

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes for the 19 March 04 Technical Committee CWPPRA Meeting

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

Mr. John Saia, Chairman, COE

Mr. Rick Hartman, NMFS

Dr. Bill Good, LDNR

Mr. Darryl Clark, FWS

Mr. Troy Hill, EPA

Mr. Britt Paul, NRCS

A copy of the agenda is included as **Encl 1**. A copy of the attendance record is included as **Encl 2**.

2. Agenda Item 1. Decision: Selection of Six (6) Candidate Projects to Evaluate for PPL 14 (Saia). Mr. John Saia announced that the Technical Committee will select six projects under PPL14 for further analysis as Phase 0 candidates. The Regional Planning Teams (RPT) selected 11 project nominees for consideration. CWPPRA Engineering and Environmental Workgroups will perform evaluations, site visits, wetland value assessments, preliminary engineering and design, and cost estimates for the six candidate projects selected. Public meetings will be held November 17-18, 2004 to present project evaluation results. On December 16, 2004, the Technical Committee will select up to 4 projects for recommendation to the Task Force for inclusion in PPL14. On January 26, 2005, the Task Force will select projects on PPL14.

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn briefly presented each of the candidate projects:

1. Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation (Region 1). This project is located in Orleans Parish and involves the construction of 17,350 linear feet of rock shoreline protection. The project goal is to reduce shoreline erosion and create/nourish marsh. The project would nourish and/or create 875 acres of brackish marsh after 20 years. The fully funded cost range is \$30-40 million.
2. White's Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management (Region 2). This project is located in Plaquemines Parish. It involves rehabilitation of the existing diversion through installation of additional pipes and weir openings. The goal of this project is to reduce erosion rates by introduction of freshwater and nutrients into interior marshes. The fully funded cost for this project is \$15-20 million.
3. Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration (Region 2). This project is located in Plaquemines Parish and consists of hydraulically dredging material from the Mississippi River to create marsh and nourish existing marsh on Scofield Island. The goals of this project are to repair newly formed breaches in the shoreline, reinforce existing shoreline

with sand, and plug/repair the growing tidal outlets. Created and nourished areas would be planted with native vegetation. The project would cost \$30-40 million over 20 years.

4. South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration (Region 2). This project is located in Jefferson Parish. It consists of the construction of 11,900 linear feet of shoreline protection and dedicated dredging. This project would create 140 acres of marsh, nourish an additional 140 acres of marsh, and cost \$15-20 million dollars (fully funded).
5. Venice Ponds Marsh Creation (Region 2). This project is located in Plaquemines Parish. It involves construction of three marsh cells through hydraulic dredging of material from Tiger and Grand Passes and the Mississippi River. Approximately 960 acres of marsh would be created and 410 acres of existing wetlands nourished at a cost of \$40-50 million (fully funded).
6. Penchant Basin Marsh Creation (Region 3). This project is located in Terrebonne Parish. The goal is to create approximately 96 acres of fresh marsh using dredged material from channel enlargement work at a fully funded cost of \$5-10 million.
7. North Lost Lake Marsh Restoration (Region 3). This project is located in Terrebonne Parish. It involves installation of inflow gated water control structures and replacement of weirs along Carencro Bayou, installation of 3,000 linear feet of rip-rap along Lost Lake, and creation of 212 acres of marsh. The goal of this project is to maintain and restore critically important marshes along Bayou Decade and north of Lost Lake. The estimated fully funded cost is \$20-30 million.
8. Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration (Region 3). This project is located in St. Mary and Terrebonne Parishes. It consists of constructing approximately 83,000 linear feet of earthen terraces and 250 linear feet of earthen plugs. This project would create 10 acres of marsh on the most critical areas of the shoreline. The goal of this project is to reduce shoreline erosion, establish submerged aquatic vegetation, encourage expanded delta development, and repair breaches to the shoreline to restore lower energy hydrologic conditions within the adjacent interior marshes. The fully funded cost for this project is approximately \$5-10 million.
9. East Marsh Island Marsh Creation (Region 3). This project is located in Iberia Parish and involves creating approximately 210 acres of interior emergent marsh with hydraulically dredged material from East Cote Blanche Bay. The project goal is to recreate brackish marsh habitat in open water areas of the interior marsh primarily caused by hurricane damage. The fully funded cost for this project is approximately \$10-15 million.
10. Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization – Joseph’s Harbor East to Little Constance Bayou (Region 4). This project is located in Cameron and Vermilion Parishes. It involves construction of 25,000 linear feet of rock shoreline protection to reduce shoreline erosion at a fully funded cost of over \$50 million.
11. Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension (Long Beach) (Region 4). This project is located in Cameron Parish and will extend breakwaters approximately 6,600 linear feet,

