

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 8 June 05 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Tom Podany opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. and previewed the agenda items. The Technical Committee members then introduced themselves. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Mr. Tom Podany, Chairman, Corps of Engineers (COE)

Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

Mr. Kevin Roy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), substituting for Mr. Darryl Clark

Mr. Gerry Duszynski, Louisiana Department of Natural Resource (LDNR)

Ms. Rachel Sweeney, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), substituting for Mr. Richard Hartman

Ms. Sharon Parrish, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

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

2. Agenda Item 1. Discussion: Priority Project List (PPL) 16 Process (Podany).

Ms. Julie LeBlanc gave a presentation of the CWPPRA Funding Overview to aid in the discussion of Agenda Items 1 and 2. There are currently 22 projects and one complex project (Increment 1 cost of \$381 million) that are scheduled to request Phase II approval in FY06. With the receipt of FY05 funding, the available funding (unencumbered balance) is -\$529,000.

Adding in the potential return of about \$1 million from the Leeville deauthorization, the total available amount is \$470,000. Although the program has recently increased obligations, obligations still lag behind available funding. The total cost to fund the 20-year project cost for all projects on PPL1-14 totals \$1.73 billion. The total Federal and non-Federal program funding through 2020 is projected to be approximately \$2.06 billion. The funding required for all PPL1-8 projects and the current phase of PPL9+ projects totals \$800.2M. The funding required to also include the 20-year life of projects scheduled to come forward for Phase II funding in January 2006 is \$1,256.9 million. In the short-term, the CWPPRA program currently has its lowest unobligated balance (approximately \$80 million) since 1995. The program is cash strapped in the short-term and has more projects requesting construction funds than funds available. However, even though the program is cash strapped there is \$80 million of unobligated funding available. In the long-term, the ten-year extension provides breathing room and enables the program to fund construction of all projects currently in Phase I and Phase II for PPLs 1-14, if the program chooses to fund those projects.

Mr. Tom Podany said that it was important to go over the budget to aid in future program decisions. The program needs about \$1.7 billion over the next 14 years to fund Priority Project Lists 1 through 14. With more than \$2 billion coming in, that would leave approximately \$350 million (or \$25 million/year) to fund new projects over the next 14 years (between now and

2019). The PPL15 process currently includes evaluation of eleven project nominees and six candidates, and up to four selected for Phase I funding.

He asked for a discussion regarding whether to adopt something for PP16 that's very similar to what was done in previous years or recommend changes to the process.

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

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that the intent was to have more projects ready than money in case additional funding became available. He recommended that they continue the size of the operation and the number of projects. He would like to modify the Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings where the projects first come up by adding a meeting to vote on projects that are being nominated so that a more comprehensive view on how the projects fit together can be obtained.

Mr. Podany brought up five sub-agenda items to be considered in developing a draft PPL16 process for subsequent Task Force approval. The first was:

Sub Agenda Item No. 1: Number of Nominees/Candidates Considered

- Current (PPL15) process:
 - Nominees: 1 project per basin, 2 from Barataria & Terrebonne (11 total)
 - Candidates: Technical Committee select 6
 - Phase I funding: Technical Committee recommend up to 4 to Task Force
- Possible scenario(s) to discuss:
 - Nominees: 2 projects per basin, 3 from Barataria & Terrebonne (20 total)
 - Candidates: Technical Committee select 8-10
 - Phase I funding: Technical Committee recommend up to 4 to Task Force

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

Mr. Gerry Duszynski was concerned that projects are getting weeded out too fast at the early stages.

Ms. Sharon Parrish said that she is not opposed to having a broader list of projects from which to select but wondered if funding would be available to select more projects. EPA would like to see previously selected projects move into construction over funding new projects for Phase I.

Ms. Rachel Sweeney said that NMFS is in favor of sticking with the process in place for PPL15. Six candidate projects are about the right number to evaluate over the short period of time. They are not in favor of loading any more projects into the candidate evaluation phase.

Mr. Kevin Roy said that the FWS is in favor of sticking with the process currently in place and that six projects as candidates are appropriate. They don't want to evaluate more projects because of the limited evaluation time and the \$350 million funding constraint.

Mr. Britt Paul suggested doing an initial screening of the 20 nominees with just a fact sheet. These could then be screened down to six to evaluate as candidates. He thought that it didn't make sense to increase the number of candidates for full evaluation since there is not much money and there is already a backlog.

