

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 16 December 04 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. John Saia opened the meeting at 9:35 a.m. and announced his retirement from the Corps at the end of 2004. He announced that the Breaux Act had been extended until 2019, making it a 30-year program. Mr. Saia introduced Mr. Tom Podany as the interim Technical Committee Chairman. The Technical Committee applauded and thanked Mr. Saia for his work. Mr. Saia then excused himself from the meeting. The remaining Technical Committee members introduced themselves. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Mr. John Saia, Chairman, Corps of Engineers (COE), leaving after introductions
Mr. Tom Podany, interim Chairman (replacing Mr. John Saia)
Mr. Britt Paul, NRCS, Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS)
Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)
Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Mr. Gerry Duszynski, Louisiana Department of Natural Resource (LDNR)
Mr. Wes McQuiddy, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), substituting for Sharon Parish

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

2. Mr. Tom Podany went over the agenda. There was a discussion as to which item should be handled first and the agenda order was reorganized. It was agreed that Ms. Julie LeBlanc would discuss the funding first and then the committee would move on to hear Agenda Items 2 and 4 respectively prior to considering a Phase I funding recommendation for PPL14.

3. Ms. Julie LeBlanc reviewed the amount of money available. The previously expected FY 05 dollar amount was \$57 million, but the number was recently updated by the Department of Interior to be \$53.05 million. If the Technical Committee were to take action on Agenda Item 2 (limiting funding for Phase I of projects to the current estimate) and the Task Force were to subsequently approve the action, an additional \$839,000 in Federal funding would be required. This would result in a total unencumbered amount of \$4.1 million. If the Technical Committee does not make the recommendation on Agenda Item 2, there would be another discretionary \$10 million that agencies could request with Technical Committee or Task Force approval to raise the Phase I cost of projects to the 125% level. The de-authorization of the Leeville project would make the total available for PPL14 Phase I \$5.1 million.

4. Agenda Item 2. Decision: Recommendation to Restrict Phase I Budgets for Ongoing Projects to a Cap of 100% (Including Contingency) (Podany). Mr. Podany stated that the committee should make programs consistent, which includes capping the Phase I costs of some older projects. This will help make funding available for other projects. Ms. Julie LeBlanc then discussed the information in the binders regarding Phase I budgets. The current estimated sum for all Phase I of projects listed is \$69.9 million, but the required estimate is \$70.9 million. The difference between the figures equates to the Federal amount increase of \$839,000. Without

Technical Committee and Task Force action on this agenda item, agencies could request an additional \$10 million from the Corps without further approval.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark stated that FWS would be fine with the 100 percent cap except for one project where they may go over because of some modeling that was not budgeted for at the beginning of the project. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that all agencies submitted their required amounts to the Corps.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman make a motion to approve the recommendation to limit Phase I budgets for the listed projects to the column entitled “Phase I Required Amount”. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

5. Agenda Item 4. Discussion: Briefing on the Status of De-authorization of the Marsh Creation South of Leeville Project (BA-29) (McQuiddy). Mr. Tom Podany said that this project has been in the de-authorization process for some time and there has been quite a bit of public information distributed prior to this meeting. Mr. Podany asked Mr. Wes McQuiddy to brief the committee further on the matter. Mr. Wes McQuiddy could not supply the committee with the exact amount of money that could be returned, but he believed that it would be in the neighborhood of three quarters of a million dollars. Mr. McQuiddy pointed out the numerous letters concerning the project and the engineering reasons that this project is not feasible at the current estimated funding level. The DNR and EPA concur that this project needs to be de-authorized.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that there has been plenty of discussion from local representatives as to what their rationale was and why they could not build this project. He agreed with Mr. McQuiddy that this project had various problems, and there were too many issues affecting the project to go forward with it.

Mr. Tom Podany concluded that the Technical Committee has already approved a recommendation that this be brought to the Task Force. He added that the only thing that remains is for this project to be placed on the Task Force agenda for the January meeting.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments/discussion from the Technical Committee.
There were no comments.

Mr. Tom Podany noted that no motion needed to be taken, but it will be added to the next Task Force agenda in January.

6. Agenda Item 1. Decision: PPL14 Candidate and Demonstration Project Evaluation Results (Podany). Mr. Chris Monnerjahn presented the six candidate projects and 7 demonstration projects.