as well as nourish 70 cubic yards of beach. It will also protect State Highway 82 at a fully funded cost of \$15-20 million.

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

Mr. Rick Hartman asked if land rights had been worked out for White's Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management Project. Mr. Britt Paul replied that they had.

Mr. Rick Hartman made a correction concerning the Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration Project. He said that this project is only looking at sand mining from the Mississippi River and not the Gulf.

Mr. Rick Hartman made an observation concerning the Venice Ponds Marsh Creation Project. He said that if the project does not go forward, then there could be potential to use cell number three in the delta-wide crevasse project scheduled to begin construction this summer.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked about the preliminary cost for the Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension (Long Beach) and the Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization Projects. The preliminary cost for the Holly Beach Breakwaters Project is \$11 million, while the fully funded cost is \$15-20 million, an increase of nearly 25 percent. For the Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization Project, the initial cost is \$28 million, and the fully funded cost is nearly twice the initial cost. He asked if different multipliers were used when going from preliminary to fully funded cost. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn, Chairman of the Engineering Workgroup, said that there were two different features involved with the Holly Beach Breakwaters Projects and a weighted average based on cost attributed to each was used resulting in different multipliers between the two Region 4 projects.

Dr. Bill Good said that he felt that the Venice Ponds Marsh Creation Project was a great place for a crevasse project, but not a good place for marsh construction. He asked if the Technical Committee could change the project from dredge material to crevasse splay. Mr. Rick Hartman said that he does not think we should change the project at this time. If the project does not move forward, then it could be addressed with the Delta-Wide Crevasse project at a later time. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed with Mr. Rick Hartman.

Dr. Bill Good relayed comments from Mr. Paul Cox, the local sponsor for the Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension Project, about concerns with project costs. He said the project cost could be reduced by eliminating the sand component.

Mr. John Saia opened the floor for comments from the public. Mr. Saia stated that public comments would be accepted project-by-project. He asked that the public limit their comments to 2-3 minutes and requested that they comment only once per project.

*Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project:*

Ms. Yarrow Etheredge, City of New Orleans Mayor's Office of Environmental Affairs, said that the Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection Project is important to the city because it would help maintain the physical integrity of Lake Pontchartrain and alleviate flooding for some

residents. She relayed comments from a recent public meeting where 60 residents attended. Overall, residents are in favor of the project but are concerned about the dredging of borrow material, marsh creation, and water quality impairment for fishing and pelican habitat. Councilwoman Cynthia Lewis supports the project as well as the Mayor. Comment cards from nine people were submitted to the Technical Committee for the record.

Mr. Peter Gerica, Lake Pontchartrain Fisherman's Association President, said that there could be serious problems with dredging for the Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection Project. They are concerned about the water depths and tides changing and also the potential impact to the large population of white and brown pelicans. He stated that he doesn't see where filling in the open water areas would be beneficial to the environment.

Mr. Carlton Dufrechou, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, spoke in favor of CWPPRA projects in the basin and supports the concept of the Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection Project. He would like the project to be modified to incorporate the recommendations of Mr. Peter Gerica and fellow citizens from Irish Bayou.

*White's Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management:*

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator for Plaquemines Parish, said that a disagreement between a landowner and the Parish concerning maintenance of the outfall canal delayed the White's Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management Project in the past. He believes the landowner now supports the revitalization of this project. He feels that this project makes economic sense since half of the project is already in place.

*Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration:*

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator for Plaquemines Parish, said that he believes enhancing the Scofield Island segment in the Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration Project is one of the highest priorities of the CWPPRA program. Construction of the Pelican Island segment, just west of Scofield Island, was recently approved. There is already a breach in the shoreline of the Scofield Island segment. If this project is not selected, the integrity of Pelican Island Project would be sacrificed resulting in another Shell Island. This project will not only help residents of Plaquemines Parish and the Port Sulphur and Venice areas, but it could also help reduce tidal surge in Jefferson and Orleans Parishes.

*South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration:*

Mr. O'Neil Malbrough, consultant for Jefferson Parish, discussed Powerpoint slides. He said that the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project is actually a component of a bigger, central marsh barrier that is critical to the Barataria Waterway. He supports this project.

Mr. Milton Hymel, representing Mayor Kerner of the Town of Lafitte, gave his support for the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish Department of Environmental Affairs, said that the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project is their priority project. This area is an important, critical central marsh area to separate salt and fresh water. This area also has high erosion rates.

Ms. Mariella Green, Madison Land Company, said that the majority of landowners and locals are in favor of the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project.

Mr. Jason Smith, Board Coordinator for the Jefferson Parish Marine Advisory Board, agreed with the points made by Marnie Winter, O'Neil Malbrough, and Mariella Green with regards to the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project. He spoke of concern with the flow of water in the central marsh area and would like to see this project move forward.

Mr. Randy Gros, member of Jefferson Parish Marine Fisheries Advisory Board, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, and a recreational fisherman, said that the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project would enhance both commercial and recreational fisheries. It would also form a barrier to prevent saltwater intrusion in the brackish marsh and is an important project for the area.

Ms. Yarrow Etheredge, City of New Orleans Mayor's Office of Environmental Affairs, said that the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration Project would be beneficial to the city in regards to flood control and supports the project.

*Venice Ponds Marsh Creation:*

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Coastal Zone Administrator for Plaquemines Parish, gave his support for the Venice Ponds Marsh Creation Project. He said that if the project were approved he would be interested in any discussion about changing the project to include crevasses. He wondered about how the two cells near Tidewater Road would be affected by crevasses. He believes the importance of this project is defined by its protection of the industry and infrastructure in the area. Mr. Rick Hartman clarified that the existing crevasse project could not benefit areas 1 and 2, but could be put in area 3 if the landowner wanted it.

*Penchant Basin Marsh Creation:*

Mr. James Miller, Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management, said that Terrebonne Parish sent two top priority projects to CWPPRA in February that included the Penchant Basin Marsh Creation Project and North Lost Lake Marsh Restoration. Both projects combined would benefit 300 plus acres. He asked that the Technical Committee consider these projects.

Mr. John Saia expressed his condolences in the passing of Mr. Bob Jones, and advocate for environmental restoration from Terrebonne Parish. Mr. James Miller added that Mr. Jones' ashes would be spread over the barrier islands on March 28, 2004.

Mr. George Strain, Continental Land and Fur, said he is a representative for most of property adjoining the Penchant Basin Marsh Creation Project area. This area has been waterlogged for many years. Continental Land and Fur has been supporting NRCS' TE-34 plan to move excessive freshwater from the northern part of the basin to the southern area. He asked if the marsh creation areas are in open water areas or floating marsh. He is concerned about damage from dredge delivery pipes to the floating marsh. He is opposed to gapping the banks and believes this project will contradict the Penchant plan and Coast 2050. He does not think this plan should be approved and submitted comments for the record.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of Coastal Zone Management, Coastal Restoration and Preservation Committee, said he hopes the landowners will have a say where dredge material will be placed for the Penchant Basin Marsh Creation Project. He supports this project.

Mr. Mark Rogers, resident of Terrebonne Parish, said that the area in the Penchant Basin Marsh Creation Project has experienced a lot of subsidence over the years. Any type of diversion project will bring in nutrients and help this area solidify. He supports the Penchant Basin Marsh Creation Project.

