

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 16 Jul 03 Technical Committee CWPPRA Meeting

1. Mr. John Saia opened the meeting at 9:40 am and all Technical Committee members introduced themselves. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

- Mr. John Saia, Chairman, COE
- Mr. Troy Hill, EPA
- Mr. Darryl Clark, FWS
- Mr. Rick Hartman, NMFS
- Mr. Britt Paul, NRCS
- Dr. Bill Good, LDNR

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

2. Agenda Item 1. Presentation of Prioritization of PPL1-12 Projects Not Approved for Construction (Monnerjahn and Roy). Mr. Chris Monnerjahn and Mr. Kevin Roy, Chairmen of the Engineering Workgroup and Environmental Workgroup, respectively, prepared the information on this agenda item. Mr. Monnerjahn went over the dates that the two workgroups met to come to a consensus on the prioritization ranking of the projects. He also posed two questions to the Technical Committee asking for: (1) direction on when to update individual project scores, and (2) direction on whether or not to develop scores for PPL13 projects. In addition to presenting a ranked list of the projects, Mr. Monnerjahn also handed out another spreadsheet that was put together to give the Technical Committee a feel for what projects could be built on the current list using the funds through the remainder of the program (FY09). The Technical Committee was cautioned that the spreadsheet did not take into account: PPL13 candidate projects that could be selected for Phase I funding, two complex projects (Diversion Below Empire (Ft. Jackson Sediment Diversion) and Central and East Terrebonne which have not been funded for Phase I as yet (combined cost of \$92.5M), other large projects which are not carrying a Phase II estimate (Myrtle Grove Diversion, Bayou Lafourche), and that the spreadsheet counted the Barataria Barrier Island project four times instead of two. The resulting spreadsheet showed a shaded area that the program would have enough funds to construct if the additional items listed were not added to the list of funding needs and if projects below the shaded area were not approved for construction. Currently, Mr. John Saia noted, this area falls below the Lake Boudreaux project (TE-32a).

Mr. John Saia opened the floor for comments/discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Rick Hartman reiterated that there was \$60M in redundant costs since all Barataria Barrier Island (BA-38) alternatives were included in the analysis of “available funds”. The Corps will update the spreadsheet to take this into account and forward to the Technical Committee members.

Mr. Troy Hill indicated that it would be helpful to include the anticipated construction start date on the spreadsheets in order to make it a more useful tool. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that this was why he asked for a cumulative cost – in his mind if a project falls within the shaded area of the graph, he’d vote yes to fund it.

Mr. Darryl Clark thanked the workgroups and indicated that there was a good consensus in the groups since there was disagreement only 5% of the time. He wanted to entertain accepting the scores “as is”, and that they be used as a guide, realizing that the Task Force will ultimately decide how to use the ranking.

Mr. John Saia opened the floor for comments from the public.

Mr. Randy Moertel, representing the M. O. Miller Estate, stated that he realized that the ranking is a tool and understands why it is being used. During the development of PPL#11, the South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration was picked as the number 1 project on the PPL in that process. Now, with the re-ranking, other PPL#11 projects are ranked above this project. He indicated that it took a lot of hard work to get the project to the point it was when it was voted first on PPL#11.

Mr. Rick Hartman rebutted that the project didn’t do well on the LCA criteria and this criteria wasn’t being taken into consideration during the PPL development. Projects that are built under CWPPRA should be supportive of the LCA plan. Mr. Britt Paul re-emphasized that the ranking is only a tool.

Mr. Bob Jones, representing Terrebonne Parish, stated that he had previously expressed his concerns about the criteria and wouldn’t reiterate. He stated that the parish is currently being asked to sign a land rights agreement, and now he is hearing that the project is not really authorized. One of the criteria that bothers him is “Implementability” since this is a critical factor on if a project can be constructed or not. He was glad to hear that the ranking will be used as a tool, because that means that decisions can be influenced.

