

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 6 December 2006 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)
Mr. Gerry Duszynski, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR)
Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Ms. Sharon Parrish, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
Mr. Tom Podany, Corps of Engineers (Corps), Acting Chairman (outgoing)
Mr. Troy Constance, (Corps), Acting Chairman (incoming)

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

Prior to beginning the agenda items, Mr. Tom Podany announced that Mr. Troy Constance, Corps, would be taking over as the Acting Chairman of the Technical Committee.

2. Agenda Item 1: Report: Status of Breaux Act Program and Project Funds (LeBlanc). *Ms. LeBlanc will discuss the Construction Program and the status of the CWPPRA accounts, to aid the Technical Committee in making today's funding decisions.* Ms. Julie LeBlanc announced that the available funding in the Construction Program as of today is expected to be \$65,065,701 (including estimated FY07 allocation). Ms. LeBlanc summarized the funding requests from the Construction Program in the agenda. If the requests listed in Agenda Items 2 and 3 were approved by the Technical Committee for further approval by the Task Force, there would be an available balance of \$56,223,018 in the Construction Program to fund the Phase II requests under agenda items 4 and 5.

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

Mr. Rick Hartman asked how certain the FY07 funding is for the Construction Program. Ms. Gay Browning noted that there was a discrepancy two years ago, but last year the program received the expected funding.

LDNR had concerns about addressing post-hurricane increases in construction costs. Mr. Gerry Duszynski stated that there has been a sharp increase in construction and material costs post-hurricanes. He noted there are projects approved for Phase II construction, which have not been bid yet. Mr. Duszynski would not like to use all available funding to approve new projects, but rather have remaining funds to cover increased construction costs on these approved projects.

Mr. Rick Hartman did not want to set aside a pool of money. Instead, he would like to look at the Phase II voting and fund one less project withholding at least \$10 million.

Mr. Darryl Clark agreed it would be good to hold funds back; the question is how much. There is no information available on the funding needs of the projects that could potentially be impacted by the construction cost increases and he is concerned that it will limit the ability to fund additional Phase II construction projects. Mr. Clark would like to see the agencies wait until the bids come in to request additional funding for construction from the Task Force.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that LDNR has some small projects that did not receive bids because contractors are too busy with other projects. In addition, there is a balance between having funding for new projects and having funding set aside for increases. The availability of rock has been reduced as one of the quarries has shut down.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that some of the projects experiencing cost increases might not have been funded if the Technical Committee knew about the increase in cost before approving. Mr. Hartman noted that whatever the Technical Committee does with regard to setting aside a pool of money, he would still like the projects to request funding so that if a project doubles in cost and it barely warrants funding, the decision can be made not to fund the project.

Mr. Britt Paul agreed that funds should be set aside in this manner. The requests should come to a vote after the bids have been received and the actual cost increase is known.

Mr. Tom Podany noted that we are under emergency conditions and therefore are paying premium costs. The CWPPRA program has the benefit of signaling that emergency prices will not be tolerated. He wanted to set aside funds for potential cost increases, but there is no guarantee that cost increases would be approved. If the results from the first round of bids are unsatisfactory, the project may have to be delayed or re-advertised. The program has to consider the changing market and allocate funds accordingly. Mr. Podany believes that selecting fewer Phase II projects would adequately reserve funds.

There was a general consensus that funds would be set aside once projects on future agenda items are ranked.

3. Agenda Item 2: Decision: Request for Additional Phase II Increment 1 Funding for the West Lake Boudreaux Project (TE-46) (Clark). The Technical Committee will consider the request by the FWS and LDNR for additional funding for the West Lake Boudreaux Project due to the increased costs of rock and hydraulic dredging after the 2005 hurricanes. Phase II Increment 1 funding in the amount of \$14.6 million was approved by the Task Force on February 8, 2006. It is anticipated that additional Phase II Increment 1 funding in the amount of \$1,916,859 is needed because rock and hydraulic dredging costs have increased as a result of the 2005 hurricanes. Mr. Darryl Clark asked Mr. John Jurgensen to discuss the request. Mr. John Jurgensen, NRCS, announced that the unit cost of the West Lake Boudreaux Project has increased due to the cost increase for rock, geo-textiles, and dredging. The labor costs have remained constant.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked what the percentage increase was for the project (over the original approved project cost). Mr. Darryl Clark responded that the increase in cost is 10-15% with no changes to the benefits.