A. Irish Bayou to Chef Menteur Pass Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation. This project would provide benefits over a project area of 249 acres of brackish marsh and water that

is eroding between 5 and 54 feet per year. This project would provide 147 acres over a 20-year period and has a prioritization score of 51.1. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$13.25 million.

B. Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration. This project would provide benefits over a project area of 746 acres of barrier island and water that had an erosion rate of 13.2 feet per year from 2000 to 2004. Sediment would be pumped from the Mississippi River to create marsh on this barrier island. This project would create 234 net acres over a period of 20 years and has a prioritization score of 55. The fully funded estimate is \$44.5 million.

C. South Shore of The Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation. This project would provide benefits over a project area of 193 acres of intermediate marsh and water in an area that is eroding between 4 and 27 feet per year. This project would create/nourish a net of 116 acres of marsh over a period of 20 years and has a prioritization score of 50.25. The fully funded estimate is \$17.5 million.

D. Venice Ponds Marsh Creation. This project would provide benefits over a project area of 919 acres of fresh marsh and water in an area that is subsiding between 3-5 feet per century. This project would create 593 acres of marsh by the end of 20 years. The prioritization score for this project is 60.5. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$20.17 million.

E. White Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management. This project would provide benefits over a project area of 8,224 acres of fresh/intermediate marsh and open water. This project would create/protect approximately 189 net acres of marsh over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 52.5. The fully funded estimate is \$14.8 million.

F. East Marsh Island Marsh Creation. This project would provide benefits over 378 acres of intermediate/brackish marsh and open water. The project would create a net of 189 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The prioritization score for this project is 35.5. The fully funded estimate is \$16.8 million.

G. Barrier Island Sand Blowing Demonstration Project. This project would use the sand blowing method to distribute high quality dry sand along the barrier islands in order to close breaches or areas of over-wash on the island. The fully funded cost is \$1.77 million.

H. Beneficial Use of Dredge Disposal Areas Demonstration Project. This project would demonstrate the use of dredging technologies to mine upland disposal areas for beneficial use. The fully funded cost is \$2.4 million.

I. Evaluation of Bioengineered Reefs Performing as Submerged Breakwaters Demonstration Project. This project would investigate specific designs of bioengineered reefs and their ability to mitigate erosion. The fully funded cost is \$1.3 million.

J. Floating Wave Attenuator Demonstration Project. This project aims to test several floating wave attenuator systems with different mooring systems to determine if the products can

protect the shoreline in a low to moderate wave energy application. The fully funded cost is \$1.3 million.

K. Flowable Fill Demonstration Project. This project aims to decrease maintenance work due to rock slippage caused by storms by using flowable fill over existing or new rock type structures in order to bond the rocks together. The fully funded cost is \$1.2 million.

L. Sand Fence Alternatives for Dune Formation and Colonial Nesting Bird Platforms on Barrier Island Demonstration Project. This project would test an innovative alternative to sand fencing for creating sand dunes on barrier islands by using biodegradable oyster shell sacks and vegetative plantings. The fully funded cost is \$0.5 million.

M. Wetland Enhancement via Treated Sewage Effluent Diversions Demonstration Project. This demonstration project would consist of upgrading the capacity of the existing effluent systems and installing 1,700 feet of PVC pipe force main in order to re-route wastewater treatment plant effluents to adjacent wetlands. The fully funded cost is \$1.1 million.

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

White Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management

Mr. Rick Hartman asked why the pumps are at two locations and not just one. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn answered that the existing capacity was 250 cfs and there was a good return when the project was operational before, so they went with the same design capacity. Mr. Britt Paul stated that the capacity of the pump could be looked at in more detail during Phase I and stated that there was no known reason to limit the size.