Dr. Bill Good suggested that the word “tool” be used to replace the word “guide” in Mr. Clark’s suggested motion language (that the Technical Committee accept the scores as a guide).

DECISION: The revised motion language, suggested by Darryl Clark now reads: “that the Technical Committee accept the scores “as is” and that they be used as a tool”. Mr. Rick Hartman seconded. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

DECISION: The discussion continued in order to answer the workgroup's questions regarding when project rankings should be updated. After some discussion, a motion was presented by Mr. Rick Hartman that would require that the sponsoring agency present their suggested scoring at the 95% Design Review meeting for consensus among the agencies. It was understood that all agencies should have appropriate representation from the Environmental and Engineering Workgroups to allow the 95% Design Review to constitute workgroup review. The consensus score would then be presented as part of the Phase II package. Mr. Rick Hartman moved, Mr. Britt Paul seconded. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

DECISION: The discussion moved to the question regarding when the PPL13 projects should be ranked. Mr. Rick Hartman moved that the Environmental and Engineering Workgroups be tasked with taking PPL13, and all future PPLs, through the prioritization process as part of Phase 0 analysis. Mr. Troy Hill seconded. All members voted in favor. The motion passed.

3. Agenda Item 2. Presentation of the Results of Additional Analysis of Converting PPL1-8 OM&M to Cash Flow (LeBlanc). During the last Task Force meeting, the Technical Committee was tasked with providing more detailed information regarding operation, maintenance, and monitoring (OM&M) commitments to be retained in individual projects in lieu of being moved into cash flow. Ms. LeBlanc presented the compilation of data from all of the agencies in the form of a spreadsheet and short Powerpoint presentation.

Ms. LeBlanc noted that there was an additional \$2M obligated under OM&M since the Technical Committee reported to the Task Force in April 2003. Obligations will continue to accrue, and actual numbers that could be moved to cash flow will be smaller. The Corps anticipates that FY02 credits not yet included in the analysis (for the Corps, FWS, and EPA) and FY03 credits (all agencies) will increase the obligations. The presentation concluded that \$23.0M (\$6.8M for monitoring and \$16.2M for O&M) could be moved into cash flow (as of 12 Jun 03) if the Task Force made the decision to move OM&M for PPL1-8 projects into cash flow. Ms. LeBlanc ended her presentation by asking the Technical Committee if they believed that they should make a recommendation to the Task Force regarding if OM&M from PPL1-8 should be moved to cash flow.

Dr. Bill Good stated that he believed that the Technical Committee fulfilled what it was asked to do by the Task Force and that it would be presumptuous to make a recommendation to the Task Force on if the move to cash flow should take place.

Mr. Britt Paul recommended not converting OM&M for PPL1-8 projects to cash flow.

Mr. Rick Hartman stated that he would like to hear from LDNR and the Corps (as the banker of the program) on what they would prefer. Dr. Bill Good stated that he believed that we could achieve cash flow without amending cost sharing agreements. The Corps

previously commented that moving some projects into cash flow while leaving others as they are would create two accounting procedures for OM&M on these projects.

Mr. John Saia stated that the Corps would consult our attorneys on whether or not the cost sharing agreements would need to be amended in order to move funds into cash flow. This will be done before the August Task Force meeting.

Mr. Darryl Clark stated that they are generally in favor of moving the projects into cash flow. If the dollar figure is \$16.2M (not including the \$6.8M for monitoring), this would allow for two additional projects that could move to construction.

It was agreed that a similar Powerpoint presentation be presented to the Task Force at their August meeting. The Corps will update the spreadsheet to take into account additional obligations and FY02 and FY03 credits.

Mr. John Saia opened the floor for comments from the public. There were none.