*North Lost Lake Marsh Restoration:*

Mr. Frank Ellender, Burlington Resources and landowner, spoke in support of the North Lost Lake Restoration Project.

Mr. Mark Rogers, resident of Terrebonne Parish, said that the proposed North Lost Lake Restoration Project is very important, and he fully supports the project. It is in an area in need of marsh creation. He added that the Terrebonne Basin is an area where the most erosion and subsidence has occurred in Louisiana.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of Coastal Zone Management, Coastal Restoration and Preservation Committee, spoke in favor of the North Lost Lake Restoration Project.

Mr. James Miller, Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management, said that the North Lost Lake Restoration Project will benefit 200 acres of marsh, and he supports the project.

*Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration:*

Dr. André Cenac, long term leaseholder at the Plumb Island Point area, said that Hurricanes Lili and Andrew caused a lot of destruction in the area. He said that there are no controversies with landowners or oil and gas industry with regards to the Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration Project. It is a cost-effective project, and he supports it.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, said that the terraces for the Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration Project would be constructed on the main delta of the Atchafalaya. The terraces would reduce wave energy, increase shoreline integrity, and enhance establishment and maintenance of submerged aquatics. This project could also compliment the Castille Pass project.

Mr. Frank Ellender, Burlington Resources, spoke in favor of the Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration Project.

Mr. Carol Vinning, St. Mary Parish Director of Planning and Zoning, said that he supports the Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration Project. It will be good for navigation and has a low cost benefit ratio.

*East Marsh Island Marsh Creation:*

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing McIlhenney Company, Avery Island Incorporated, and Iberia Parish Coastal Advisory Committee, pointed out that the East Marsh Island Marsh Creation Project is the only project that has no potential issues. He said this project would produce the best bang for our buck with existing funding available.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, said that Marsh Island took a significant hit from Hurricane Lili with tidal surges of 8-10 feet for up to five hours. At least 500 acres were converted from emergent marsh to open water. The East Marsh Island Marsh Creation Project would restore a portion of the emergent marsh on the northeast tip of the island.

*Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization – Joseph’s Harbor East to Little Constance Bayou:*

Mr. Guthrie Perry, Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries and Rockefeller Refuge, spoke in regard to the Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization, Joseph’s Harbor East to Little Constance Bayou Project. He said that the erosion rate in the Rockefeller area is at its greatest (3,800 acres lost in 38 years). There are five pipelines in the proposed area. Due to erosion, pipes are becoming exposed causing public and environmental hazards. Also, wells that were properly plugged and abandoned in the 1960’s and 1970’s are now offshore. He said that something needs to be done to help with hazards to navigation and the environment. He would like to dovetail this project with other projects his department is doing so that the projects compliment each other. LDWF is spending \$2.5M for Gulf shore stabilization.

Mr. Myles Hebert, Cameron Parish Police Jury, said that the seven member jury is in favor of the Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization, Joseph’s Harbor East to Little Constance Bayou and Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension (Long Beach) Projects. He submitted a letter of support to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Milton Hymel, homeowner in the Lafitte area, said that the Gulf of Mexico is the first line of defense and supports the Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization, Joseph’s Harbor East to Little Constance Bayou Project.

Mr. Paul Cox, representing home and landowners in the Holly Beach Breakwater extension project area, said he understands the Technical Committee is working with a budget deficit. The high cost is the reason that they have asked that the sand component be removed from the project. He said that the west Holly Beach area has lost 80 feet of land in the past two years and that the breakwaters would benefit. He said a bird sanctuary is located east of the project area.

The Audubon Society supports the project because of tourism and birds that come to the area. He stated that the erosion rate is the same as the Rockefeller Refuge project and should have a higher acre benefit. He added that if the Technical Committee sees that sand is needed, he was agreeable to keeping it in the project.

Ms. Lifora LaGrone, representing her grandfather Wendell Lindsay, spoke in favor of the Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension (Long Beach) Project. She distributed a packet with a letter of support from Senator Landrieu to the Technical Committee. Erosion has caused wildlife to retreat and if allowed to continue, would threaten Hwy 82.