Mr. Tom Podany said that it appeared that the consensus is to recommend (to the Task Force) twenty nominees, six candidates and up to four projects for Phase I.

Mr. Podany brought up the second sub-agenda item:

Sub Agenda Item No. 2: Technical Committee Selection of Candidates without Task Force Ratification

Issue: The Task Force questioned the authority that they delegated to the Technical Committee which enabled the Technical Committee to select 6 candidate projects from the 11 nominees without further ratification by the Task Force

- Current (PPL15) process: Technical Committee selects candidate projects, assigns Federal agencies, and begins Phase 0 evaluation (no ratification of selection by Task Force)
- Possible scenario(s) to discuss: Technical Committee recommends candidate projects to Task Force for their ratification prior to agency assignment and Phase 0 evaluation

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

Ms. Sharon Parrish said that her Task Force member would prefer that the Technical Committee recommend the candidate projects to the Task Force for ratification.

Mr. Britt Paul said that his Task Force member is comfortable with the way it is now being done—working through the Technical Committee to make the technical decision.

Mr. Kevin Roy said that they like the process as it is currently in place. The agencies should be able to convey their concerns on projects just as well through the Technical Committee as they can through the Task Force. The process has worked well for the past fourteen years.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that the Task Force did not come to a consensus on this. He is comfortable continuing doing what the Technical Committee has been doing.

Mr. Tom Podany added that Colonel Rowan is satisfied with the current process.

Mr. Tom Podany said that the consensus is to leave this item “as is”, with no recommended changes in the PPL16 process.

Mr. Podany brought up the third sub-agenda item:

Sub Agenda Item No. 3: Technical Committee Recommendation of Projects for Phase I

Issue: The Task Force questioned being asked to approve a “slate” of projects for Phase I funding versus approving projects “individually”. The Task Force also asked for a brief reason why projects were/were not selected for funding.

- Current (PPL15) process: The Technical Committee recommends “up to 4 projects” for Phase I approval. All candidate projects are presented to the Task Force, along with the Technical Committee’s recommendation. The Task Force can consider projects one-by-one or as a “block”. The Technical Committee does not provide reasons for selection.
- Possible scenario(s) to discuss: No change to recommendation procedure – the Task Force can decide to fund any project(s) it wishes to fund. The process can be modified to require the Technical Committee to provide “reasons” for its recommendation for Phase I funding.

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

Mr. Britt Paul said that they are already doing this. If any Task Force member has a question on an individual project, they can separate it out and vote on it individually. No change is needed.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that they should ask the Task Force how they want to hear the project presentations. Ms. Julie LeBlanc said that for the last couple of years all 6 candidate projects have been presented to the Task Force followed by the Technical Committee's recommendations. Mr. Britt Paul said that this is when four projects are selected from the 6 candidate projects. Mr. Tom Podany said that the Technical Committee is always prepared to present all of the projects.

Mr. Tom Podany said that the consensus is to leave this item “as is”, with no recommended changes in the PPL16 process.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public on sub-agenda items 1-3.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing Biloxi Marshlands Corporation said that they are very much in favor of more nominee projects--twenty projects, going down to six--because it requires a deeper look at the projects. Many parishes that have only one nominee may have two good projects. Mr. Chris Andry, St. Bernard Parish, said that he agreed with Mr. Randy Moertle.

Mr. ONeil Malbrough, Jefferson Parish, said that if LCA is authorized it should release funding back into the CWPPRA program. If that authorization happens before the PPL16 process begins, then some of the restrictions could change. If the LCA process moves forward, they could revisit this to look at more projects because more money would be freed up. He also noted that the total available funds should be divided by nine rather than 14 since the last five years are only for construction. That would free up \$35-40 million per year rather than \$25 million.

Mr. Podany brought up the fourth sub-agenda item:

Sub Agenda Item No. 4: Nomination/Regional Planning Team (RPT) Meetings.

Issue: PPL nomination process may not allow agencies and parishes adequate time to understand benefits or problems with nominated projects.

- Current (PPL15) process: One RPT meeting is held in each hydrologic region, resulting in a list of 11 nominees coast-wide.
- Possible scenario(s) to discuss: Hold 2 RPT meetings per hydrologic region. The first round of RPT meetings will be held to accept nominations and assign fact sheets. The second round of RPT meetings will be held to present more details on projects and to vote on projects to move forward as nominees. A second scenario allows for one coast-wide second meeting to present projects and vote for nominees. They have a draft recommendation from PACE to add one more meeting per region.