4. Agenda Item 3. Request for Construction Approval for the Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project. Mr. Darryl Clark asked Ms. Martha Segura to present the information about the project. Following a brief description of the project, Ms. Segura stated that there were two notable issues related to the project. One is the fact that the cost estimate includes \$32,000 for oyster costs, but this is really an unknown cost because this project will be the first one that the state will implement under their new oyster policy. Dr. Good asked that Ms. Honora Buras comment on the status. Ms. Buras stated that they are currently finalizing the appraisal contract and stated that since the program is voluntary, she is not sure if they will be able to reach an agreement with the holder of the lease at this time.

Ms. Segura mentioned that the other issue relates to the fact that there was no cost included for removing any structures at the end of the project life (8 years). This would add an additional \$400,000 that is not included in the current project estimate.

Dr. Good made comments on both issues. Regarding the oyster issue, Dr. Good stated that they have no assurance from the oyster lessees that they will agree to a certain amount. This needs to be taken into account before construction is authorized. Regarding the removal issue, Dr. Good stated that before LDNR would agree to approve construction, he would want some assurance that the project included the financial capability to remove the structures.

Dr. Good requested contingent approval for the project, based upon: (a) written acceptance of compensation amount from lessees, and (b) that the budget reflect the anticipated removal cost. Ms. Segura stated that this additional cost may not put them over the 125%. Dr. Good stated that he didn't want to go into the contingency at this early date and would still like to see the removal cost included. It was asked if they would know the oyster costs before the Task Force meeting. Ms. Buras replied: No. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that no project can be constructed without having the landrights issues resolved, but the SOP doesn't require that we have all agreements signed before

asking for Task Force approval. Dr. Good stated that the SOP requires that we have the oyster lease appraisal done before approval is granted.

Mr. John Saia asked for comments from the public. There were none.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to approve the request, contingent upon successful oyster negotiations and inclusion of the removal cost in the estimate. Dr. Good added that the motion should include written acceptance from lessees of compensation offered. Mr. Troy Hill seconded the amended motion. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. Motion was approved.

5. Agenda Item 4. Request for Phase II Authorization for the Black Bayou Bypass Culverts Project (Paul). Mr. Britt Paul presented the information about the project. Mr. Paul presented the information and noted that the cost was under the original cost estimate. Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to approve, Mr. Darryl Clark seconded.

Mr. John Saia asked for any comments from the public.

Mr. Ted Joanen, representing Sweetlake Land and Oil, stated that they are in favor of the project. A primary concern in the Mermentau Basin is the timely removal of water. This project should help the situation tremendously and will abate erosion. It will also increase plant biodiversity and increase the land/water ratio. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that this project benefits two basins (Mermentau and Calcasieu/Sabine) by lowering the water level in the Mermentau and by providing freshwater into the Calcasieu/Sabine. In addition, it ranks 6th on the prioritization list.

DECISION: Mr. John Saia asked for a vote on the previously stated motion to approve recommendation of this project to the Task Force for Phase II funding approval. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. Motion was approved.

6. Agenda Item 5. Request for Phase II Authorization for the Little Lake Shoreline Protection/Dedicated Dredging near Round Lake (Hartman). Mr. Rick Hartman requested that Ms. Cheryl Brodnax present the information about the project. Ms. Brodnax presented the information and mentioned that the 95% design review was scheduled for 31 Jul 03 and that they have not yet submitted their permit application. She also stated that the estimated construction start date was in Spring 2004 and that there are 500 dredging days involved.

It was stated that the SOP requires 95% Design Review to be completed before the Task Force meeting, not the Technical Committee meeting. It will be completed by the Task Force meeting.

Mr. Troy Hill stated that later on the agenda there is a discussion about amending the SOP to allow quarterly Task Force approval and that we should try to consistently apply the requirements.

Dr. Bill Good stated that contingent approvals are of concern to the state as well. He hopes that if quarterly Task Force approval is allowed, it should do away with contingent approval requests in the future.

Mr. Darryl Clark also stated that they would not be delinquent if they had their permit application in by 14 Aug 03. In addition, he stated that there were initially 14 projects on the agenda asking for approval in Aug 03. The FWS and other agencies pulled their projects off the list because they didn't have all of the checklist items completed. Dr. Good agreed that we needed to tighten up.