Mr. Robert Dill, Long Beach landowner, gave his support for the Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension (Long Beach) Project. He said there is only 300 acres between Long Beach and Highway 82, and at the present rate of erosion, this area will be gone in 20 years.

Mr. Keffer Delino, Long Beach camp owner, presented photos to the Technical Committee showing erosion loss on Long Beach. The photos showed that if one were standing on the coastal dunes, one would not be able to see the camp rooftops.

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

Dr. Bill Good asked about the Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project and if the area designated for marsh creation is a valuable habitat as stated by Mr. Peter Gerica. If so, what is the reason for creating marsh in this particular area? Ms. Barbara Boyle, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, said that they did not intend to fill in the marshes but only put a veneer of soil to nourish marsh enhancement. Ms. Martha Segura, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, added that the intent is to nourish the area, not to cover it. Detail of how much open water should be filled in is still open for discussion. Ms. Yarrow Etheredge, City of New Orleans Mayor's Office of Environmental Affairs, said that it is important to figure out what is needed and to maintain the shoreline. Ms. Sue Hawes recommended looking at the land loss maps to determine the areas to fill in. Ms. Martha Segura added that the project is still in the early stages of development, and GIS analysis to look at the land loss rates has not been performed, but would be done.

Mr. John Saia reviewed the voting process. Each agency has six votes, ranging from six being the high and one being the low. Each Technical Committee member will cast a vote for the eleven projects. The voting consensus (number of votes) will be looked at first. If there is a tie, then the weighted scores will be used.

The agencies then submitted their votes. The sorted results were announced by Ms. Julie LeBlanc:

- White's Ditch Resurrection and Outfall Management – 6 votes, 28 points
- South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Restoration – 6 votes, 22 points
- Irish Bayou to Bayou Chevee Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation – 6 votes, 17 points
- Riverine Sand Mining/Scofield Island Restoration – 5 votes, 21 points



- East Marsh Island Marsh Creation – 4 votes, 7 points
- Venice Ponds Marsh Creation – 3 votes, 10 points
- Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization, Joseph’s Harbor East to Little Constance Bayou – 2 votes, 6 points
- Holly Beach Breakwaters West Extension (Long Beach) – 2 votes, 5 points
- Plumb Island Point Terracing/Hydrologic Restoration – 1 vote, 6 points
- North Lost Lake Marsh Restoration – 1 vote, 4 points
- Penchant Basin Marsh Creation – 0 votes, 0 points

A spreadsheet outlining the voting outcome is included as **Encl 3**.

3. Agenda Item 2. Report and Public Comment: Presentation of Financial Status of the CWPPRA Program and Public Comment Regarding Future of CWPPRA Funding and Program Management (LeBlanc). Ms. Julie LeBlanc presented the financial status of Breaux Act program funds. Cumulative funds into the program from FY ‘92 through FY ‘09 are anticipated to be \$1.14 billion including both Federal and non-Federal funding. The fully funded current estimate for all projects on PPLs 1-13 is \$1.7 billion. The projected shortfall, if all projects on PPLs 1-13 move forward to construction phase, is approximately \$560 million. The Task Force is seeking public input and discussion regarding the future funding options for the program in both the near and long term. Some options include suspending or limiting approval of new projects on PPLs 15 and future lists and demonstration projects. For existing approved projects, options may include suspension of Phase 2 construction funds for the remainder of 2004 and initiating an annual funding cycle beginning at the January 2005 Task Force meeting when fiscal year funds come into the program. Other options may be to find alternative sources of funding for CWPPRA initiated projects.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark asked that the Technical Committee hear public comments before discussion. He stated that he was prepared to make a recommendation for the Task Force to consider at their April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

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

Mr. O’Neil Malbrough, consultant with Jefferson Parish, said he thinks elimination of the annual selection process would greatly reduce the support and involvement from the public. He said the concern about having too many projects than can be funded comes from the Task Force and Technical Committee, not the public. He feels it is easier to go to Washington and ask for funding for a specific project than for a program. He said if the PPL process is discontinued, it will do injustice to the CWPPRA program and take out significant involvement in the process. He added that Jefferson Parish and the Coalition of Coastal Parishes will submit written comments before the next Task Force meeting.