Floating Wave Attenuator Demonstration Project

Mr. Rick Hartman stated that there had been a similar structure previously constructed, and he asked if the change in wave energies at Cypremont Point could be monitored instead of investing in a new demonstration project. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn clarified that he was not aware of the design configuration, but assumed that one could monitor the performance of the existing structures in Cypremont Point.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that there was a discussion about putting some floating wave attenuators at Grand Isle also. He recommended using the monitoring money to find out if any of them work before the committee spends any more money. Mr. Rick Hartman agreed.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that in looking at the demonstration projects as a whole, some were not demonstrations at all. Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that each agency consider whether the Breaux Act is already involved with similar projects. Mr. Darryl Clark added that the Engineering and Environmental Workgroups passed some information to the Technical Committee, and some projects did not meet the demonstration criteria. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn stated that the Engineering Workgroup did not feel that it was their place to remove projects

from the list, so the committee will have to recommend it or not based on the matrix provide in the binders.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc interjected that there is a possibility, with agenda item 6, to make some minor changes to the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). Perhaps whichever group is in charge of the SOP changes can also make changes to the process for nominating and evaluating demonstration projects. Mr. Tom Podany said that today the committee will work with the current information, but with the review of the SOP there are potential changes and recommendations to consider. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that he did not want to put a large sum of money into demonstration projects. He suggested that the committee first fund the other projects, and then discuss funding demonstration projects with any remaining funds.

Mr. Rick Hartman nominated the P&E committee to review the process for demonstration projects.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public.

Irish Bayou to Chef Menteur Pass Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation

Ms. Yarrow Etheridge, Director of the New Orleans Mayor's Office of Environment, fully supports this project. It would help protect those who live in Irish Bayou.

Ms. Charlotte Parker, a biologist from the FWS is concerned by the rapid rate of erosion and deterioration of the marsh. The FWS fully supports this project.

Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator for Plaquemines Parish feels that it is imperative that the Scofield Island project be funded. Using material dredged from the Mississippi remains the last real unknown aspect of coastal restoration. On behalf of the Coastal Zone Committee and Mr. Benny Rousselle, Parish President, he fully supports this project.

Mr. Jimmy McGuire, resident of Plaquemines Parish, believes that time is of the essence and fully supports this project.

Mr. Kerry St. Pé, Director of the Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program, stated that this technique will allow the area to become sustainable and the benefits of the Scofield Island project are grossly underestimated. It will not only benefit Plaquemines Parish, but the entire Barataria Basin. On behalf of the Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program, Mr. St. Pé strongly supports this project.

South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation

Mr. Harry Cahill with the Jean Lafitte Mayor's Office stated that the Mayor strongly supports this project. Due to Hurricane Ivan and the tropical storm that followed, the levee on the

southwest side of the Pen will have to be rebuilt. This project would create a buffer that would protect the levee, and thus protect the homes and businesses in the town of Jean Lafitte.

Mr. O'Neil Malbrough, a consultant with Jefferson Parish, stated that this project started out as a group of Jefferson Parish constituents ranking projects to submit to the PPL14 process. Smaller dredging projects have already helped significantly, and this project will do even more. He feels that this project is worthy of selection by the committee.

Mr. Skip Haller, Madison Landing Company, said that the entire marsh south of the project area is very fragile and there is a dire need for this project. He concurred with Mr. Cahill that this project would help protect the citizens of Jean Lafitte.

Ms. Vickie Duffourc, member of the Coastal Stakeholder's Group, also spoke in favor of the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline project. The Stakeholder's Group developed the South Shore project, and it is a very important project for the people of Jean Lafitte.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Director of the Department of Environmental Affairs, stated that the small dredge project is successful and this is why the coastal stakeholders group selected this project. They have seen results with previous projects and feel that this project will complete the area.

Mr. Randy Growman, a recreational fisherman from the recreational fishing industry in Jefferson Parish, stated that he has personally seen a great demise of the marsh and highly recommends this project to the committee.

Venice Ponds Marsh Creation

Mr. Natt Phillips, representing the Louisiana Fruit Company, the landowner affected by the Venice Ponds project, voiced his support for this project. Mr. Phillips feels that this project will piggyback some efforts (Spanish Pass Diversion) that are already underway in the area and will supplement previous efforts to help protect this area. He also noted that the project had a high prioritization score.

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator for Plaquemines Parish, spoke in favor of the Venice Ponds project and feels that the land owner support goes a long way as far as allowing the project to be done in the first place. The project will protect infrastructure.

White Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management

Mr. Robert Lobrano, a landowner at White Ditch, addressed two questions the committee made earlier in the meeting. He stated that there are no plans to move the current pipes and replace them with new ones, that is why a second set is planned to the south. Increasing the capacity of the pipes is not an option. If the capacity were increased, the pipes would damage the area. He fully supports the White Ditch project.