Mr. Rick Hartman moved that the Technical Committee recommend approval of the project. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded.

Mr. John Saia asked for comments from the public.

Mr. Randy Moertel, representing the only landowner in the project area, spoke in support of the project. He stated that they have lost nearly 100 ft of shoreline in past storms and have lost even more from Tropical Storm Isidore and Hurricane Lili last year. He also mentioned that a British Petroleum pipeline will be put through Superior Canal and into Little Lake. This will include rearmoring the pipeline and the canal. This project will connect to this protection and is an example of the cooperative effort between government and industry. They are in favor of the project.

DECISION: Mr. Troy Hill asked for clarification from Rick on the motion: does it include a contingency upon the successful completion of 95% Design Review and submittal of the permit application? Rick confirmed that it did. Mr. John Saia asked for a vote. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. The motion was approved.

7. Agenda Item 6. Request to De-Authorize the Marsh Creation South of Leeville Project (Hill). Mr. Troy Hill stated that they are requesting that de-authorization of this project be recommended to the Task Force.

Mr. John Saia asked if there were any comments from the public. There were none.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to recommend de-authorization to the Task Force. Mr. Britt Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. The motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 7. Planning Budget (Browning). Ms. Browning stated that the FY04 planning budget would need to be developed for final approval by the Task Force in October 2003. She stated that a few items needed to be discussed so that agencies could start developing their budget. Ms. Browning noted three items: (1) will there be a PPL14, (2) will there be supplemental tasks, and (3) will CWPPRA fund Federal agency participation for LCA. She also stated that in recent years we have dipped into the

surplus funds and have approximately \$454K in surplus over the \$5M that we will receive in FY04.

Mr. Britt Paul stated that he was glad to see that the Corps supports funding LCA tasks out of CWPPRA. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that they are looking for a list of tasks outlining what the agencies will be expected to do in FY04 for LCA. He stressed that this was needed before going forward with development of the budget. Ms. Julie LeBlanc indicated that the LCA manager was aware of this and she ensured the agencies that this would be provided. Ms. LeBlanc also indicated that additional funding would be forthcoming from LCA when additional tasks are outlined. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that the FWS Coordination Act requires a report as part of the feasibility study. He also wants clarification on what the agencies will be asked to do.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked if the Technical Committee wanted to use the \$100K from last year's budget as a placeholder. All agreed.

Regarding the development of a 14th PPL, Mr. Darryl Clark remarked that some agencies didn't want to have a 13th list, much less a 14th list. Mr. Britt Paul and Dr. Bill Good agreed that the Technical Committee should request guidance from the Task Force at the August meeting. This will be included as an agenda item for the August Task Force meeting.

Mr. Troy Hill reiterated that there is an impression (as previously stated by Mr. Bob Jones, Terrebonne Parish) that we are required to develop an annual list. Dr. Good stated that there was a requirement for PPLs 1-3 and the development of a comprehensive plan, but not beyond. However, others read it differently. A decision on if we are legally required to do a yearly list is needed (it was noted after the meeting that this was previously done). The Corps will provide this information to the Task Force and Technical Committee.

Mr. John Saia stated that an additional benefit of continuing to do lists is how it related to LCA. As we proceed with LCA, development of an annual list allows us to maintain the momentum, in addition, some projects developed under CWPPRA could be implemented under LCA.

Mr. Darryl Clark asked that each agency review the supplemental and miscellaneous tasks from previous years to determine if all needed to be funded in FY04.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked Ms. Gay Browning to send out an electronic copy so that they agencies could start developing their budgets. The group decided to assume a PPL14 similar in scope to PPL13 until further guidance is received from the Task Force.

Mr. John Saia summarized the discussion: (1) that the Technical Committee prepare a presentation on the plusses and minuses on development of a 14th PPL, (2) that the assumption is that CWPPRA will fund some LCA participation, and (3) that the agencies should review the supplemental activities for appropriateness.