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

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that PACE supports holding 2 RPT meetings per region because it would help the parishes as well as the State. Some parishes have said that if they had had a chance to reflect maybe they would have supported another parish's project. It would also give everyone a chance to make a case for the most cost effective projects.

Mr. Britt Paul said that he would support one additional meeting for coast-wide voting, but not one additional meeting per region. He also noted that the process, logistics, and timing would need to be carefully worked out so the public will know when they need to be present to vote for projects in their region.

Mr. Kevin Roy suggested holding one coast-wide voting meeting in Baton Rouge once they have all of the projects that could be considered for nomination. They could vote for each of the four regions or for each basin. Doubling the amount of meetings is excessive. Ms. Rachel Sweeney said that Mr. Roy's suggestion of a second scenario is a good middle ground and would address State concerns. Ms. Sharon Parrish added that they were comfortable with either of the scenarios.

Mr. Tom Podany said that it appeared that the consensus of the Technical Committee was to add one meeting overall that would be centrally located and cover voting for all four regions.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public on sub-agenda item 4.

No response.

Mr. Podany brought up the fifth sub-agenda item:

Sub Agenda Item No. 5: Demonstration Project Nominees

Issue: The Workgroups are evaluating large numbers of demonstration project nominees, even though we only selected one demo under PPL13 and none under PPL14. Some demonstration submissions may not meet the CWPPRA definition of “demonstration”.

- Current (PPL15) process: Any number of demonstration projects can be submitted to the Engineering/Environmental Workgroup for consideration/evaluation.
- Possible scenario(s) to discuss:
 - Limit demonstration submissions to 1 per agency
 - Develop a process for the Workgroups to “screen” list of nominees for: (1) eligibility (meeting demonstration project criteria) and (2) limit to a set number of demos (like we specify a set number of nominees/candidates)
 - Select a category yearly for demos (shoreline protection, dredging, etc.)

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

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that he is not sure what some of the existing demonstration projects are “demonstrating”. It’s not good to give false hope; so limiting the number of demonstration projects nominated may help. Each agency could screen the demonstration projects according to their own criteria. This shouldn’t be an unruly process where too many projects are being processed and evaluated.

Mr. Kevin Roy said that he is in favor of trimming back on the number of demonstration projects. The nominations could be limited to one per agency. He also likes Ms. Julie LeBlanc’s suggestion of moving demonstration project nominations to the RPT meetings and having the agencies vote on one per region that would be further evaluated by the workgroups.

Mr. Britt Paul said that he liked the idea of having one demonstration project per basin because sometimes the demonstration projects don’t come from the agency--sometimes the ideas come from the public. Limiting it to one per basin keeps the number at a manageable level. The demonstration projects should be screened and any that are not a real demonstration of something new should be removed.

Mr. Tom Podany said that in the past the spirit of the demonstration program has been not necessarily to limit it to a region where it might be implemented, assuming it could be applied where it's appropriate.

Mr. Kevin Roy said that reducing the number and having one per region would make it somewhat site specific and that is something to avoid. The best idea is to continue what they are doing but limit the nominations to one per agency.

Ms. Rachel Sweeney said that one demonstration project per agency would keep the numbers manageable. She envisioned problems with trying to screen demonstration projects at the RPT level and trying to figure out what is and what is not a demonstration project.

Ms. Sharon Parrish said that they are in favor of screening them to make sure they meet the demonstration project criteria. One per agency may be too restrictive and one per basin makes it site specific.

Mr. Tom Podany stated that at least two or three of the agencies are suggesting one demonstration project per agency. Mr. Britt Paul said he would go with the group consensus as long as the public knows that they can bring demonstration project ideas to an agency. He noted that most demonstration projects are targeted to a given area.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public on sub-agenda item 5.

Dr. Jenneke Visser, Louisiana State University, said that she liked the idea of having the demonstration projects presented at the RPT meetings, especially since there would be a meeting added after the RPT meeting to vote on the nominees. There could be discussion about which demonstration projects fit the criteria and they could be developed further. The number could still be limited. With the CWPPRA program extension, demonstration projects are needed because there is more time to use that information.

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Foundation, said that he believes that limiting demonstration nominees to one per agency would be cutting some of the opportunity for public input to nominate demonstration projects. He suggested limiting the number of demonstration project nominees and not saying it has to be by agency or by basin.

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

Mr. Podany said that they are most concerned about reducing the number of demonstration projects. He suggested limiting the number to six and accepting the nominations at the RPT meetings and then screening them down at the last meeting.