Ms. Yarrow Etheredge, City of New Orleans Mayor’s Office of Environmental Affairs, said that demonstration projects provide technology development and are important to progress and grow. She is reluctant to do away with them.

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

Mr. Troy Hill asked if any other comments had been received. Ms. Julie LeBlanc replied that they had received comments from the RPT meetings, but none since then. These comments were previously provided to the Technical Committee/Task Force. Mr. Darryl Clark summarized public comments from the Region 4 RPT meeting that included interest in continuing the PPL process and demonstration projects. Minimal/no comments were received at two of the RPT meetings. Ms. Martha Segura said that there were not a lot of comments from the Region 3 RPT meeting, but there was interest in keeping the demonstration projects.

Dr. Bill Good said he is not sure what position the State will take on this matter. He said that early on in the CWPPRA program, the emphasis had to be on planning. Now that the LCA program has been implemented, there is a need to integrate the planning between LCA and CWPPRA. He said that because of the limited planning budget and the amount of dollars being spend for the annual PPL process, the wrong thing is being over emphasized. The focus should be to emphasize efforts in Phase 1 and take them to Phase 2. Implementing projects at a faster pace, as opposed to putting additional projects on a list that we don't have funding for, what better serve the public. He added that public input for LCA and CWPPRA should be combined somehow.

Mr. Rick Hartman said his biggest concern is that construction money is being spent on engineering and design for projects CWPPRA cannot afford to build. He asked that since CWPPRA money is being used to support LCA right now, can LCA dollars be spent to help fund the engineering and design of projects that are moving forward. Mr. John Saia said that funds are specifically geared to LCA for planning studies and not for engineering and design, so using LCA funds would not be possible. Mr. Rick Hartman said that if money is being spent on engineering and design then some projects cannot be built, and he feels that the public is not being well represented.

Mr. Britt Paul said that with the option of going to an annual funding cycle, the Task Force will have to make the decisions on whether some projects are funded for engineering and design or whether projects ready for construction are funded.

Mr. Darryl Clark said that engineering and design is not a large percent of construction. He supports Mr. Rick Hartman's recommendation to go toward a PPL 15 and is in favor of continuing the PPL process. He believes that because the public was focusing on nominating projects at the RPT meetings, they were not prepared to discuss future funding options. He added that he is concerned about funding for Phase 2 project construction. Because there is only \$1 million left and this money could be needed for current projects that go over cost, he recommends deferring all construction funding requests until January '05. Mr. Troy Hill said that more public input is needed before the Technical Committee can vote on this recommendation. Mr. John Saia said that the Technical Committee should send out a letter soliciting comments for future funding options. Comments should be submitted in writing for the next Task Force meeting on April 14, 2004. Mr. Rick Hartman said we could also send the

letter out in the Breaux Act Newsflash. Ms. Marnie Winter asked that the Technical Committee send the letter to the Presidents of the 19 coastal parishes.

Mr. Darryl Clark believes it is a wise decision to continue with the Priority Project List project development. Mr. Britt Paul said that the Technical Committee should plan on having a PPL 15 until the Task Force acts. Mr. John Saia stated that there appeared to be a consensus that we would work toward a PPL15. Dr. Bill Good stated that there was not necessarily a consensus. He said the wide range of comments and suggestions should be compiled for presentation to the Task Force.

4. Agenda Item 3. Decision: De-authorization of Weeks Bay/Commercial Canal/GIWW Shoreline Protection Project – TV-19 (Saia). This item was removed from the agenda.