Mr. Darryl Clark announced that the bids have not gone out. He recommended that the money be set aside so when bids come in, the exact amount could be requested. Mr. Britt Paul agreed with Mr. Clark's approach. Mr. Rick Hartman believes the \$1.9 million should be approved. Mr. Clark responded that the bids will be going out in the middle of December and the amount of the bids will not be known until after the Task Force meeting. Mr. Gerry Duszynski agreed with Mr. Rick Hartman and recommended approving the estimated funding increase. If additional funding over the \$1.9 million is needed, a fax vote could be conducted to approve.

Mr. Tom Podany asked if the funds would be returned if the bids were low. Mr. Darryl Clark said the agency could return the extra funds as soon as possible even though there is a tendency to hold on to them for potential modifications.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to approve the increase in Phase II Increment 1 funding for the West Lake Boudreaux Project (TE-46) in the amount of \$1,916,859. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at its next meeting.

Ms. Gay Browning asked if the Technical Committee's recommendation included Increment 1 cost and the 17-year cost for O&M. The cost for the remaining 17 years of the project life was slightly increased and it would exceed the approved current amount. If the recommendation were to be approved by the Task Force, Mr. Tom Podany believed it should be treated as if starting with a new baseline (20-year) cost.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that changes to O&M cost due to additional construction costs need to be clearly identified. Mr. John Jurgensen stated that this has been identified for this project and that the majority of the money is for the first construction but a small portion is set-aside for O&M because of the increased material cost. In the future, Mr. Tom Podany would like to see a break down of O&M and Phase II costs.

4. Agenda Item 3: Decision: Request for Additional Phase II Increment 1 Construction Funds for the Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project (PO-30) (Parrish). The Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project received Phase II Increment 1 funding in the amount of \$16.6 million from the CWPPRA Task Force on February 8, 2006. EPA and LDNR final project review efforts prior to bid solicitation (anticipated in early 2007) indicate pre-Katrina/Rita cost estimates for the authorized project should be made consistent with post-hurricane material costs and recent project awards. In order to avoid likely construction bid overruns in 2007, EPA is seeking an increase in Phase II Increment 1 funding in the amount of \$6,925,824. Mr. Tim Landers, EPA, explained that this project was a combination of two previous CWPPRA projects designed to restore the lower rim of Lake Borgne. The reason for the additional funding request is due to an increase in material costs, particularly rock. The \$6.9 million request includes the increased cost of materials, increase in initial construction, contingency, and increase in O&M. The aim for construction is within the dredging window of May to September.

Mr. Tom Podany asked how the rock price compared to the one quoted derived from the West Lake Boudreaux Project. Mr. Tim Landers responded that the rock price was the latest estimate from the Corps. The estimate was reviewed by the Engineering Workgroup.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that the State CPRA plan indicated that several levee alternatives are being proposed through the vicinity of Bayou Dupre and Lake Borgne. He is concerned that the money spent on this project will be wasted. Mr. Tim Landers agreed that is a very important consideration. Mr. Tom Podany agreed it is difficult to determine what the plan is for the area; there are at least three alignments being considered, one of which could be close to the rock dike to be constructed by this project.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that the CPRA plan is still a preliminary draft with no timeline on implementation. This project is time sensitive in order to prevent large breaches and should be done now while other projects are being developed. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed and noted that some of the levee alignments, especially the one through Lake Borgne, will not be good for the environment and will potentially destroy the estuary. Mr. Tim Landers added that a lot of damage could occur in the period it may take for storm protection measures to be finalized.

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

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, supported the additional funding for this project. The Foundation considers the Lake Borgne shoreline to be a critical landform. He agreed there is uncertainty on the new levee alignment, but the EPA project will still protect wetlands.

DECISION: Ms. Sharon Parrish made a motion to approve the increase in Phase II Increment 1 funding for the Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project (PO-30) in the amount of \$6,925,824. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at its next meeting.

Mr. Britt Paul questioned if a contingency needs to be added to these project costs a second time. Contingency is typically added because construction does not occur immediately. In this case, the unit cost is an up-to-date number. Ms. Gay Browning clarified that a contingency is usually added to the construction cost estimate. Mr. Tom Podany noted that since the Engineering Workgroup feels the contingency was added consistently with other projects, the additional money would be necessary. Mr. Gerry Duszynski added that if the bids come in low, the extra money could be refunded.

