

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 26 Mar 03 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. 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 A. Selection of Eight (8) Projects to Evaluate for PPL13. Mr. John Saia stated that Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings were held in each coastal region in February 2003. During these meetings, projects were nominated (maximum of 2 per each of the 9 hydrologic basins). Mr. John Saia noted that there were a total of 17 nominees under consideration. The Technical Committee will select 8 candidate projects for further analysis. He stated that each agency has eight weighted votes. The votes will be first ranked by consensus vote. The weighted vote will be used to break any ties.

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn presented a Powerpoint presentation outlining each of the 17 nominees. Technical Committee members were allowed to ask questions during the presentation, however, Mr. Saia asked that the public comments be held until after the presentation.

Technical Committee comments during Mr. Monnerjahn's presentation:

Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection: Dr. Bill Good stated that LDNR has some concerns about the wave energy in this area, and were unsure if the plantings would survive.

Lake Lery Shoreline Protection: Mr. Rick Hartman stated that he saw a flurry of emails stating that the public was not in support of this project. Mr. Monnerjahn confirmed this, but stated that since the RPT meetings had concluded, it was not officially taken off the list.

Caernarvon Outfall Management East: Mr. Rick Hartman asked where the siphon would be located. Mr. Monnerjahn indicated that it would pull water out of the outflow canal and into the two possible conveyance channels. Mr. Hartman asked: As head of the Engineering Workgroup, do you think there will be enough head to move the water

through an inverted siphon? Mr. Monnerjahn stated that this wasn't explored yet, but a small pump could be added if needed. Dr. Good stated that any flows that go to the east would allow additional flow to be put through the structure. Mr. Monnerjahn agreed and stated that it was assumed that the flow through the structure would have to be increased.

Naomi Siphon Sediment Enrichment: Mr. Rick Hartman asked if there was a single point discharge along the outfall canal. Mr. Monnerjahn answered: Yes. Mr. Troy Hill stated that the discharge would be either in or out of the canal. The major concern is getting the sediment out of the canal without causing a maintenance issue.

Black Bayou Hydrologic Restoration, Phase II. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that he had spoken to the sponsoring agency (NMFS) and that they agreed that the stabilization may not be necessary and that they would be willing to remove portions of it should the project make the candidate list.

Following the Technical Committee comments, Mr. Saia recognized officials in the audience. Recognized officials included: Mr. Benny Rousselle, President, Plaquemines Parish; Mr. Henry J. Rodriguez, Councilman, St. Bernard Parish; and Mr. Ted Falgout, Port Director, Port Fourchon. Mr. Paul Naquin, Councilman, St. Mary's Parish, was also recognized.

Mr. Saia asked for public comments:

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish, indicated that the parish supports the Goose Point project. In answer to Dr. Good's concerns on the plantings, he stated that the parish has previously looked at armoring the shore and determined that it was overkill. He believes that plantings would work.

Mr. Julio Mayorga, St. Bernard Parish, stated that the parish supports the Bayou Bienvenue project. This is their number one priority, for reasons of safety and lives.

Mr. Henry Jr. Rodriguez, St. Bernard Parish, stated that he agreed with Julio. The projects for the other parishes are all good, and he doesn't like that they have to compete against them. There is very little left on the bank on the north side of the GIWW. He stated that we have to consider the 70,000 people in St. Bernard and 60,000 in the Lower Ninth Ward. He commented that the Caernarvon project needs more work (doesn't agree with cost).

Mr. O'Neil Marlborough, representing Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of the Naomi Siphon Sediment Enrichment project. He indicated that the outfall area came up as an area of need in the previous PPL process. This project would give us a hands-on experience on how to do this. There were concerns in the Engineering Workgroup about being able to move the sediment in the outfall area, he feels that this risk isn't warranted.

Mr. Rick Hartman stated that he was told that the Corps has a CWPPRA demonstration project that is looking at the Naomi Siphon. Mr. Monnerjahn answered in the

affirmative, and stated that the project is entitled *Periodic Introduction of Sediments and Nutrients*. Mr. Monnerjahn stated that the Corps is currently looking at the Naomi Siphon for this demo. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that if the Corps is looking at this as a demonstration, is it possible that the demo project would demonstrate moving the sediment in the outfall area as well. Mr. Marlborough stated that he wasn't sure when the demonstration was approved, but, the parish was not aware of it and has not be part of the discussions. He stated that we need to move it forward and get it underway.

Ms. Jenneke Visser wanted to reiterate O'Neil's comments. We need to get sediments on the ground. The cost of the project ranges from \$10-15M, and a demonstration is typically \$2M. Can this project be done under a \$2M demonstration? The PPL13 project is a full-fledged project over 20 years, and not a one-time event.

