18) Project, PPL 10. This project was originally conceived as a 9.2 mile shoreline protection project from Beach Prong to Joseph Harbor. However, geotechnical analysis revealed challenging soil conditions and a very energetic environment. The project team investigated 84 design alternatives. A demonstration-style project was funded via the Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) to test three alternatives and was monitored for 13 months. Based on this demonstration, the project team would like to move forward with the reef breakwater with lightweight aggregate core. However, due to costs, they are requesting a scope change from 9.2 miles of protection to 2.0 miles of protection immediately west of Joseph Harbor Canal. This location, which is part of the original footprint, was selected due to predominant wind direction and the location of an existing oyster shell reef. The reef breakwater would have offsets for excess water to be evacuated from the area, but not true gaps. This scope change would reduce the fully funded project cost from \$96 million to \$28 million. The net acres will be reduced from 920 to 198. A significant amount of engineering and design (E&D) has already been completed for this project, but NMFS would need a new \$502,842 MIPR to replace the one that was de-obligated to complete Phase I. This is less than the amount of money returned to CWPPRA when NMFS allowed the Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (MIPR) to expire. The construction estimate, with a 15% contingency, is \$24.7 million. The costs do not include operation or maintenance funding.

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

Mr. Jurgensen asked Dr. Foret about settlement rates and why they were lower than anticipated. Dr. Foret replied that the project team still has the opportunity to investigate this issue, but the lower-than-expected settlement occurred on both the traditional rock and the lightweight aggregate that was tested. Mr. Roy asked if any named storms occurred during the monitoring period. Mr. Jurgensen noted that Tropical Storm Lee hit the Louisiana coast in September 2011. Mr. Clark admired the offset construction, which provides for moving excess water out of the area and gives organisms access to the shoreline. Mr. Clark asked for clarification about the \$502,000 requested for E&D. Dr. Foret clarified that the project team is not asking for additional budget, but for money that had already been allocated to the project

Mr. Inman 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 accept the scope change requested by Dr. Foret. Ms. McCormick seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for Approval for Final De-authorization on the PPL 9 -- Weeks Bay Marsh Creation/Shoreline Protection/Commercial Canal/Freshwater Redirection Project (TV-19) (Stuart Brown, CPRA; Hilary Thibodeaux, CB&I). The USACE and CPRA requested approval for final de-authorization procedures on the project. The Task Force voted to initiate de-authorization at the October 11, 2012 meeting, allowing the project team to give a presentation about the project changes at the January 24, 2013 meeting, and making a final decision at the June meeting. Mr. Brown provided a presentation on Weeks Bay, followed by a presentation by Mr. Thibodeaux.

Mr. Brown presented an overview of the Weeks Bay Marsh Creation/Shoreline Protection/Commercial Canal/Freshwater Redirection (TV-19) Project. This project was put on hold in 2009 after the costs increased to over \$50 million for multiple reasons. Vermilion and Iberia Parishes used CIAP money to continue to investigate project design alternatives and whether or not the project would provide enough benefits to justify the costs. In 2011, the local stakeholders proposed a shoreline protection feature with a cost of approximately \$10 million. However, the State was still unable to calculate benefits that justified the cost, and therefore recommended the project for de-authorization. At the October Task Force meeting, the State was tasked to look at potential benefits of moving freshwater further west by reducing the opening of the GIWW at Weeks Bay. However, calculating the benefits of this is difficult without a defined benefit area or defined additional flow. Several studies have been conducted on this issue. Approximately 60% of the freshwater moving in the GIWW is lost at the Jaws. At the gauge at Cypremort Point, there is an average westward flow of only 1,300 cubic feet per second (cfs). The vast majority (85%) of the Atchafalaya River water in the GIWW is lost through the Jaws and other openings before it gets to Weeks Bay. The State concluded, using numbers originally provided by Shaw, that additional westward flow that might be captured by reducing the Weeks Bay opening is not large enough to justify the cost of the project. Mr. Brown recognized that this is a great oversimplification of the system. Modeling shows that the GIWW north of the Weeks Bay opening exhibits bidirectional flow, with the net flow actually going east, not west.