5. Agenda Item 4: Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (O&M only) for the "Lake Borgne Segment" of the Lake Borgne/MRGO Shoreline Protection Project (PO-32) (Podany). *The 3rd Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act provided funds for construction of shoreline protection in the area of the MRGO. A portion of these funds are being utilized to build the Lake Borgne segment of the PO-32 CWPPRA project. A contract for this work was awarded by the Corps in September 2006 and*

construction is scheduled to begin in January 2007. The work is being completed using designs and NEPA documents completed under CWPPRA Phase I. The project will build 18,820 feet of rock dike to protect 93 acres of marsh along the southern shoreline of Lake Borgne between Doullut's Canal and Jahncke's Ditch. The Corps is requesting Phase II authorization and Phase II Increment 1 funding (O&M only) for the Lake Borgne segment of the PO-32 project. Increment 1 cost, not including initial construction, is \$9,159,788 (fully funded). The 20-year O&M cost is \$13,799,013. It is proposed that the required O&M funds be provided by CWPPRA to maintain the project under the same procedures identified for CWPPRA projects constructed with CIAP funds. Mr. Greg Miller, Corps, noted that this project, originally authorized under PPL12, includes two segments of shoreline protection along Lake Borgne and the MRGO totaling 32,000 linear feet (LF). The Task Force asked that this project be designed as two separate projects. The Lake Borgne segment includes 18,800 LF of offshore breakwater. This project will create, protect, or restore 93 net acres over the 20-year project life.

The Corps is currently constructing the Lake Borgne segment of the project using hurricane recovery funds provided by Congress in the 3rd emergency supplemental appropriation. A construction contract was awarded in September with expected completion in March 2007. This will become the first wetland restoration project constructed in the Pontchartrain Basin since Hurricane Katrina. Mr. Greg Miller announced that the \$9.1 million funding request is for the Increment 1 O&M component (3 years) of this project. Phase II approval and Phase II Increment 1 funding for the MGRO segment of the project is requested under Agenda Item 5.

Mr. Darryl Clark questioned whether the second O&M lift was necessary at year three. He wondered if it could be postponed to year four or later with another funding request next September. Mr. Greg Miller responded that the project was designed in collaboration with the predicted O&M need. The Engineering Workgroup agreed a lift was needed in year three. Mr. Miller noted that this lift would essentially finish the project and will patch any irregular settlement. Delaying the lift would require a review from the appropriate committees. Mr. Clark is concerned that the 3-year O&M cost is \$9.1 million, which would limit the funding potential for other projects.

Mr. Britt Paul asked if there is money remaining in the supplemental appropriation to fund the O&M lift. Mr. Greg Miller replied that the funds used to build the project have a sunset clause on them and have to be expended before the O&M event would be required.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that this has been reviewed and apparently, it needs a lift at year three. He does not feel that delaying the lift is the way to handle this project. He would like to see the project built, but noted that this request is for O&M only, not construction.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski supported the idea of paying the O&M costs under CWPPRA. He wondered if the project should be constructed, and then see what the conditions are and decide what the O&M should be.

Mr. Rick Hartman stated he wasn't comfortable picking up O&M on the project. He continued that anyone can build a project and then ask CWPPRA to pick up the O&M cost. Mr. Miller

responded that this is different. We are trying to capitalize on a project that CWPPRA selected under PPL12. It has been through all the CWPPRA procedures and reviews.

Mr. Tom Podany believed Mr. Gerry Duszynski raised a good point, but since this is a CWPPRA project that had been intended to move forward, it should not be penalized by not providing three years of funding for O&M. Mr. Rick Hartman noted that CWPPRA agreed to invest in the engineering design, not in the construction.

Mr. Britt Paul asked why O&M is needed at this stage when the funds are required three years from now; it will not impact the project. Mr. Greg Miller asked why the program would set aside funds for future O&M for any project (as is current procedure). He feels that the request is the best way to operate, allowing for planning and design.

Mr. Tom Podany agreed that there is another two years to make the decision. He asked if the Engineering Workgroup did an analysis and if the O&M at year three was critical. Mr. Greg Miller responded that the review projected that the settlement from construction would be observed in year two, and year three was the most cost effective time to rebuild it to the designed elevation. Mr. Darryl Clark noted another reason for moving the O&M lift to year four would be to allow more time to observe the initial subsidence. Mr. Podany pointed out that the same argument to delay funding O&M could be made for other projects, which could jeopardize their success.