5. Agenda Item 4. Report and Discussion: Presentation Regarding Adaptive Management Procedures for Constructed CWPPRA Projects (Good). Dr. Bill Good presented a proposed process on adaptive management for constructed CWPPRA projects to be implemented in 2004. He would like the Technical Committee's support on the adaptive management review proposal in principle and recommendation to the Task Force to support the proposal. He would also like to use some planning funds for the activity. The proposal is based on the 2002 Adaptive Management recommendations co-lead by Dr. Jenneke Visser and Mr. Rick Raynie. The proposal calls for three sets of workshops. Workshop #1 consists of three monitoring and project evaluation workshops. These workshops will last 2 days and are tentatively scheduled for April 28-29, 2004 in Lafayette, May 4-5, 2004 in New Orleans, and May 11-12, 2004 in Thibodaux. Participants would include DNR field biologists and engineers, as well as CWPPRA Engineering and Environmental Work Group representatives. Workshop #2 would be a two-day working meeting, held in Baton Rouge during September 2004, and focus on the extent environmental goals are being achieved. Workshop #3 involves decision-maker review and input to determine the management responses there are warranted by the assessment. This workshop would be held in New Orleans in December 2004. Dr. Good estimates the series of workshops would cost \$39,600 for federal agencies to participate.

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

Mr. Rick Hartman said that if DNR wants to lead this kind of effort, the agencies can decide who to send and no action is needed by the Technical Committee.

Mr. Darryl Clark said that adaptive management is a good idea and improving the program is important. He does not object to planning money being used to fund this proposal. He thinks it would be good to have this exercise between DNR and federal sponsors to review projects and formulate conclusions, and then have a second level to present to the entire CWPPRA group. He would like to have a team work together to design an agenda for any September meeting to be held. One option is to defer the proposal to the fiscal year '05 budget process and perhaps hold the workshops on a larger scale. He believes the federal sponsor should be involved.

Dr. Bill Good made some points of clarification. He said that it is important for the Technical Committee to endorse this. He would like to go to the Task Force with the idea of having a one

day workshop with them. The Technical Committee needs to tell the Task Force that this is important, and now is the time to do this. The meeting with the Task Force in December is critical. The Technical Committee makes a lot of decisions by default, but final decisions rest at the feet of the Task Force.

Mr. Britt Paul said that he is not against adaptive management. He likes Mr. Darryl Clark's idea to get together with monitoring people and individual agencies and make conclusions together, prior to going to a larger group meeting. He does not want to jump into an April meeting right away. He said that buy-in from all Technical Committee members is needed up front.

Dr. Bill Good said he wants to make the monitoring effort better. He would like input from the biological and engineering groups to be in a forum where they can work together and draw conclusions. It is an opportunity to review results prior to being formalized in a report. Mr. Britt Paul asked how that level of detail and discussion on every project would be achieved. Dr. Bill Good replied that there would be three workshops with an average of 12 or 13 projects per workshop. The core group has to prepare this information so when people come to the table it's essentially predigested and available for review and discussion. Mr. Britt Paul expressed his concern that a number of people from each agency would need to attend to cover all information from individual projects.

Mr. Darryl Clark said that adaptive management is a good thing but that it is premature to perform a large exercise. He made a motion that DNR should have a series of meetings with their people and the Federal sponsors before this goes to a larger group. He does not want to have disagreements within the group and suggested that Federal sponsors meet with LDNR monitoring and O&M managers. He suggested that DNR meet with the Planning & Evaluation Subcommittee to develop the workshop format.

Mr. Troy Hill said that the adaptive management proposal is an effort to build credibility for LCA. He thinks there should be a neutral party involved. He agrees with Mr. Rick Hartman and feels the concept may need further development. Dr. Bill Good said that the bottom line is trust. He said that since projects are monitored for 20 years, he wants to invest time and resources on good projects. Mr. Britt Paul said that he would like to be involved in the synthesis of information to results.

Dr. Bill Good said that if all of the root source people were brought together at once, the meeting would be unmanageable and costly. He said that Technical Committee members would have an opportunity to view results before going public. He also commented on the motion made by Mr. Darryl Clark. He said that the proposal is utilizing and enhancing an existing task that would have been performed anyway. He feels that the extensive meetings and reviews that are being asked for are not feasible.

Mr. Rick Hartman said that he felt the motion made by Mr. Darryl Clark took things too far. He suggested that Dr. Bill Good incorporate pre-meeting discussions in the proposal.

