

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 10 Dec 02 CWPPRA Meeting

1. Mr. John Saia opened the meeting and all Technical Committee members introduced themselves. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

- Mr. John Saia, COE
- Mr. Wes McQuiddy representing Mr. Troy Hill, EPA
- Mr. Gerald Bodin, FWS
- Mr. Rick Hartman, NMFS
- Mr. Bruce Lehto, NRCS
- Mr. Bill Good, LDNR

A copy of the sign up sheet is included as **Encl 1**.

2. Agenda Item I. PPL12 Candidate Project Evaluation Reports. Mr. Saia briefly went over the process for PPL12 and the steps that the Technical Committee will take today to recommend projects to the Task Force. First, Mr. Chris Monnerjahn will make a presentation on the PPL12 candidate projects. After general comments from the Technical Committee, the general public will then be allowed to comment on the projects prior to agency voting. Mr. Saia explained that each agency will have 5 weighted votes. Mr. Rick Hartman mentioned that the Technical Committee will likely recommend the top four projects to the Task Force.

Mr. Monnerjahn presented a Powerpoint presentation on the proposed PPL12 projects to the audience.

Mr. Saia opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee:

Mr. Rick Hartman asked if the cuts on the Maurepas project would actually allow water to flow into the adjacent marsh and if this uncertainty was the reason why hydraulic modeling was included in the study phase and the reason for the “high” risk and uncertainty rating. It was confirmed by Kevin Roy that this was the reason for the high risk and uncertainty, and was the reason for requiring modeling in the budget.

Mr. Hartman also asked if the benefits from the Myrtle Grove project were taken into consideration for the benefits of the Bayou Dupont project. Kevin Roy indicated that the Myrtle Grove Diversion project was not assumed in-place since it was not authorized for construction.

Mr. Rick Hartman indicated that an adjacent landowner has raised some concerns about the increased level of water from the Avoca project. He asked if this had been addressed. Mr. Greg Miller indicated that he spoke to Mr. Strain regarding his concerns. In addition,

under existing conditions, water will wrap around the lower end of the levee, therefore, if the project is constructed no additional water is anticipated in the area of Mr. Strain's concern.

Mr. Hartman asked why the risk and uncertainty was rated as "high" on the North Bully Camp project. A similar reason to the reason on the Maurepas project was indicated: uncertainty in hydrologic/hydraulic modeling.

Dr. Bill Good indicated that LDNR is concerned that the Bayou Dupont project is located at a potential site for the Millennium Port. In addition, there is also river revetment in this reach. How much flexibility is there in terms of the site for the project? He sees it as more of a demo-type project that shouldn't be limited to this site. Mr. Wes McQuiddy indicated that if EPA were to remain the Federal sponsor, they be willing to look at alternate locations.

Dr. Good indicated that he understood that the Shell Island project is within the area of the barrier shoreline feasibility study. In addition, LDNR has some concerns about the cost and whether it is appropriately sized for CWPPRA. Mr. Britt Paul indicated that we could start Phase I activities with the realization that the project will be implemented outside of CWPPRA.

Dr. Good stated that the North Bully Camp project is located in the vicinity of Golden Meadow oil and gas fields, in one of the highest subsidence areas in the state. Was this taken into consideration? Mr. Kevin Roy said that this was taken into account (in risk/uncertainty) and in the maintenance cost for the project. Dr. Good indicated that the subsidence rate would be around 1.5' over the 20-year project life. Mr. Rick Hartman also expressed his concern about eventually having structures that will be in open water because of the high level of subsidence.

Mr. Saia opened the floor for public comments:

O'Neil Marlborough, representing Jefferson Parish: He indicated that when the Bayou Dupont project was initially proposed, there was a permanent pipeline in the project. The project will not impact the Millennium Port. The project will be an asset because it is protecting the area from erosion. He also feels that there will be a synergy between Bayou Dupont and the Myrtle Grove project.

Randy Moertle, representing Miller Estate and Vermilion Parish: He supports the South White Lake project. The PPL12 project includes more acreage than the PPL11 project. This is the only project in Region 4 and it is the only one that meets the mapping strategy for White Lake unit. Hwy 82 is one of two evacuation routes for Grand Chenier and Creole. Over 112 letters of support have been sent to Colonel Rowan. In referring to the project evaluation matrix, this project has the highest protection of wetlands, and low risk project, and is #3 in cost effectiveness. The only two that are above it are considered high risk. The Miller Estate and Vermilion Parish are in strong support of the project.