Mr. Thibodeaux with CB&I (formerly Shaw Coastal) also gave a presentation on this project. Using CIAP funds, Vermilion and Iberia Parishes contracted with CB&I to investigate different alternatives. One alternative was a concrete barrier wall sediment trap along the GIWW shoreline at the Weeks Bay opening, similar to the Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection project (BA-27). The Weeks Bay Project was originally nominated and selected as a shoreline protection/marsh creation project. However, the concrete barrier alternative that CB&I is recommending would require a re-scoping to a freshwater/sediment diversion and sediment trap. The Parishes' goal is to reestablish the corridor of the GIWW in this area, so that whatever Atchafalaya River water may be flowing west can be contained in the GIWW instead of leaving the system through Weeks Bay. CB&I does not believe that several of the studies (MIKE FLOOD and ADCIRC) that have been performed are representative of the actual conditions in this area, because they were not designed for this area. The USGS/Swarzenski report, which presented actual data instead of modeling results, showed positive effects with an Atchafalaya River level of just +2.5 feet. Mr. Thibodeaux noted that the gauge at Cypremort Point reaches as high as 5,000 cfs, and the 1,300 cfs figure cited by Mr. Brown is an average. CB&I would like to continue to study this project to determine whether more benefits can be calculated. They would like to look at secondary benefits, such as those to navigation. Mr. Thibodeaux also noted that this project is very similar to the Freshwater Bayou Enhancement Project, which was proposed in PPL 23.

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

Mr. Clark stated that the USGS study reported that effects of the Atchafalaya River extended 50 miles east and west. He asked where the 50-mile point is. Mr. Edwards responded that it is Intracoastal City, Little Vermilion Bay.

Mr. Hartman noted that the Task Force voted to initiate de-authorization, with the final vote not occurring until June 2013. He asked if the Technical Committee needed to take any action if they wanted to continue down that path. Mr. Clark responded that the Task Force was looking for a recommendation from the Technical Committee once the modeling was complete. They should make a recommendation, even if it is to continue with de-authorization. Mr. Hartman stated that, in his opinion, the Technical Committee had not heard any additional information that would justify changing their course of action. This should be a report to the Task Force, but not a recommendation.

Mr. Jurgensen asked for the State and Federal sponsors' opinions. Mr. Haase responded that CWPPRA could continue to spend time and money researching this project, but with the amount of time and money already spent, the potential benefits do not warrant further review. Mr. Inman stated that the USACE is the Federal sponsor and they agree with the State. The options for the current project scope have been exhausted.

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

Mr. Langlinais, Iberia Parish Levee and Conservation District, stated that this project has been planned since 1999. All the Technical Committee needs to do is look at maps from 1999 and compare them to maps from 2012 and they will see the reason to build this project. Historically, projects in the Teche-Vermilion Basin have been successful. There is sediment coming from the north that could nourish this area. Over 12 feet per year is being lost on both sides of the bank of the GIWW. He stated that he understands that it is difficult to measure, but the fact that the project has benefits should be common sense. There was a reason that this project was originally authorized. This is the only area of the GIWW that has this large of an opening. Mr. Langlinais suggested continuing to study the project. It meets the mission of the Levee and Conservation District. The benefit area is a lot larger than just Weeks Bay. Mr. Langlinais stated that he has personally taken salinity measures in this area, and salinity levels decrease as he moves west within Iberia Parish. If the Task Force votes to de-authorize this project, he would like each member to write down the reason that it is not going to be built, so that he can bring that back to his constituents. Mr. Langlinais voiced skepticism of the model results, because aerial photographs show large plumes of water moving west. He urged the Technical Committee not to de-authorize this project, and he assured them that it would be a success if built.

Mr. Clark responded that the shoreline protection benefits to the original project area does not justify constructing the project. Iberia and Vermilion Parishes asked for additional time to see if freshwater flow westward could justify construction. The initial request to deauthorize this project was two to three years ago, so CWPPRA has already waited for the Parishes' CIAP results, and constructing the current project is just not cost effective. Mr. Hartman added that the Committee has not heard any compelling information to justify a change in the project de-authorization process.