Mr. Jay Lobrano, a resident from White Ditch, added that there is not a hurricane levee south of the area but there is one north of the area. He stated that this would be a relatively inexpensive diversion. He strongly recommends the White Ditch project to the committee.

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator, stated that this project will complement the Caernarvon project. He fully supports this project.

East Marsh Island Marsh Creation

Mr. Edmond Mouton, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, spoke on behalf of the administration. Marsh Island is very important in storm surge protection, as it lessens the impact of the waves. The administration strongly supports the East Marsh Island Marsh Creation project.

Barrier Island Sand Blowing Demonstration

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator, stated that he agrees with the Technical Committee that projects should be funded before demonstration projects. However, he believes that bringing in sand and fortifying barrier islands is a good idea. He supports this demo project.

Ms. Yarrow Etheridge from the City of New Orleans spoke in favor of this project because the barrier islands are crucial for protection from future hurricanes and storms.

Bioengineered Reefs Performing as Submerged Breakwaters Demonstration

There were no public comments regarding this project.

Floating Wave Attenuator Demonstration

Ms. Yarrow Etheridge from the City of New Orleans supports this project and feels that it is important to support projects that protect the marshes.

Sand Fence Alternatives for Dune Formation and Colonial Nesting Bird Platforms on Barrier Island

Ms. Rebecca Murphy with RPI Louisiana has just completed a Master's thesis on Raccoon Island. During her 2 ½ to 3-year analysis, and she was appalled by the effects of the hard structures on the island. She believes that we need to take a closer look at Raccoon Island in order to save it.

Flowable Fill Demonstration

There were no public comments regarding this project.

Beneficial Use of Dredge Disposal Areas Demonstration

There were no public comments regarding this project.

Wetland Enhancement via Treated Sewage Effluent Diversions

There were no public comments regarding this project.

Additional Comments

Ms. Marnie Winter with Jefferson Parish supported the idea to use the money for projects instead of demonstrations.

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator, reiterated some points about the Scofield Island. He firmly believes that this project can set the stage for future design in some other areas in need of coastal restoration efforts.

Voting Process

Ms. Julie LeBlanc discussed the voting process previously agreed to by the Technical Committee. Each agency will vote for 4 projects, and rank the projects with a weighted score (with 4 being the highest ranked and 1 being the lowest ranked). Projects will then be ranked by number of agency votes first and weighted score second. For demonstration projects, agencies will vote for two projects, and rank projects with a weighted score (with 2 being the highest ranked and 1 being the lowest ranked). Demonstration projects will then be ranked by number of agency votes first and weighted score second.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski asked if the committee was going to vote first and then going to discuss funding or if they would discuss funding and then vote. Mr. Duszynski stated that in his view, he would like to discuss the funding before the vote so that the committee would not be forced to pick projects that fit the budget. He suggested that the committee discuss and finalize the budget before voting.

Ms. Gay Browning confirmed that there is a total of approximately \$5.1 million available. But since the returning amount for the Leeville deauthorization is unknown, the committee should use the \$5 million figure.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski asked if it would be appropriate to pick the top four projects and give whatever that figure is to the Task Force. Agencies could then be asked to look for additional funds or opportunities to move funds around.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc reminded the committee that the guidance from the Task Force was up to four projects. Mr. Rick Hartman pointed out that the committee could pick less than four and then find the necessary money either in the following years or through de-authorization of other projects.

Mr. Britt Paul asked if the Task Force would accept a recommendation of more than \$5 million. Mr. Tom Podany stated that the expectation from the Task Force may be to identify a list of 4 projects. Maybe identifying the list may be more important than identifying projects within

available dollars. Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that the committee recommend the top projects within available funds and approve additional projects contingently, if funds become available. Mr. Darryl Clark suggested that the agencies could vote for three and work from there, or vote on four and then look at how the budget breaks out. Mr. Paul stated that he thought the committee should stick to the original process (each agency cast weighted votes for 4 projects).

Mr. Tom Podany stated that those Breaux Act projects that have been identified under LCA may move to LCA at the 30% design level, possibly freeing up funding in the program.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to identify the list of up to four projects and indicate that there is \$5 million for projects at the top of the list. Those projects that fall below the available funding line will be authorized contingent upon available funds within the next year. If contingent projects are not funding within the year, they can be reconsidered for Phase I funding along with PPL15. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. (Note: This motion documents the consensus of the Technical Committee prior to receiving the ranked vote, and is not a recommendation to the Task Force).