Wade Walk, representing Avoca, Inc.: He is in favor of Avoca project. The project has the full support of the landowner. He has witnessed severe degradation and this project will be beneficial in protecting the area. This project also has the support of St. Mary Parish (letter to Colonel).

Paul Hogan, General Manager of Avoca Inc.: He is in strongly support of the Avoca project.

Martin O. Miller, owner Miller estate: He is interested in the South White lake project. Human life is at stake if Hwy 82 is inundated during storms. The Miller family members are in support of the project.

Carol Vinning, Director of Planning for St Mary's Parish: He is in support of Avoca project.

Hardy Fowler, citizen: He is in support of the Avoca Island project. He has seen deterioration of the habitat and appreciates support of the freshwater diversion to help restore wetlands.

Julio Mayorga, St Bernard Parish: He supports the Lake Borgne/MRGO project. The marshes in St. Bernard Parish are in dire need. It is an area that can gain much from project implementation. In looking at the matrix, this project ranks 4th in total net acres created, and 2nd in Phase I cost. He hand delivered letters of support from a US representative and the state legislative delegation.

Martin Miller III., Rellium Surface Management LLC: He supports the South White Lake project. The Hwy 82 evacuation route will be cut off without the project.

Dan Arceneaux, St. Bernard Parish CZM: He is in support of the Lake Borgne/MRGO project. Storm systems have caused damage and soon the lake will be breached into the MRGO.

Henry Rodriguez, St. Bernard Parish Councilman/chairman: He is in support of Lake Borgne project. Bank stabilization is a must to protect a \$40 M levee. Hurricane protection is important as well to St. Bernard and Orleans Parish.

Jess Curole, Lafourche Parish CZM: The North Bully Camp is a good project, and they support it as their number 1 project.

Sherrill Segrera, Vermilion Parish CZM: He is concerned about the encroachment of White Lake on the ridge and its effect to Pecan Island. He supports the South White Lake project.

Peter Labouisse, citizen: He supports the Avoca project. He has been a land user for over 50 years and has observed degradation over the years. This project will go a long way in helping the situation.

Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish. She supports the Bayou Dupont project, even though it is in Plaquemines Parish because it will be useful to demonstrate the technique of using Mississippi River sediments.

Mr. Rick Hartman made a comment on the Lake Borgne project. He noticed that the rocks that the Corps put in other reaches are currently under water. He asked if there is enough cost included for maintenance? Mr. Chris Monnerjahn indicated that there are three separate maintenance events assumed over the 20 years. Ms. Cynthia Duet indicated that it seems that there are other areas that there is subsidence every 3-5 years along the MRGO and questioned whether three times in 20 years was enough. Mr. Monnerjahn stated that the maintenance schedule was based upon actual subsidence rates from other reaches that the Corps has already built in the area. Mr. Monnerjahn also indicated that there was a consensus amongst the members of the Engineering Workgroup that the 3 proposed maintenance events were adequate.

Mr. Henry Rodriguez, St Bernard also made a comment. He feels that CWPPRA monies are being used for work that the Corps is responsible for (MRGO) and that this part of the project could be eliminated. It seems to him that this should be covered under the Corps maintenance program.

Following comments from the Technical Committee members and the general public, Mr. Saia acknowledged the names from letters of support that were handed to him during the meeting (updated version included as **Encl 2**). A summary of letters of support was provided to the Technical Committee members .

Before the agencies voted, Mr. Saia asked NRCS to clarify which increment should be voted for on the Shell Island project. Mr. Britt Paul suggested that we vote for the whole project and not the smaller increment.

All agencies voted (5 weighted votes) and the final tally for PPL12 is included as **Encl 3**. The final tally for the PPL12 demonstration projects (1 vote) is included as **Encl 4**.

Following sorting of the spreadsheet, Mr. Rick Hartman moved to break the tie for fourth place (between Lake Borgne and Maurepas Swamp) by including the project with the most agency support. Dr. Bill Good seconded. All voted in favor of recommending the first four projects to the Task Force for Phase I funding.

Mr. Rick Hartman moved that the Technical Committee recommend the Freshwater Floating Marsh project as the demonstration project to be funded. The motion was seconded. All voted in favor.