Mr. Edwards informed the Technical Committee that he had asked several questions about the model and never gotten answers. One issue is that the model does not have dimensions for the GIWW. Another issue is that the model was validated for a north-south flow, but not east-west. The study found bidirectional flow, but Mr. Edwards asked what was wrong with bidirectionality. Mr. Edwards urged members of the Technical Committee to look at aerial photos of the area. He added that the study did not account for a future in which the deltas at Wax Lake Outlet and the Jaws mature. Once this happens, Mr. Edwards maintained that more water will flow west. However, Weeks Bay will not develop into a delta because the opening is over 3,000 feet wide. Mr. Edwards also asked about hypoxia conditions, which could form if the GIWW continues to flow directly into Weeks Bay north of Southwest Pass. He reminded the Technical Committee that the Four Mile Canal Terracing Project was in four feet of water 22 years ago, and now people are planting smooth cordgrass on land between the terraces. This kind of project can work in the Teche-Vermilion Basin. He noted that this is south central Louisiana's only hope for a river diversion project. This is an opportunity to create one of the most creative win-win-win situations in the State. While the fishermen in the eastern part of the State do not want freshwater diversions, the fishermen in this area want this diversion. Mr. Edwards pleaded with the Technical Committee to leave the project authorized, even if they do not spend any money on further investigation or construction. The CWPPRA Program does not need to spend money on the project, but if de-authorized, it will have a stigma as a failed project and no other agency will fund it.

Mr. Donald Sagrera, Teche-Vermilion Fresh Water District, stated that the purpose of his agency is to promote fresh water in Vermilion and Iberia Parishes. He expressed a strong need for Mississippi River water in the Mermentau Basin. The Teche-Vermilion Fresh Water District currently pumps water north of Krotz Springs, but if this project could encourage freshwater in the GIWW to flow west, they would no longer have to pump. This project could have a positive impact on the Mermentau Basin.

Mr. Kevin Sagrera, Vermilion Parish Police Jury, stressed the importance of not de-authorizing the project and begged the Technical Committee for support to leave the project "on the shelf."

Mr. Jurgensen asked the local stakeholders what their next step would be if CWPPRA does not de-authorize this project.

Mr. Edwards responded that they have not fully formulated next steps. They would need to find funding or another Federal sponsor. However, this will be much more difficult if CWPPRA de-authorizes the project. He stated that all of the E&D work that has been done for this project should not be thrown away. If CWPPRA de-authorizes this project, no other agency will build it. Mr. Edwards asserted that the benefits have not been redefined based on the proposed new scope of the project. He asked if the Federal sponsor was supposed to be calculating new benefits, because they do not appear to have changed. Mr. Edwards stated that the local stakeholders are not asking CWPPRA to spend any more money on this project, but would like for it not to be de-authorized so that they can sell the project to another agency.

Mr. Clark noted that the Restore Act should provide money to the coastal parishes. If the parishes are supportive of this project, which they are, the Restore Act could be a potential source of funding.

Mr. Edwards stated that the amount and timing of money from the Restore Act is uncertain. Additionally, the parishes may be required to have a Federal, State, or non-governmental organization (NGO) sponsor.

Mr. Inman reiterated that the original project was a marsh creation project. Geotechnical investigations revealed that the conditions were not suitable to support marsh creation. CB&I (Shaw) agreed that rock could not be used, and formulated an alternative based on concrete walls. However, material could not be pumped behind the concrete walls to create marsh. The project that the local stakeholders are now suggesting is completely different than the original project. The USACE is not interested in being the Federal sponsor for the version of the project that the local stakeholders are currently proposing. In response to a question from Mr. Edwards, Mr. Inman reported that the USACE would be willing to transfer the project if another CWPPRA Federal agency wanted to take it. Mr. Inman added that any new sponsor would need to spend considerable time and money on modeling efforts; the current efforts were not meant to be comprehensive due to the limited timeframe.

Mr. Edwards disputed the idea that much more work would need to be performed. He asserted that much work has already been done, and the models just need to be tweaked. The water has been shown to go as far as Intracoastal City, but that does not mean that the project area must include that large of an expanse. However, the local stakeholders need a Federal sponsor to be able to answer those questions and make those decisions.

Mr. Hartman recognized the strong feelings for this project. However, both the Federal and State sponsors are in favor of de-authorizing the project, and nothing that he has seen has convinced him otherwise. The Task Force has already given the project extra time for additional review. The CWPPRA process is to build a project or de-authorize it, and it is obvious that CWPPRA is not going to build this project.

Mr. Jurgensen expressed a concern that the locals have disputed the findings of the model, and asked if there was a possibility that the project team could present the model to the parish and local stakeholders to answer their questions. He further opined that a meeting between the Parishes and the modeling team should be scheduled before the June Task Force meeting. Mr. Haase agreed that that was possible.