Mr. Henry Haller (Skip) emphasized the use of sediment and what it does to the marsh. He is 100% in support of the project.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that the Naomi project is their #1 project on this list. She doesn't want it to be held up due to the demonstration project. This is the first that she has heard that the demo is looking at this site. The Barataria Basin has the most rapid rates of erosion.

President Benny Rousselle, Plaquemines Parish, supports the Shell Island project. He stated that all of the projects that you have heard about will do us no good if there isn't a plug at the bottom of the basin. When the brown marsh die off happened, you found out that the saltwater came in because there wasn't any barrier island to keep it out. He wants to see action on this and the Red/Spanish Pass project as well.

Ms. Heather Finley, LWLF, stated that the agency supports the Tom's Bayou project. They support the Whiskey Island Back Barrier Fill project as well.

Mr. Henry Julius, Winfield Hunter, supports the Spanish Pass and Red Pass project. They have been working with Plaquemines Parish on this project. Spanish/Red Pass were natural distributaries of the Mississippi River (closed off 40 years ago). Thirty years ago there was a cypress swamp where there is now open water. ROWs should be available since they are natural distributaries. He feels that the project could be built quickly.

Mr. Bob Jones, Terrebonne Parish Govt, supports the Havoline Canal and Whiskey Back Barrier projects. While they recognize that in it's (Havoline Canal project) reconfigured shape it is no longer in Terrebonne, they still support the project because it is restoring a barrier island. Terrebonne Parish government is strongly supportive. There is evidence from the differences in the waves in front of and behind the barrier islands from recent storms that barrier islands offer protection to bays and marshes. The projects will work synergistically with other projects. The sand source will be determined in New Cut and Whiskey Island Flank projects currently underway.

Mr. Ted Falgout, Port Director Port Fourchon and Lafourche Parish CZAC Chair, was supportive of dedicated dredging of Havoline Canal. The system is rapidly deteriorating. Both parishes and St. Mary Parish support the project as their number one project in the basin. He anticipates a Corps WRDA project to follow in order to keep nourishing the CWPPRA project. This would provide an evacuation route for vessels to get out of HNC.

Mr. Paul Naquin, Parish Councilman at St. Mary's Parish, wholeheartedly supports the Bayou Sale Ridge project. In the last 20 years, there has been erosion on the Bayou Sale Ridge. During Hurricane Lili, there was a 13-foot surge which overtopped the Corps hurricane protection levee. If we don't do anything, this marshland will go away and the bay will be against their protection levee.

Dr. Andre Cenac stated that he was the original proponent of the Plumb Island Point project. There has been damage in the area from recent hurricanes. It is an easy problem to fix (with plugs). We need to stop the coastal wave surges so that the marsh can restore itself.

Mr. O'Neil Marlborough, representing Coastal Engineering and Environmental Consultants, Inc., stated that the Bayou Sale project was submitted under PPL12 and was part of the identified "area of need".

Mr. Carol Vining, Director of Planning for St Mary's Parish, supports the Bayou Sale project.

Mr. Randy Moertel, representing Vermilion Parish, McIlhenny Corporation, and Sherrill Segrera, spoke in support of the Tom's Bayou project. He stated that past terracing has been very successful in the Little Vermilion Bay area. We must also protect the peninsula south of Indian Point.

Mr. Tom Hess, LDWF, stated that the department wants to go on record supporting the Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Protection project. They have earmarked \$2M to do work at the Joseph's Harbor shoreline, and the projects would compliment each other.

Mr. Randy Moertel, representing the Vermilion Parish Police Jury, indicated that the Freshwater Bayou Canal nominee would be a continuation of projects authorized under CWPPRA to protect the Mermentau Basin.

David Jones, representing the landowners of "Long Beach", stated that he made a presentation for a demonstration project at the Region 4 RPT meeting. The project would be a demonstration of the use of geotubes. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that we will not be selecting demos at this meeting, we will have until August 1st to submit them. The Technical Committee will recommend approval of demonstrations in December of this year. Mr. Jones suggested using ash and concrete and filling the geotubes on-land. They will be semi-permanent when in place.

Mr. Saia mentioned letters that we received in support of PPL13 nominees:

- Congressman Tauzin in support of Havoline Canal project
- Apache Corporation in support of Oyster Bayou Terracing project
- William Andre Senac in support of Hydrologic Restoration of Plumb Island

Following public comments, all agencies voted (8 weighted votes). The ranking of the projects was based upon consensus of the agencies (number of votes). Ties were broken using the weighted vote that was cast. The final tally for the 8 PPL13 candidate projects is included as **Encl 2**.

3. Agenda Item B. Fort Jackson Complex Study. The request for Technical Committee approval for Phase I will be deferred to a future meeting.