3. Agenda Item II. Construction Authorization Request for Four Mile Island Terracing and Sediment Trapping Project. Mr. Rick Hartman introduced Mr. John Foret who proceeded with a discussion of the funding needed for the Four Mile Canal Terracing Project. He mentioned that while the total project area was lower, the total acres

created/protected were higher. He then asked for the project to be recommended for approval to the Task Force.

Dr. Bill Good made a motion to approve it. Gerry Bodin seconded. All voted in favor.

4. Agenda Item III. Construction Authorization Request for Timbalier Island Dune and Marsh Creation Project. EPA is requesting a TC recommendation for construction approval to the Task Force. DNR and EPA are comfortable with the design template. Rick Hartman indicated that at the very least, he would like to see the approval contingent upon review and comment by the non-partisan barrier island group. Rick Hartman would like to see Technical Committee review and approve the design prior to contract being let. Mr. Wes McQuiddy stated that EPA is not opposed as long as it doesn't affect the schedule for construction. Dr. Bill Good said that it would not be possible to get the barrier island review board together before the April date, however, it could be done on an informal basis.

Mr. Rick Hartman moved to approve the recommendation contingent upon review by this "group" and TC poll to approve final go-ahead prior to letting contract. Mr. Saia indicated that there should also be a post-storm survey completed before letting the contract (this was added to the motion). Mr. Gerry Bodin seconded. Dr. Good asked if there were any concerns from Chris Williams, LDNR. Mr. Williams indicated that if there is a design change recommended, that they would not make the April construction window. Dr Good indicated that they would put together a position paper from the group and take into account re-design time (if needed) for the TC to make a decision. Mr. Bodin asked if it were better to wait a year to get an ideal design or go forward now with this design and at least provide some protection to the area? Mr. Britt Paul asked if EPA would have the survey information available for the Technical Committee along with the position paper? EPA answered yes. All voted in favor.

5. Agenda Item IV: Construction Approval Request for the Barataria Landbridge Phase 2. Mr. Quinn Kinler presented information on the project and indicated that there are phases of the landbridge project (Phase 1 and 2) that were approved before cash flow procedures, and Phase 3 which is subject to cash flow. They are asking for contingent approval, since they have only recently completed 30% design review. The 95% design review will be completed in May 03. In order to avoid a 6-month delay, they are asking for contingent approval. Mr. Kinler stated that 68% of Phases 1 and 2 has been built, while they have spent 68% of the 125% amount. For Phase 3, they have completed 53% and spent 55% of the 125% amount.

Mr. Rick Hartman moved to approve. Mr. Wes McQuiddy seconded. Dr. Bill Good asked if he could make a comment before voting. DNR is concerned with contingent approval. What he'd like to see is if we had a quarterly approval for the TF, as this would eliminate the need for the contingency approval. His concern is that the SOP standards may be eroded over time with an increase in contingent approvals. Even if the Task Force goes to a quarterly funding cycle, it would be their discretion to approve

funding requests at any quarterly meeting. All voted in favor of recommending contingent approval for the project to the Task Force.

Mr. Saia asked if the Technical Committee should recommend that the TF go to a quarterly funding approval. Mr. Britt Paul said yes. Mr. Rick Hartman expressed a concern that this will become an issue when we start running out of money and would not allow a group of projects to have to compete against each other. Dr. Good stated that part of the rationale for Phase 2 would be so that there would be a pool of projects from which to select. The Task Force could take this into advisement and decide that they want to have the projects in a pool prior to making a funding decision (they don't have to decide to fund on a quarterly basis). No decision was made.

6. Agenda Item V. Briefings on Efforts of Oyster Ad Hoc Committee. Secretary Caldwell has been involved in oyster issues recently and they are expected to present recent efforts at the Task Force meeting in January. Ms. Rachel Sweeney asked when DNR expected to have final rules that we can implement. Dr. Good indicated that it generally takes a year. Ms. Sweeney asked if there were going to be interim procedures that we can use in the meantime for project with oyster issues now. Dr. Good indicated that he would look into this and provide a response.

7. Agenda Item VI. FY03 Budget Request for Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. Ms. Heather Finley indicated that the amount was the same amount as last year for their participation. Mr. Rick Hartman moved to approve. The motion was seconded. All voted in favor.

8. Agenda Item VII. Project De-authorization Request for the Bayou L'Ours Ridge Hydrologic Restoration. A motion was made and seconded. All voted in favor.