Voting Results

Ms. Julie LeBlanc presented the results from agency voting. The weighed score is noted in parentheses.

1. Riverine Sand Mining - 6 agency votes, weighted score of 20
2. White Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management project - 5 agency votes, weighted score of 13
3. South Shore of the Pen - 4 agency votes, weighted score of 10
4. East Marsh Island - 4 agency votes, weighted score of 6
5. Irish Bayou - 3 agency votes, weighted score of 5
6. Venice Pond - 2 agency votes, weighted score of 6

CWPPRA PPL14 Technical Committee FINAL VOTE

Region	Project	COE	DNR	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score	Phase I Fully Funded Cost	Cumulative Phase I Fully Funded Cost	Phase II Fully Funded Cost
2	Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration	2	4	4	4	4	2	6	20	\$3,221,887	\$3,221,887	\$41,323,113
2	White's Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management	1		3	2	3	4	5	13	\$1,595,676	\$4,817,563	\$13,249,324
2	South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation		2		3	2	3	4	10	\$1,311,146	\$6,128,709	\$16,202,854
3	East Marsh Island Marsh Creation		3	1		1	1	4	6	\$1,193,606	\$7,322,315	\$15,631,094
1	Irish Bayou to Chef Menteur Pass Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation	3	1		1			3	5	\$968,775		\$12,283,225
2	Venice Ponds Marsh Creation	4		2				2	6	\$1,027,462		\$19,144,538
Total										\$9,318,552		\$117,834,148

Demonstration Projects:

1. Barrier Island Sand Blowing - 5 agency votes, weighted score of 9
2. Floating Wave Attenuator - 3 agency votes, weighted score of 4
3. Bio-engineered Reefs - 3 agency votes, weighted score of 3
4. Sand Fence - 1 agency vote, weighted score of 2

CWPPRA PPL14 Technical Committee DEMO VOTE

16-Dec-04

Lead Agency	Demonstration Project Name	Total Fully Funded Cost	COE	DNR	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	# of votes	TOTAL SCORE
COE	Barrier Island Sand Blowing	\$1,774,000	2	2	1	2	2		5	9
EPA	Floating Wave Attenuator	\$1,278,000	1	1	2				3	4
NMFS	Evaluation of Bioengineered Reefs Performing as Submerged Breakwaters	\$1,308,000				1	1	1	3	3
NRCS	Sand Fence Alternatives for Dune Formation and Colonial Nesting Bird Platforms on Barrier Islands	\$491,000						2	1	2
NMFS	Beneficial Use of Dredge Disposal Areas	\$2,375,000							0	0
NRCS	Flowable Fill	\$1,243,000							0	0
COE	Wetland Enhancement via Treated Sewage Effluent Diversion	\$1,111,000							0	0
Total			3	3	3	3	3	3	12	18

Mr. Rick Hartman said that based on the previous motion the committee should approve the first two projects and that South Shore of the Pen should be approved contingent upon available funds. He clarified that as money comes in, it would go toward South Shore of the Pen until it is fully funded. Mr. Britt Paul and Mr. Gerry Duszynski supported including the 4th ranked project, East Marsh Island, in the contingent approval as well. Any other available funds would then go towards East Marsh Island. Mr. Hartman stressed that if anyone has an overrun on an already-approved project, the money should go towards the overrun projects rather than the contingent ones discussed previously. If a project does not receive funding it will go back on the list for the PPL15 voting.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to recommend the top 4 projects for Phase I funding approval. Mr. Tom Podany clarified that the motion state that the committee recommends the first two projects (Scofield Island Restoration and White Ditch) be fully funded for Phase I and the next two (South Shore of the Pen and East Marsh Island) be contingently funded through August 2005 (available funds to be used to fully fund Phase I for the South Shore of the Pen first, then East Marsh Island). If Phase I funding is not

available for one or both contingent projects before the end of August 2005, the contingent projects would be considered along with the PPL15 candidates for Phase I funding (in Sept/Oct 2005 meetings). Mr. Britt Paul seconded. The motion passed.