Dr. Bill Good handed out an updated draft on the Storm Response Plan to be considered in the FY04 planning budget. He explained that the funding is needed to assess damage after storm events. LDNR has asked for comments from the appropriate folks at the agencies. Comments should be provided to Garrett Broussard. Mr. Darryl Clark indicated that they had some minor comments to provide.

Mr. John Saia asked for comments from the public.

Mr. Bob Jones, representing Terrebonne Parish, stated that they have already begun expending funds to develop potential projects for PPL14 and would appreciate notification of any decision concerning PPL14 development so that they could cease activities if necessary.

Ms. Gay Browning confirmed that she would need a draft budget submittal by mid September 2003. Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that the details could be covered with a P&E meeting. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed. Dr. Bill Good asked the following LDNR personnel be informed of the budget proceedings: Phil Pittman, Diane Smith, Chet Fruge, and himself.

Mr. O'Neil Marlborough asked if the decision on whether or not to develop a 14th PPL would be decided at the August Task Force meeting. The answer was yes.

9. Agenda Item 8. Proposed CWPPRA SOP Amendments (Good, Monnerjahn, and Clark). Mr. John Saia stated that there were three items up for consideration under this agenda item: (a) OMRR&R language in SOP, (b) clarification of base cost estimate in SOP, and (c) consideration of a recommendation to the Task Force to modify the SOP to include funding approvals at any quarterly Task Force meeting.

(a) OMRR&R language in SOP. Dr. Bill Good indicated that this issue is requested to appease the Corps' attorneys. The change involves replacing "OMRR&R" with "Project Operations and Schedule Manual", applicable to the Corps only.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman moved to accept the recommended changes, Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. The motion was approved.

(b) Clarification of base cost estimate in SOP. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn referenced the Technical Committee meeting in January in which it was agreed that the Corps would develop recommended changes to the SOP language to clarify the funding cap for cash flow and non-cash flow projects, for review and approval by the Technical Committee. Mr. Monnerjahn stated that the Corps received comments on our suggested language from Mr. Darryl Clark in an effort to be more concise, however, the Corps still would like to use our proposed language. Mr. Darryl Clark indicated that he didn't object to our language.

DECISION: Mr. Britt Paul moved that we accept the language as submitted by the Corps. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. The motion passed.

(c) Consideration of a recommendation to the Task Force to modify the SOP to include funding approvals at any quarterly Task Force meeting. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that the Technical Committee had previously discussed this issue. He recommends that the Technical Committee ask the Task Force to consider approving Phase II approvals at any Task Force meeting (currently the SOP states that approval can be requested at January and August meetings, with the exception of demos and PPL1-8 construction authorizations that can be requested at any Task Force meeting).

DECISION: Mr. Clark made the following motion: “that the Technical Committee recommends that the Task Force allow Phase II construction approvals at any Task Force meeting”. Dr. Bill Good seconded, with the revision that the wording be changed to “that the Technical Committee recommends that the Task Force allow Phase II construction approvals at any regularly scheduled quarterly Task Force meeting”. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. The motion was approved. This item will be included on the 14 Aug 03 Task Force meeting agenda for decision by the Task Force.

The Corps will incorporate the SOP changes approved in items (a) and (b) and provide to the Technical Committee via email for review. Changes related to item (c) may be incorporated at a later date, pending a final decision from the Task Force.

10. Agenda Item 9. Presentation of Execution Plan for CRMS (Steyer). Mr. Greg Steyer reminded the Technical Committee that the Task Force approved CRMS as submitted (in April 2003), contingent upon the development of an execution plan for presentation at the August Task Force meeting. He stated that the Execution Plan provided to the committee is an addendum to the previous plan. Mr. Steyer recommended that the identified monitoring funds for PPL1-8 projects not be moved into cash flow, but remain with the project. However, if the Task Force decides to move these funds into cash flow, he would ask that they be used to fund CRMS. He recommended that the Task Force, in addition to the \$6,795,926 identified in Ms. LeBlanc’s spreadsheet for FY04-06 for CRMS, approve additional funding in the amount of \$5,611,580 (for a total of \$12,407,506). This funding includes needed funding through FY06.