Mr. Hartman added that the Technical Committee and Task Force should consider an internal discussion on the implications of not de-authorizing projects even if they know they will not be constructed. Government Accountability Office (GAO) evaluations of the CWPPRA Program have been critical of the number of unconstructed projects within CWPPRA. Mr. Inman added that these projects are considered current obligations, which increases the amount that CWPPRA has to report as "overspent." Mr. Haase also noted that meetings like the one suggested by Mr. Jurgensen with the modelers and the local stakeholders cost the Program money, because they have to pay the modelers for their time. Mr. Jurgensen responded that nevertheless, this particular meeting is very important and he stated that the last report indicated some funds were

still on the project books. Mr. Hartman stated that they are using tax dollars and they should try to be as effective as possible. Mr. Clark agreed with this statement and added that CWPPRA should try to get the most for their dollars.

12. Agenda Item 11. Decision: Request for Approval for Final Deauthorization on six projects (Bren Haase, CPRA). CPRA requested approval for final deauthorization procedures on the six projects listed below. These projects face technical implementation issues, have an unfavorable benefit-to-cost ratio, or have languished for an extended period. The Technical Committee will vote on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the final deauthorization of the following six projects:

- a. Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization (TV-11b), PPL 9, USACE
- b. Delta Building Diversion North of Fort St. Philip (BS-10), PPL 10, USACE
- c. Avoca Island Diversion and Land Building (TE-49), PPL 12, USACE
- d. Spanish Pass Diversion (MR-14), PPL 13, USACE
- e. White Ditch Resurrection (BS-12), PPL 14, NRCS
- f. Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction (BS-15), PPL 17, EPA

Mr. Stuart Brown presented an overview of these six projects. These projects have languished and face technical and programmatic issues.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. There was no discussion by members of the Technical Committee.

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

Mr. Randy Moertle, Rainey Conservation Alliance, stated that the Rainey Conservation owns almost all the property on both sides of the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization Project. He asked the Technical Committee that it not be de-authorized. The local stakeholders are cognizant that CWPPRA will not fund the project, but they feel there is a better chance of another agency funding it if it is not a de-authorized project. Freshwater Bayou is causing severe problems in this area, and there are several other agencies that may have BP money available soon that may fund the project. This project is in the State Master Plan. It is already 95% designed, and Mr. Moertle believes that the project has a good chance of being funded by another program.

Mr. Kevin Segrera supported putting the Freshwater Bayou Project in a suspension category, which has been previously discussed. This would prevent the project from having the stigma of de-authorization.

Mr. Edwards pleaded with the Technical Committee not to de-authorize the Freshwater Bayou Project.

Mr. Haase noted that even de-authorized projects remain on the list in an appendix of every annual plan.

Ms. Suazo affirmed Mr. Moertle's statement that Ducks Unlimited and other NGOs are investigating the Freshwater Bayou Project. They have been in discussions with the Rainey Alliance for several weeks. Other funding sources may be available as early as July 2013. Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) monies may also be available in the 2017-2019 timeframe and would provide opportunities for local governments to receive revenues for coastal restoration. If there are no long term costs to the CWPPRA Program, she supports putting the project aside in a "caretaking" category, but not de-authorizing it, so that other agencies have further opportunities to evaluate the options.

Mr. Jurgensen agreed that the Freshwater Bayou Project is unique in this list of six projects because it is completely designed. However, NRCS is not the Federal sponsor and he will follow the lead of the Federal and State sponsors.

Mr. Haase noted that Freshwater Bayou is a PPL 9 project and has effectively been in "suspension" for a number of years. He stated that other organizations could fund the project regardless of whether it has been de-authorized in CWPPRA. Other de-authorized CWPPRA projects have been evaluated by other agencies in the past, because everyone recognizes that conditions change. He stated that he did not agree that de-authorizing the project in CWPPRA would decrease the likelihood of another agency or program constructing the project.

Mr. Moertle expressed disbelief that the project could be in the State Master Plan, yet the State is asking for it to be de-authorized. This is a perfect shovel-ready project. The locals are the ones who will be going to other agencies to ask for funding so the Technical Committee should believe them when they say that it is easier to get funding for an authorized project.

Mr. Hartman suggested making two separate motions, one for the Freshwater Bayou Project and another for the other five projects. He expressed support for an internal discussion on the implications to the Program of leaving unconstructed projects authorized. Mr. Clark noted that the Task Force has already started de-authorization procedures for all six projects.

Mr. Jurgensen stated that he would not vote against the wishes of the State and Federal sponsors, but he encouraged the Technical Committee to have further dialogue about the Freshwater Bayou Project because this project is not being deauthorized due to lack of benefits or complications, it is completely designed and shovel-ready. Why does it need to be deauthorized?