Mr. Tom Podany discussed the demonstration projects and asked if the committee would provide contingent funding for the top demo as well. Mr. Britt Paul, Mr. Rick Hartman, and Mr. Darryl Clark agreed that they were inclined to not recommend any demos to the Task Force. It was agreed that the voting results for the demo projects be presented to the Task Force, stating that no demos were recommended due to the lack of available funding.

7. Agenda Item 3. Presentation/Discussion: Briefing on the Proposed Plan to Construct Test Sections for the Rockefeller Refuge Gulf Shoreline Stabilization Project (ME-18) (Hartman).

Dr. John Foret gave a presentation of the proposed plan to construct test sections for the Rockefeller Refuge Gulf Shoreline Stabilization Project. Dr. John Foret stated that they are not asking for funding at this time, but because of certain circumstances things have changed with the project. The existing beach is crushed shell, which is very fragile. A typical rock breakwater weighs 100 pounds per square foot. The load-bearing capacity of the beach and nearshore soils is 300 pounds per square foot. This plus the uninterrupted wave activity onto the shoreline results in a large amount of erosion about 100 feet per year. After careful analysis it has been accepted that the original project is not feasible at this time. The Lafayette Galveston Lab looked at different shoreline protection projects to try to find the best solution to the erosion problem. The group ended up with four protection solutions: a concrete panel breakwater, a reef breakwater with a light aggregate core, gravel/crushed rock beach fill, and gravel/crushed rock beach fill with a small reef breakwater that is below the water surface. Originally the budget was projected at \$95 million, which was reduced to \$38 million for construction and \$6 million for O&M. Accurate shoreline models with this type of environment do not exist, and while waves can be predicted, the shoreline effect cannot. Dr. John Foret asked permission to build four test sections and monitor them for one year. After this period, Dr. Foret would return to the Technical Committee and ask the Task Force for full implementation.

Mr. Rick Hartman clarified that this item was to be considered a change in scope, and thought the committee should be briefed on the status. The committee has the power to say no at any time regarding this project and de-authorize it when it sees fit.

Dr. John Foret pointed out that this project did not only go to the consultants, but was outsourced as well. It was not just one group. Mr. Britt Paul stated that the approach sounded reasonable to him and that they should continue with the test sections and bring the project up for funding approval. Mr. Darryl Clark stated that FWS did not object to proceeding in this manner.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion that the Technical Committee recommend the Task Force approve the changes in scope to the Rockefeller Refuge Gulf Shoreline Stabilization Project. Mr. Tom Podany clarified that additional funds are not being requested at this time. Mr. Gerry Duszynski seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 5. Decision: Request for Change in Scope of the Pass Chaland to Grand Pass Shoreline Restoration Project (BA-35) (Hartman). Ms. Rachel Sweeney presented the information to the committee in accordance with the standard operating procedures for a change of scope. The Chaland to Grand Bayou Pass was authorized for Phase I on the 11th Priority List. At the time of Phase I authorization the problems in the project were identified as a narrowing of the Gulf shoreline to what was viewed to be a critical width and anticipated breaching and fragmentation of the shoreline. The project goals were stated as to prevent breaching of the barrier shoreline by increasing the island width through the creation of a back barrier marsh platform and creation of about 225 acres of intertidal wetlands. The original conceptual project feature was to create just a marsh platform, roughly 1000 feet wide, behind the existing shoreline. During the engineering and design analyses, it was determined that a marsh platform alone was not going to meet that primary goal of preventing breaching marsh from the existing shoreline. The preferred alternative involves creation of a dune and beach platform on the front of the island that will help rebuild the structural framework, in addition to back barrier marsh creation.

Mr. Tom Podany asked if it was standard operating procedure for a change in scope of a project to go before the Task Force. The SOP states that the Technical Committee must report and recommend this to the Task Force.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion that the Technical Committee recommend the Task Force approve the changes in scope to the Pass Chaland to Grand Pass Shoreline Restoration Project. Mr. Tom Podany clarified that additional funds are not being requested at this time. Mr. Gerry Duszynski seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 6. Discussion: Briefing of the Results of the After Action Review of the Fall Phase II Decision Process in 2004 (Podany). Ms. Julie LeBlanc reviewed the responses provided by the agencies and compiled the comments into three groups (all responses included in binder):

- Recommendations that require Task Force approval if the Technical Committee decides to make recommendations to the Task Force,
- Recommended changes or clarification to the SOP, and
- Recommendations regarding the flow of future annual funding meetings.