Mr. Britt Paul said that he liked the idea of having demonstration projects nominated at the RPT meetings when they evaluate regular projects but is concerned that information may be lacking. Mr. Podany suggested screening the number of demonstration projects down to 6 at the second coast-wide RPT meeting. Ms. Rachel Sweeney suggested considering this a bit more to make sure that we have an appropriate voting procedure for demonstration projects if we are going to vote at the RPT level. Mr. Britt Paul suggested considering demonstration projects coast-wide. Then there could be one big vote for demonstrations.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that we want to say how many demonstration projects that would be screened to rather than going through the RPT or even one per agency. He suggested six projects and going through the same process currently in place and screening at the Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Podany stated that the demonstration projects could either be screened at the RPT meetings or at a later time. Mr. Paul clarified that Mr. Duszynski suggested that the Technical Committee select demonstration candidates at the same meeting where candidate projects are selected. Mr. Paul added that we could take all demonstration project nominees or up to a certain number and then cut them at the Technical Committee level before workgroup

evaluations. Ms. Rachel Sweeney confirmed that the demonstration projects be cut the Technical Committee level prior to the full evaluations being completed by the workgroups.

Mr. Podany reopened the floor for comments from the public on sub-agenda item 5.

Mr. O'Neil Malbrough said that having the same amount of demonstration projects as real project being reviewed is excessive and has an unintended consequence of making consultants/parishes think up new demonstration projects because of a false sense of hope that they will be approved. It is better to look at the problems with current projects and consider only demonstration projects that would demonstrate new techniques that improve performance. For example, in Bayou Perot and Bayou Rigolets they demonstrated a technique using concrete panels and pilings that turned out to be better than putting rock material in place.

Yarrow Etheridge, City of New Orleans, said that everyone benefits from having a public discussion about all the projects that are nominated. Having the discussion at one RPT meeting would be of benefit to everyone.

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked if setting a specific number was appropriate and, if so, was six or three the right number? Agencies and contractors have looked at the problems and have come up with ideas and people are thinking out of the box. But it also encourages people to repackage projects to make them into demonstration projects.

Ms. Sharon Parrish suggested not changing the process this year and that perhaps the large number of nominations this year is an anomaly. Mr. Britt Paul added that there will be tough meetings ahead for the workgroups to go through the 14 demonstration nominations. Mr. Gerry Duszynski suggested asking the P&E Subcommittee to work up evaluation criteria. Mr. Kevin Roy said that there already are ranking criteria that are used on the nominated demonstration projects. He doesn't see the need for a pre-screening meeting by the workgroups before the Technical Committee narrows down the demonstration projects.

Ms. Rachel Sweeney suggested a possible scenario of nominating an unlimited number of demo projects then selecting a certain number of projects at the coast-wide voting RPT meeting, whether it be four or six. This would allow for public involvement and give us time to look at the projects between the RPT nomination meeting and the RPT voting meeting. Mr. Podany stated that it could be done either way (vote at the coast-wide RPT meeting or vote at the Technical Committee meeting). He stated that he was more comfortable having the decision at the Technical Committee level, but suggested that demonstration projects be discussed at the coast-wide RPT meeting.

Mr. Tom Podany suggested the following: Nominations for demonstration projects would be accepted at the four RPT meetings and then further discussed at the coast-wide RPT meeting (no set limitation specified, but expectation of four to six nominees). Then the Technical Committee would vote on a number (to be decided upon based on input from the

Engineering Workgroup and Environmental Workgroup) at the same time that it votes for the 6 candidate projects.

The Technical Committee tasked the P&E Subcommittee with drafting the PPL16 process, to be presented to the Technical Committee for their approval. This final draft PPL16 process will be presented to the Task Force for their review/approval at the July 27th, 2005 meeting.

3. Agenda Item 2. Decision: FY06 Planning Budget Development (Podany).

Mr. Tom Podany said that the FY06 Planning Budget process was initiated to allow final Task Force approval of the FY06 Planning Budget at the October 26, 2005 Task Force meeting. The Technical Committee will discuss and decide upon a process to develop the FY06 budget, to include PPL16. The Programmatic Assessment is going to cost \$164,000, which is coming out of the Planning dollars. He suggested tightening the FY06 budget to try to keep it at \$5 million. There is about \$300,000 left in the Planning program that's unencumbered from previous years, so that allows for items that might come up between budget cycles. He also asked for views on the budget considering that LCA is now moving ahead. He suggested reducing funding from \$30,000 to \$15,000 for the "seat at the table" funding and making up the difference in the LCA Project Management Plans (PMPs) to ensure that the involvement remains at the current level. He also suggested reducing the number of Technical Committee meetings each year (currently six meetings are scheduled). Mr. Wes McQuiddy suggested four Technical Committee meetings per year.