Mr. Steyer mentioned that they plan to use existing cost sharing agreements for PPL 1-8 projects, but some funds will be project-specific and some will be CRMS. He mentioned that for PPLs 9-12 projects that are currently in Phase II (signed CSAs) will continue to fund CRMS under that existing CSA until an amendment is required to request funds beyond initial construction and 3 years of OM&M. When the CSA is amended, CRMS will be taken out of the project and put into a CRMS project, to be cost shared between the Corps and LDNR. For those PPL 9-12 projects that have not yet moved to Phase II, all CRMS funding will be included in separate CRMS project. Ms. Gay Browning asked for a clarification on any PPL 9-12 projects that have written CSAs for the entire 20 years

of OM&M. Mr. Steyer indicated that these CSAs will be amended up front to move the CRMS out of the project.

Mr. Darryl Clark that there is no action required by the Technical Committee because the Task Force had already approved CRMS. Dr. Good asked if the committee would recommend that the Task Force accept the plan and fund the requested money. Mr. John Saia stated that there was general consensus and it would be presented to the Task Force as such.

Mr. John Saia asked if CRMS would need to have accelerated funding in order to meet the goals of LCA. Mr. Steyer stated that they could not spend dollars on a quicker timeline and this funding schedule assumes that they get up and running as quick as possible. He also mentioned that the wetland-related monitoring will meet the needs of LCA. They are adding water-related monitoring under LCA.

Dr. Bill Good recognized that the program can fill the needs of CWPPRA, LCA, Caernarvon, and Davis Pond so that there is a seamless picture of the coast. Cost sharing can come from various sources.

11. Agenda Item 10. Jonathan Davis Wetland Restoration Project – Construction Unit 4 Revised WVA (Paul). Mr. Britt Paul requested that Mr. Quin Kinler present the results of the WVA. Mr. Kinler stated that 3 construction units had already been completed (\$12.4M), and he described the last unit and the WVA revisions.

Dr. Good stated that this is a good project because it plays a role in maintaining the landbridge.

Mr. Rick Hartman stated that he believes that the project is a good standalone project, but, he doesn't see it as an integral part of the landbridge. He believes that the section at the Harvey Canal and Rigolettes does this. He stated that the project has merit, but, it would be hard for him to support it because it didn't fare well on the prioritization. There was some discussion about the specific scores and the fact that there was disagreement between the workgroups concerning the project's feasibility.

Mr. Troy Hill stated that it would be helpful to know what projects are coming up for approval in January 2004 and stated that it would be useful to have this in the ranking spreadsheet as well as the construction start date discussed previously. Ms. Gay Browning read off a list of 24 projects that are scheduled to request Phase II funds in January 2004. If all projects come forward in January 2004, we will be nearly \$300M in the hole.

Mr. Britt Paul moved that the Technical Committee approve the request for funding, Dr. Bill Good seconded.

Mr. John Saia asked for comments from the public.

Mr. O'Neil Marlborough, representing Jefferson Parish, stated that they supported the project 11 years ago as a critical part of their program. He questioned the score of 5.3 on "Area of Need", given the fact that the project is in the proximity of the Town of Jean Lafitte.

Mr. Rick Hartman stated that there are \$60M of Barataria landbridge projects that need to be funded, and asked O'Neil if this was the most critical to the Parish. O'Neil said that he sees it all as part of the landbridge, so he wants it all since it is as critical as the rest of the landbridge projects.

Mr. Skip Haller, a landowner representative, said that they lost quite a bit of land and delaying the project any further will only compound the land loss.