The Corp of Engineers suggested that a separate group handle the SOP revisions, and Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that the Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee take that role. Mr. Darryl Clark also suggested that changes to the SOP be remanded to the P&E Subcommittee. Mr. Tom Podany also added that the P&E Subcommittee should look at the process for demonstration projects, as was previously suggested. The P&E Subcommittee was tasked with presenting recommended SOP revisions to the Technical Committee at their March 2005 meeting. The P&E will also discuss the 3rd category of minor items and come to a consensus on which suggestions to incorporate into the next funding cycle and also present this at the March Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Darryl Clark recommended that the program should approve Phase II projects in January because we will know how much money will be available for the current fiscal year at that time.

He stated that Phase I, O&M requests, monitoring requests, Corps administration requests, could be approved in October. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that Ms. Julie LeBlanc suggested that Phase I, Planning Budget, etc. be funded in October, allowing us to save the big funding items (Phase II approvals) for January when we know how much money we will receive. It is difficult to decide on projects if the actual budget is not known. Mr. Britt Paul asked if Phase I could coincide with the Phase II funding in January. Mr. Gerry Duszynski stated that the State prefers to have the Phase I budget at the earlier date (Oct) since this is better for submittal of the State Plan. Last, Mr. Wes McQuiddy stated that he preferred the January meetings for both Phase I and II, but understood the State's concerns and agreed with Phase I in October.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark motioned for the Technical Committee recommend two funding meetings to the Task Force: one in October (Phase I selection and funding, Planning Budget approval, O&M requests, monitoring requests and Corps Administration requests) and one in January (Phase II construction funding). Mr. Britt Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

10. Agenda Item 7. Additional Agenda Items (Podany).

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

Mr. Wes McQuiddy said that he had an item related to the Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) and proposed that more regular updates be provided to the Technical Committee, P&E Subcommittee, or Monitoring Workgroup. Information is not being shared in a timely and uniform manner. Mr. Rick Hartman agreed with Mr. McQuiddy and stated that he wanted to make sure that taxpayer money is being well spent and preferred to have more in depth briefings on how the money is being spent. His concern is that there isn't a plan on how to analyze the data that will be collected. He agreed that the committee needed to ask the Monitoring Workgroup to give the P&E Subcommittee and the Technical Committee briefings on the future focus and their plan to address these issues. Mr. Gerry Duszynski indicated that they've selected a contractor recently and offered to oblige the group in whatever was needed. Mr. Tom Podany asked what format the Technical Committee would like to proceed with (have the Monitoring Workgroup work with the P&E Subcommittee first or report to us jointly?). Mr. Hartman suggested that the Monitoring Workgroup present a half hour or hour-long briefing at the next Technical Committee meeting. Mr. McQuiddy agreed with Mr. Hartman and added that he wanted briefings to be a regularly scheduled event, at least initially. He also suggested that the briefing be held a day prior to the Technical Committee meeting or as part of a quarterly Monitoring Workgroup meeting. Mr. Podany suggested that a Monitoring Workgroup briefing on the CRMS effort be scheduled.

There was further discussion by the committee regarding the necessity of scheduling a separate meeting in lieu of holding the briefing during a regularly schedule Technical Committee meeting. It was agreed that this would be decided at a later date depending upon the amount of information that would be presented and considering the number of agenda items on the March 2005 Technical Committee meeting. In any case, it was stated that the Technical Committee wanted to make sure that there was enough time for everyone to get their questions answered and that some sort of document should be produced that shows the intent of the program.

Mr. Hartman stated that the SOP states that demonstration projects must be turned in by August 1st of a given year. Now that we have moved the PPL selection to September/October of each year, we must also move the submittal date for demonstration projects to be earlier (maybe May 1st) to allow time to evaluate the submittals.

Mr. Hartman announced that he writes regular articles for his agency and asked members of the Technical Committee to supply him with any ideas they may have for upcoming articles.

11. Agenda Item 8. Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (Podany). Mr. Tom Podany announced that the next Task Force meeting is scheduled for 9:30 a.m. January 26, 2005 at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Office in New Orleans [NOTE: this meeting has been tentatively rescheduled for February 17th, 2005]. The next Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for March 16, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. in New Orleans as well.

12. The Meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.