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

Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that the State feels that CWPPRA should support some of the LCA activities at the front end with LCA eventually taking on more responsibility. He supports having money in the budget to support the Federal agencies.

Ms. Rachel Sweeney said that if there were only four Technical Committee meetings, there would only be two working meetings (since two meetings are spent discussing funding issues). Mr. Gerry Duszynski said that reducing meetings wouldn't save much money. Mr. Britt Paul added that the agenda was full for every meeting.

The general consensus of the Technical Committee was to ask the P&E Subcommittee to develop a FY06 budget recommendation to the Technical Committee at their September 14, 2005 meeting, allowing for final approval by the Task Force in October 2005. The P&E Subcommittee will begin to work on the budget once the Task Force approves the Technical Committee's PPL16 process in July 2005.

4. Agenda Item 3. Decision: Request for Change in Scope of the East/West Grand Terre Islands Restoration (BA-30) (Sweeney). Ms. Rachel Sweeney presented a proposed change in scope for the East and West Grand Terre Islands Restoration project. One of the original project goals was to prevent breaching of these islands and to maintain shoreline integrity. During the design process several breaches have developed on East Grand Terre. The fully funded cost of both

islands (at the time of Phase I authorization) was \$18 Million. The fully funded cost of all project features (East and West) is now estimated to be \$25-\$32 Million. The fully funded cost for East Grand Terre Island is \$20 Million. The Corps has beneficially used maintenance-dredged material on West Grand Terre Island and plans to continue to use the island for beneficial use. Since East Grand Terre is in a much more deteriorated condition than West Grand Terre, she requested a no cost change to proceed to final design on only East Grand Terre and not to undertake any action on West Grand Terre.

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

Mr. Wes McQuiddy asked if they had coordinated with Jefferson Parish. Ms. Rachel Sweeney replied that they had not because they have just completed the thirty percent design review. To keep on schedule for requesting Phase II funding this year, Technical Committee and Task Force approval to proceed to final design is needed.

Ms. Sue Hawes asked if Ms. Sweeney would give a detailed description of the alternative. Ms. Rachel Sweeney replied that the recommended alternative is alternative one, as described in the design document.

Mr. Kevin Roy asked if the material dredged from maintenance of the Barataria Bay Waterway was dedicated for use on West Grand Terre Island. Ms. Rachel Sweeney replied that the Corps' preferred disposal option for the Barataria Bay Waterway is West Grand Terre Island.

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

Mr. ONeil Malbrough, Jefferson Parish, expressed concern over the lack of coordination with Jefferson Parish on the proposed change in project scope. The islands are deteriorated and the project shouldn't be delayed. He stated that he did not have the authority to stand up and state that Jefferson Parish supported this change. He concluded by saying he would support contingent approval by the Technical Committee based on Jefferson Parish support of the change.

DECISION: Mr. Britt Paul moved to recommend to the Task Force moving to final design with the East Grand Terre portion of the project, contingent upon additional coordination with and support from Jefferson Parish. Mr. Gerry Duszynski seconded the motion. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision: Proposed Changes to the CWPPRA Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), Demonstration Project Appendix (LeBlanc). Ms. Julie LeBlanc presented the P&E Subcommittee's recommended changes to the Demonstration Project Appendix of the CWPPRA SOP. During the March 10, 2005 P&E Subcommittee meeting, the Engineering and Environmental Workgroup Chairmen were tasked with revising the Demonstration SOP to include implementation procedures for demonstration projects selected for funding. The P&E Subcommittee requests approval of the recommended changes to the Demonstration Project Appendix of the CWPPRA SOP.

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

Ms. Rachel Sweeney stated that she hadn't received feedback from everyone in her agency and suggested that more work needed to be done at the workgroup level. Considering the previous changes discussed by the Technical Committee under agenda item #1, Ms. Sweeney suggested that the committee consider those changes as well as these when revising the demonstration project appendix to the SOP. Mr. Britt Paul agreed.

No further action was taken on this agenda item. The suggested changes will be incorporated after the Task Force makes a decision on the PPL16 process.