9. Agenda Item VIII. Cash Flow Management Discussions. Ms. LeBlanc made a presentation on remaining funds to be requested under PPL1-8 and 9-11 for construction, monitoring, and O&M. The purpose of the presentation was to provide a draft of the information to be presented at the January Task Force offsite meeting. The Technical Committee members were asked to provide comments by 2 Jan 02 so that revisions could be made in time for the offsite meeting in January.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked why we were planning on a PPL13 when we are going to be out of money in a year. In August 03, we are going to have to have a way to say "no". We need to sit down and have a process to determine which projects will be funded for construction. Paul Kemp, Governor's office indicated that we have chosen to use CWPPRA funds to develop projects knowing that we will not be able to construct them. Therefore, we end up with an assumption that expenditures on PPL1-8 are most important, and this default mode may need to be revisited. Ms. Cynthia Duet indicated that she strongly supports Rick's idea of thinking NOW about establishing criteria for projects moving into construction. What will the selection mechanism consist of when we get to this point? Mr. Saia indicated that the presentation didn't get into any "options" on how to prioritize, but we need to explore various options (including

extension of authorization, curtailing projects). Mr. Gerry Bodin stated that there are projects that could fit into LCA, so while we are conducting that study we should look at the projects that have been approved to see which are appropriate for LCA.

The following options were mentioned to possibly alleviate this shortfall:

- Delete the proposed PPL13
- Review the O&M and Monitoring budgets for the fully funded PPL 1 – 8 “non cash flow” projects to reduce or eliminate O&M and Monitoring for those projects.
- Develop a methodology for selecting projects for future Phase II construction funding to ensure that the best and most cost effective projects are constructed.
- Recommend certain “high cost” projects for WRDA funding.
- Relegate CWPPRA’s future role to funding only Phase I E&D and transfer feasible projects to the LCA or other WRDA funding.
- Review all unconstructed projects (PPL 1-11) and develop a prioritized list for funding.

10. Agenda Item IX. Coastal Louisiana Land Loss changes: 1956-2000 and Projected Changes 2000-2050. Dr. Jimmy Johnston (USGS) presented the 1990 - 2000 Louisiana coastal land loss analysis using Thematic Mapper Satellite Imagery with 25 meter pixel resolution. That analysis indicated that land loss has declined from 34 mi²/yr (1978 - 1988/90) to a net loss of 10 mi²/yr (1990 - 2000). Dr. Johnston will send copies of the Powerpoint to all Technical Committee members. They are in the process of compiling this information into a report.

Dr. Johnston presented a regional overview, they are currently doing a more detailed analysis in the Caernarvon area (1 meter resolution) from 1990-2002 to see what has happened (working with DNR and the Corps). Mr. Rick Hartman indicated that at the FDT meeting last week, there was some discussion of putting together bullets for discussion (Jimmy said that this will be done). In addition, they are going back to 1870 historical lands maps under GOMP and LCA.

11. Agenda Item X. Additional Agenda Items. Dr. Bill Good announced that Mr. Bruce Lehto will be leaving the Committee as a representative from NRCS. His years of service were recognized by the committee members.

Dr. Bill Good introduced Honora Buras as the newest member of the oyster ad hoc committee.

Randy Hanchey asked Dr. Good to mention that we are getting a backlog of CWPPRA projects. He stressed that there would need to be some evaluation of the standards that are used to do these projects. Looking at the 2050 scores and cost for the PPL12 candidates, the two best projects were not selected. Robert Twilly’s model may provide a better way to screen projects in the future for CWPPRA.

Ms. Gay Browning brought up an additional agenda item concerning clarification of the baseline estimate. It is clear for Phase I, however, when agencies come back for Phase II approval, the cost may be more than the baseline. Which Phase II estimate do we use as the baseline (the 100%)? Is the baseline re-set (at 100%) when Phase II approved? Mr. Darryl Clark stated that he thinks maybe we should only go an extra 15%. We would have to make changes to SOP. On the other hand, there is still uncertainty, so there are arguments both ways. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that the good thing about cash flow is that you have a much better handle on Phase II cost. He suggested 10%. Mr. John Saia asked the Engineering Workgroup to look at this issue and come up with a proposal for presentation to the Technical Committee.

Ms. Browning also handed out information on LDNR's escrow requirement. There was a motion that the Technical Committee approve revising the SOP to eliminate the need for LDNR's contribution of funds to escrow accounts for LDNR-constructed projects. Mr. Bodin second. All voted in favor.

12. The meeting was adjourned after 2:00 pm.