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

Dr. Jenneke Visser, LSU Chair of Academic Advisory Group, said the adaptive management process is important. It is important to learn from old projects and apply that knowledge to new projects. She said that there is some money left over from the previous adaptive management effort. With the support of the Technical Committee, this money could be used for this year's efforts.

Ms. Cynthia Duet, Governor Blanco's Office, said that the Governor's Office supports DNR on this effort, not only with its applicability to larger efforts, but in continually modifying the way business is done to make the program better. She asked the Technical Committee to consider this proposal and bring it up at the next Task Force meeting.

Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, said he was confused by the process. Some projects have 2-3 years of data, while some have 5-6 years. He does not see how participants can review raw data in a short amount of time much less interact among disciplines and different people that have been involved in the project. Dr. Bill Good said that he is not asking people to look at all the data, just the information. From this, he hopes participants can discuss, evaluate, and assess the projects to gain knowledge. Mr. Quin Kinler stated there needs to be interaction with the federal sponsor before the project goes to a larger group. Dr. Bill Good said that adaptive management is a better approach than what has been used in the past. He said there is only so much time and money and that everyone cannot start from raw data. Mr. Quin Kinler said that a project should be done right the first time, not just look at the end product and have disagreements about the results. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that Dr. Bill Good's point is that adaptive management is an improvement over what is currently used.

Ms. Sue Hawes said she agrees with Dr. Bill Good. She said that science and adaptive management are what Washington wants.

**DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to recommend that DNR set up "workshop" meetings with each individual CWPPRA agency with monitoring and operations managers and with project managers of the CWPPRA agencies to exchange monitoring and O&M information. The summary information from these workshops will be presented at a general CWPPRA workshop for discussion. The format of that CWPPRA workshop will be discussed by DNR and the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee. Mr. Britt Paul seconded. Two voted for the motion (Clark/Paul). Three voted against the motion (Good/Hill/Hartman). The motion did not pass.**

Dr. Bill Good suggested having the first workshop as proposed, then look at the information again and decide what to do. He does not want to postpone the initial effort. Mr. Rick Hartman said that this would give more of a chance for input than is currently proposed. Dr. Bill Good withdrew his suggestion to ask for Task Force support of the adaptive management proposal at the next meeting. He would like to proceed with the project evaluations. A synopsis of the first workshop will be reviewed, and the Technical Committee can make a decision at the next meeting in July. He added that the proposal will not work without some level of commitment from the Technical Committee. He asked that Technical Committee members check with their groups to see if the proposed dates work. Mr. Britt Paul said that he has a conflict with the May 4-5, 2004 workshop dates due to a Vegetative Workshop being held on May 5, 2004.

6. Agenda Item 5. Discussion: Initial Discussion Regarding FY05 Budget Development (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Browning). Ms. Gay Browning reviewed the FY05 budget development. She said that the first step in the planning process is whether or not there will be a PPL 15 or if the process was going to be changed. Mr. Rick Hartman and Mr. Britt Paul agreed that the Technical Committee should proceed as if there is going to be a PPL 15. Dr. Bill Good suggested that some of the '04-'05 budget be allocated to aid in the integration of LCA and CWPPRA. Mr. John Saia agreed that it would be appropriate, but more discussions are needed as LCA develops. Mr. Rick Hartman said that the Technical Committee needs more information on the specific tasks to be done under LCA from DNR and the Corps before the next meeting in July.

7. Agenda Item 6. Additional Agenda Items (Saia). Mr. John Saia asked if there were any additional agenda items. Mr. Britt Paul announced that the Vegetative Workshop will be May 5, 2004 and will send out additional information. Mr. Jimmy Johnston reminded everyone about the crawfish boil on April 13<sup>th</sup> and encouraged Technical Committee members to provide door prizes for the event.

8. Agenda Item 7. Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (Saia). Mr. John Saia announced that the next Task Force meeting will be April 14, 2004 at the Estuarine Habitats and Fisheries Center in Lafayette. The next Technical Committee meeting will be July 14, 2004 in Baton Rouge.

9. The meeting concluded at 1:20 p.m.