Mr. Haase stated his belief that to keep this project authorized within CWPPRA is disingenuous to the public because CWPPRA is not going to construct it. It is also detrimental to the Program's accounting methods.

Mr. Moertle asked Mr. Inman if the USACE would reconsider its position on this project as the Federal sponsor. The Master Plan is supposed to guide CWPPRA, and this project is 95% designed and is in the Master Plan. The local stakeholders need help trying to get funding from other sources, and CWPPRA can help by not de-authorizing the project.

Mr. Hartman responded that he is unconvinced that de-authorizing projects in CWPPRA hinders their chances of being funded by another program. He suggested that Mr. Moertle or other local

stakeholders provide evidence of this before the next Task Force meeting. Mr. Moertle countered that he sees no reason to de-authorize this project and asked the Technical Committee to explain why it needs to be removed from the Program. Mr. Hartman stated that there may be accounting implications that are detrimental to the Program, but that CWPPRA will have internal discussions about this issue.

In response to Mr. Moertle's question, Mr. Inman stated that he would talk to his superiors within the USACE. Obviously the USACE thought that it was a good project because they designed it. However, every year great projects do not get funding. Mr. Inman speculated that other programs believe that CWPPRA is going to construct this project, and therefore do not consider it themselves.

Mr. Edwards stated that de-authorization has a negative connotation. He asked for another term that would not have the same stigma. He asked about a State library of projects that was supposed to be formed. Mr. Haase affirmed that the State does keep a list of all projects. Mr. Edwards disputed this claim.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force finalize de-authorization procedures for projects b-f listed above. Ms. McCormick seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force finalize de-authorization for Freshwater Bayou, following internal discussion about not de-authorizing projects that will not be constructed. Ms. McCormick seconded. All members of the Technical Committee except for Mr. Jurgensen voted in favor and the motion passed. Mr. Jurgensen abstained.

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

Mr. Inman stated that the Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation does not have a Federal sponsor. The State requested that EPA be the Federal sponsor. Ms. McCormick accepted the project on behalf of the EPA.

Mr. Hartman noted that they discussed the closeout of two projects, and there is a marked difference in the process being used for these projects. One project is requesting over \$100,000 for surveys and a final report, and the other is not. There should be a reason that CWPPRA is collecting this information, and the process should be consistent.

Mr. Inman responded that the assumption that the P&E Subcommittee made while working on the decision matrix was that a final monitoring report would be written. However, he would defer to the State about whether or not CWPPRA will gain anything from the final report. He added that each project is probably different and will have different needs.

Mr. Hartman questioned the usefulness of measuring elevation and vegetation data when the project is being closed out. He admitted the merit of inspecting containment dikes to determine whether or not gapping should be performed prior to closeout.

Mr. Clark noted that recently the Program has been routinely including elevation surveys in every marsh creation project that is approved. The State Monitoring Group and the Environmental and Engineering Work Groups believe that this is important information to be able to study what happens to marsh creation projects after they are constructed.

Mr. Jurgensen also noted that the Bayou LaBranche Project was the very first marsh creation project performed by CWPPRA, and therefore lessons learned from this project should be applied to future projects.

Mr. Hartman questioned whether the as-built drawings for this project would be sufficient to calculate compaction rates. However, the Technical Committee had already voted and he only wanted to ensure that everyone was aware of this discrepancy between the two projects.

Mr. Inman suggested that the project team look at CRMS data to see what is already available and reduce the possibility of duplicated effort. Mr. Clark also suggested a partial survey. It is not clear what the project team intends in terms of survey efforts. Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Wandell to investigate what surveying efforts are truly necessary. Mr. Inman committed to explore ways to save money.

Mr. Inman thanked Ms. Suazo and Ducks Unlimited for the sandwiches and snacks provided at the meeting. Mr. Clark noted that Ms. Suazo and ConocoPhillips regularly provide this service at Technical Committee and Task Force meetings.

Mr. Inman noted that Ms. Rachel Sweeney will be receiving the Stewardship Award at the upcoming Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana award ceremony.

14. Agenda Item 13. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE). There were no public comments.

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

The Task Force meeting will be held June 4, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Fisheries and Habitat Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana.

16. Agenda Item 15. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE).

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| June 4, 2013 | 9:30 a.m. | Task Force | Lafayette |
| September 11, 2013 | 9:30 a.m. | Technical Committee | Baton Rouge |
| October 10, 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 16. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. Mr. Inman adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:50 p.m.