6. Agenda Item 5. Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Funding Increase on PPL2 - Pointe au Fer Hydrologic Restoration Project (TE-22) (Burkholder). Mr. David Burkholder, Department of Natural Resources, presented a request for an increase of \$165,000 for O&M cost for the Pointe au Fer Hydrologic Restoration project. Additional O&M funding in the amount of \$215,000 (covering expected funding needs for 2005-2007) was previously approved by the Task Force in October 2004. Bids for the O&M work exceed the available funding and additional funds are required to award the contract. The Technical Committee was asked to recommend a funding increase to the Task Force. The cost increase is due to an increase in both the quantity of material and the unit cost.

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked about the risk to the project if the funding is not provided. Mr. David Burkholder replied that the breaches are compromising the overall performance of the project.

Mr. Kevin Roy asked Mr. Burkholder to confirm the amount of the request. Mr. David Burkholder replied that it was for \$165,000, which is in addition to the \$215,000 approved by the Task Force last Fall. The extra funding will cover the low bid plus contingency as well as increased cost in construction oversight.

DECISION: Ms. Rachel Sweeney made a motion to recommend to the Task Force a \$165,000 O&M funding increase for the Point au Fer Hydrologic Restoration Project (covering 2005-2007). Mr. Britt Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Tom Podany asked if a Task Force fax vote would be required since bids had already been opened. Mr. Burkholder stated that the low bidder said he would honor his bid through August; therefore Task Force action at the July 27th meeting would be acceptable.

7. Agenda Item 6. Decision: Request for Increase in the Monitoring Budget for PPL11 - Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection, Phase A (Construction Unit 1) (TE-48) (Paul). Mr. Loland Broussard and Mr. Todd Folse presented a request for \$143,000 in additional funding as a result of a change to the original monitoring plan. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR) have agreed on a proposed monitoring change to provide more detailed surveys (closer spacing and increased frequency) to

better define the sand volume changes on the island and the spit at the western end of the island. The Task Force approved Phase II funding for the project in October 2004. The Technical Committee was asked to recommend a 3-year funding increase in the amount of \$143,610 to the Task Force.

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked about the proposed wetland area behind the bay. Mr. Britt Paul replied that that was another phase of the project.

DECISION: Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to recommend to the Task Force a \$143,610 funding increase in the monitoring budget for the Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection, Phase A (CU1) project (covering 2005-2007). Mr. Gerry Duszynski seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 7. Discussion: CWPPRA Programmatic Assessment and Vision (Podany). Mr. Tom Podany reported that at the 4 May 05 Task Force meeting, the Task Force approved the proposed scope of work for the CWPPRA Programmatic Assessment and Vision and directed the Technical Committee to proceed with the assessment. As recommended by the Governor's representative on the Task Force, the Task Force agreed to have a meeting between the CWPPRA Task Force/Technical Committee and the LCA Program Management Team (PMT) to discuss program consistency and effectiveness. This meeting is in the process of being scheduled. Mr. Tom Podany noted that Mr. Randy Hanchey had wanted to see more of an LCA flavor to the Programmatic Assessment outline. Mr. Podany also noted that there should be a more information on the authority for doing the assessment (e.g., CWPPRA Section 307, Louisiana Coastal Area report to Congress).

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

Mr. Britt Paul said that they are still waiting to learn the meeting date.

No further action was taken on this agenda item.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report: Land Loss Map Updates (Podany). The FY05 CWPPRA Planning Budget included funds for preparation of updates to land loss maps. USACE staff from the New Orleans District and the Engineering Research and Development Center has completed updates of land loss maps for the Mississippi River delta and St. Bernard marshes. Mr. Del Britsch provided an overview of the mapping effort and announced the distribution schedule for the new information including printed copies of the maps.

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked if any trends were evident. Mr. Del Britsch replied that data were available for 1932, 1958, 1974, 1983, 1990 and 2001. They found deterioration in the Delacroix area, east of Caernarvon as well as Barataria—Terrebonne.

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

Mr. O'Neil Malbrough, Jefferson Parish, asked about availability of the mapping. Mr. Del Britsch replied that that printed and digital maps would be available by the end of September 2005.

10. Agenda Item 9. Additional Agenda Items (Podany). There were no additional agenda items.

11. Agenda Item 10. Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (Podany). Mr. Tom Podany announced that the next Task Force meeting would take place on July 27, 2005 in New Orleans, chaired by the new District Commander, Colonel Richard Wagenaar. The next Technical Committee meeting will be held on September 14, 2005 in New Orleans.

12. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.