4. Agenda Item C. Request for Construction Approval (pre-cash flow) for Sediment Trapping at the Jaws Project. Mr. John Foret, NMFS, made a presentation to request construction approval. All SOP requirements have been completed. Total project cost is \$3,392,135, and the project will create 1,760 acres. St. Mary Parish Councilman, Paul Naquin, asked if the project involved deepening the mouth of the Jaws. NMFS answered: No.

The motion to recommend construction approval was made by Dr. Bill Good. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Agenda Item D. Request for Construction Approval (pre-cash flow) for Hopedale Hydrologic Restoration Project. Ms. Rachel Sweeney, NMFS, made a presentation to request construction approval. She indicated that 11 of the SOP requirements have been completed. The project will rehabilitate a water control structure at a total cost of \$1,562,000 (72% of the original project cost with 79% of the total project benefits).

The motion to recommend construction approval was made by Mr. Troy Hill. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Agenda Item E. Request for Deauthorization of Bayou L'Ours Project. Mr. Saia stated that letters indicating imminent de-authorization were sent to state and local elected officials in the affected area of Lafourche Parish. No responses were received. The project will be formally recommended for de-authorization at the April 16th Task Force meeting.

7. Agenda Item F. Engineering Workgroup Recommendation on Phase II Baseline Estimate. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn presented a Powerpoint presentation on the background information regarding the baseline cost estimate and the Engineering Workgroup's recommendations. The Engineering Workgroup's recommendations are: (1) the most current Phase II estimate should be used as the baseline estimate (developed during Phase

I), and (2) there is no basis to change the currently allowable 25% cap above the baseline estimate (before additional Task Force approval is required).

Mr. Britt Paul made a motion that the Technical Committee accept the recommendation. Mr. Troy Hill or Dr. Bill Good seconded. All vote in favor.

8. Agenda Item G. Moving PPL1-8 Projects into Cash Flow. Ms. Julie LeBlanc made a presentation on the steps necessary to move PPL1-8 projects into cash flow (issues, pros, and cons).

Comments from the public:

Mr. O’Neil Marlborough asked if the Task Force has already agreed to do this. Mr. John Saia stated that the Task Force hasn’t yet made a determination, but has asked the Technical Committee for a recommendation on how to proceed. Mr. Marlborough stated that budgeting is for 3 years on OM&M, therefore, PPL1-8 projects would have to compete against annual construction starts. In essence, we are talking about having to prioritize already-built PPL1-8 projects yearly. In his view, the locals had a commitment to funding 20 years of OM&M.

Mr. Mark Davis, Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana, stated that they believe that the move toward expansion of the cash flow management approach makes sound sense. It is a question of how we do it. The fact that we have \$55M of funds sitting there dedicated to work that could be 20 years out is a problem. It makes it difficult to explain that we are applying our resources in the best way possible. He believes that OM&M should be funded on a longer period (not 20 years, but more than one year). It is important not to commit the funds out for 20 years, without breaking our commitment to the community. He believes that revisiting projects on PPL1-8 is appropriate.

Dr. Bill Good reiterated that the first issue is to take the PPL1-8 CSAs and establish a rolling fund that will fund the projects in 3-year increments. When our folks go to Washington to ask for more money, the fact that we have funds tied up is an issue.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, asked if they could provide written comments. Mr. John Saia then suggested that the committee wait for comments and then make a decision prior to the Task Force meeting. She would like a handout (and was provided one). Mr. Rick Hartman stated that he was not sure that they needed a motion, since we have done what the Task Force has asked for already: we have identified the process and have laid out the issues. Comments from the public will be provided to the Task Force along with the process developed by the Technical Committee.

9. Agenda Item H. Prioritization Process for Future PPL1-12 Phase II Authorization.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc made a presentation on the draft criteria. Mr. Rick Hartman discussed the fact that we have received comments from one Task Force member (Mr. Dave Frugé). Mr. Frugé had two big comments (on the “Implementability” and “Sustainability of Benefits”). Mr. Rick Hartman will make editorial changes and coordinate with Dr. Shea

Penland on certainty of benefits for shoreline protection and barrier island projects. The revised draft criteria will be circulated to the Technical Committee members and will be finalized via email prior to the April Task Force meeting.

Mr. O’Neil Marlborough stated that we knew that some projects were beyond the CWPPRA funding limits. Has anyone pulled these projects costs off the list? Ms. Gay Browning mentioned that Myrtle Grove is not carrying a Phase II estimate (and is therefore not included in the \$400M projected shortfall). In addition, other projects were reduced to no more than \$50M in cost.