Mr. Bob Jones, representing Terrebonne Parish, stated that if this project were approved today, then Lake Boudreaux (the last project in the shaded area) would drop off the list. This was why they were against creating the list in the first place. However, if Jonathan Davis gets funded (below the shaded area), then he is hearing that there is room to persuade the Task Force to fund projects lower on the list. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that as projects get approved, there will be more projects that cannot be built. Mr. Bob Jones stated that he hoped in January that projects below the shaded area will be given consideration.

Dr. Bill Good stated that he would vote for the project because: (a) it is part of the landbridge, (b) Barataria Basin has the highest land loss in the state, (c) if we don't do it now, once it is gone we will not be able to afford to put it back, and (d) he disagrees with the ranking score that the project received. Mr. Quin Kinler stated that the project was near the cutoff point for a higher score on "Cost Effectiveness".

DECISION: Mr. John Saia called for a vote on the previously mentioned motion to recommend approval to the Task Force for funding. Dr. Bill Good, Mr. Darryl Clark, Mr. Rick Hartman, and Mr. Britt Paul voted "yes". Mr. Troy Hill voted "no". The motion was approved.

12. Agenda Item 11, PPL13 Demonstration Projects (Monnerjahn). Mr. Chris Monnerjahn announced that demonstration project fact sheets are due in to the Engineering Workgroup by 1 Aug 03. He reminded everyone that the demo should not be site specific and should have a coastwide application. He also mentioned that the Task Force stated that they MAY fund one demo with a suggested dollar limit of \$1M.

Mr. Rick Hartman stated that if the demonstration project isn't something entirely new with a whole lot of promise, he would vote "no" for a demonstration project under PPL13.

Mr. Darryl Clark reiterated that demonstration projects should not be site specific and that the Engineering Workgroup could choose a different location, if appropriate.

13. Agenda Item 12. LCA Update – Public Meetings and Schedule (LeBlanc). Ms. Julie LeBlanc presented information regarding the LCA schedule, including upcoming public meetings and stakeholder meetings.

14. Agenda Item 13. Dates and Locations of Upcoming CWPPRA Administrative Meetings (LeBlanc). Ms. Julie LeBlanc announced that the list of upcoming meeting dates was shown in the agenda and that the next CWPPRA meeting would be the 14 Aug 03 Task Force meeting in New Orleans.

15. Agenda Item 14. Additional Agenda Items.

Mr. John Saia asked if there were any additional agenda items.

(a) Mr. Scott Wilson announced the dedication on 15 Aug 03 for four CWPPRA projects and the groundbreaking for one: Holly Beach Sand Management (NRCS), Humble Canal Hydrologic Restoration (NRCS), Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (NMFS), Pecan Island Terracing (NMFS), and Grand-White Lakes Landbridge Protection (FWS), respectively.

The dedication will be at the Apache Louisiana Mineral Property in Cameron Parish, starting at 10:00 am. The invitations went out today. It is his understanding that Senator Breaux has agreed to be the Master of Ceremonies.

(b) Mr. Rick Hartman stated that NMFS would like to use some of the O&M “removal” funds to perform O&M on the Lake Salvador Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project and asked Ms. Cheryl Brodnax to explain. Ms. Brodnax explained that the demonstration project consisted of two phases: (1) demonstration of 5 structure types on Lake Salvador, and (2) 9,000 linear feet of rock on south part of Lake Salvador. The project cost included O&M costs to demolish the 5 structures. This work was completed last month. NMFS would like to use the \$200,000 remaining in the budget for the previous demolition to redress the rock structure in discussed under item 2. She showed a picture of what a majority of the 9,000 linear feet of rock dike looked like and another picture of what 1,700 linear feet of the project looked like (under water). In addition, they will also tie into a state/parish project in the area to save on construction costs (reduced mobilization).

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to approve the requested transfer on this project. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor. The motion was approved.

Mr. Saia asked for any additional comments from the public. There were none.

16. Motion to Adjourn. Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:30 p.m.