10. Agenda Item J. Request to Separate the South Lake DeCade Project into 2 Units.

Mr. Britt Paul stated that information was sent through the Engineering/Environmental Workgroups last week. Mr. Rick Hartman asked if the project initially included freshwater introduction. Mr. Britt Paul replied in the affirmative. Mr. Britt Paul stated that there is consensus that they can build the shoreline protection part of the project and reduce salinity. NRCS wanted to make sure that everyone is aware that it will be broken into 2 units, and they will come in for construction funding as 2 units. Mr. Britt Paul stated that they know that they need to further investigate the freshwater diversion portion of the project, and don’t want to hold off on doing the work that they know they can do upfront. Mr. Darryl Clark mentioned that the FWS supports keeping both units together and that the freshwater introduction component was needed. He also mentioned that Lake DeCade has a shoreline levee surrounding it. This is not a natural condition of an estuarine lake. He stated that the freshwater introduction components are ecological features to help the lake function better. Mr. Rick Hartman also made comments in support of the freshwater introduction features. Dr. Bill Good stated that there are still some concerns about the freshwater diversion portion of the project, however, he sees these two projects as separable elements and both could function as separate projects.

Dr. Good moved that the Technical Committee accept the request. Mr. Britt Paul seconded. A tally of voting follows:

- Mr. Darryl Clark, FWS, abstained
- Mr. Rick Hartman, NMFS, abstained
- Mr. Troy Hill, EPA, voted yes
- Mr. John Saia, as Chairman, abstained

The motion passed by a vote of 3-0.

11. Item K. Request for Additional Funds to Complete the Construction of the Jonathan Davis Project.

Mr. Britt Paul, NRCS, stated that additional funds are needed to complete construction of the project, based on test sections and request from the landowner for a re-alignment. The fully funded cost is \$14.4M. Mr. Rick Hartman recommends that the Environmental/Engineering Workgroups redo the WVA analysis and cost effectiveness. Mr. Britt Paul stated that the project did not go through the WVA evaluation as separable elements. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that another idea is to include this project in the prioritization process as a separate project since there is a 600% increase over original

project cost of \$4.5M. The SOP requires that the Environmental Workgroup review and report on cost effectiveness, or redo the WVA when large changes are made in project features. Mr. Britt Paul stated that NRCS will run it back through the Environmental/Engineering Workgroups.

Mr. O'Neil Marlborough, on behalf of Jefferson Parish, asked for the Technical Committee's support of this project. This project was approved in PPL2. There is another project on PPL4 that addressed this area. The PPL4 project has subsequently been de-authorized.

12. Item I, Presentation to Introduce Two Draft Publications by LSU Ag Center and LA Sea Grant. Mr. Rex Caffey presented two publications to the Technical Committee. He stated that the packets in the Technical Committee books are draft and have not been released to the public. He would like to get comments in the next few weeks. The first is a comparison of the Florida Everglades versus the Louisiana coast. The second is a comparison between the cost effectiveness of CWPPRA and the private lands programs.

13. Agenda Item L. Review of SOP Changes and Procedures for Tracking of Future Modifications. Dr. Bill Good suggested that we defer this discussion to a working meeting or the next Technical Committee meeting. He asked that the TC members read through the changes to the SOP before the meeting. He believes that many issues can be handled quickly via email. His recommendation is to go through all recommended changes and have a Technical Committee decision to accept revisions (or defer to Task Force, as appropriate) and end up with a clean set of SOPs (not red-lined).

Dr. Good briefly outlined the 4 motions he proposes:

Motion 1: Editorial in nature.

Motion 2: Committee structure. Only Task Force and Technical Committee chairs should remain constant. Other chairs should be appointed by the Technical Committee, taking into consideration changes in personnel at the various agencies. He is not suggesting any changes to the chairmanships at this time.

Motion 3: Change in policy. Phase II construction approval at all quarterly meetings.

Motion 4: Change in policy. Suggest that we roll OM&M cash flow into one MOA (between the Corps and LDNR) to be sent to LDNR per OM&M.

Mr. Darryl Clark suggested that a working level meeting would be good. He is okay with going along with Motions 1, 2, and 3 with some editorial changes. Mr. Darryl Clark passed around his response to Dr. Good's suggested changes. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that NMFS would probably have some problems with Motions 3 and 4. He agrees with having further discussion at a future date. It was agreed that a working meeting would be scheduled in the near future.

14. Agenda Item N. Additional Agenda Items. In other business, Dr. Good discussed a proposed resolution for the Task Force concerning oysters. He referenced the report from

the Oyster Ad Hoc Committee with respect to a proposed oyster lease acquisition process.

Mr. Britt Paul noted that we did not designate agencies to work on the candidate projects. It was agreed that this would be done informally after the meeting. For the record, the agencies designated to continue Phase 0 investigations for the 8 candidate projects are shown below:

Spanish Pass	COE
Goose Point	FWS
Whiskey Island	EPA
Oyster Bayou	NMFS
Bayou Sale Ridge	NRCS
Shark Island	NMFS
Naomi Siphon	EPA
Caernarvon	COE

15. Motion to Adjourn. Motion was made and seconded. All agreed. Meeting adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.