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

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, supported the request for funding. This project is consistent with protecting this landform and it is a CWPPRA project. He believes it's a good thing that some outside money is funding a project for construction.

Unrelated to the agenda item under discussion, Dr. Lopez then passed out information on a MRGO presentation made in Washington DC.

Mr. Tom Podany explained that the committee will first review and rank the projects prior to making a decision on Agenda Item 4, which will allow the committee to consider the Phase II ranking and available funding when making its recommendation.

Mr. Tom Podany turned the remainder of the meeting over to the new Acting Chairman of the Technical Committee, Mr. Troy Constance.

6. Agenda Item 5: Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Constance). *The Technical Committee will consider requests for Phase II authorization and approval of Phase II Increment 1 funding of projects on PPLs 9 through 15, for recommendation to the Task Force. Due to limited funding, the Technical Committee will recommend a list of projects to the Task Force for Phase II authorization and Increment 1 funding within available program construction funding limits. Each project will be discussed individually by its sponsoring agency, Technical Committee members, and the general public in the following format: a. Agency presentation on individual projects (5 minutes max), b.*

Technical Committee questions and comments on individual projects, c. Public comments on individual projects (Comments should be limited to 1-2 minutes). Following presentations and discussion on individual projects, the Technical Committee will rank all projects to aid in deciding which to recommend to the Task Force for Phase II authorization and approval of Increment 1 funding. Mr. Troy Constance announced that the Technical Committee has 12 candidate projects to review for recommendation for Phase II Increment 1 Funding.

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Construction Start Date	Phase II Total Cost	Phase II Incr. 1 Funding Request	Acres Benefited Over 20 Years	Prioritization Score	30% Design Review Meeting Date	95% Design Review Meeting Date
NRCS	BA-27c(3)	9	Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 - CU 7	Aug-07	\$25,765,121	\$21,538,790	180	45.55	20 Aug 03 (A)	2 Sep 04 (A)
NMFS	AT-04	9	Castille Pass Channel Sediment Delivery	Jun-07	\$29,045,754	\$18,933,969	577	59.50	20 Jan 04 (A)	13 Oct 05 (A)
FWS	BA-36	11	Dedicated Dredging on Barataria Basin Landbridge - Fill Site 1	Aug-07	\$15,378,401	\$15,231,142	242	56.00	17 Dec 03 (A)	29 Jul 04 (A)
NMFS	BA-30	9	East Grand Terre Island Restoration	Aug-07	\$34,393,708	\$33,881,341	335	60.00	26 May 05 (A)	30 Nov 05 (A)
COE	TV-11b	9	Freshwater Bayou Bank Stab-Belle Isle Canal-Lock	Apr-07	\$28,571,202	\$25,676,625	241	39.50	27 Jun 02 (A)	22 Jan 04 (A)
NRCS	TE-43	10	GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne - Segments 1, 2, 6	Aug-07	\$15,968,228	\$13,175,993	132	40.25	21 Jan 03 (A)	26 Aug 04 (A)
FWS	PO-33	13	Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation	Jun-07	\$19,137,181	\$18,989,923	436	53.00	20 Jul 06 (A)	8 Nov 06 (A)
COE	ME-21	11	Grand Lake Shoreline Protection - with Tebo Point	Aug-07	\$23,068,344	\$20,331,947	540	61.25	11 May 04 (A)	16 Aug 04 (A)
COE	PO-32b	12	Lake Borgne & MRGO Shoreline Prot - MRGO Segment**	Apr-07	\$34,637,092	\$31,924,591	173	36.50	11 Aug 04 (A)	29 Mar 05 (A)
NMFS	ME-18	10	Rockefeller Refuge	Jun-07	\$10,544,865	\$10,544,865	N/A	NA	28 Sep 04 (A)	20 Sep 05 (A)
EPA	TE-47	11	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration	May-07	\$49,183,319	\$48,901,961	195	60.00	5 Oct 04 (A)	28 Sep 05 (A)
NRCS	TE-39	9	South Lake DeCade - CU 1	Aug-07	\$3,171,215	\$2,221,045	202	74.95	19 Jul 04 (A)	2 Sep 04 (A)

PPL9 Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 – CU 7 (BA-27c(3)): Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, described that this project, located in Lafourche Parish, includes a 22,800 LF rock dike/revetment and the beneficial use of dredge material to create 38 acres of marsh. This project would create 180 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 45.55. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$25.8 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$21.5 million.

PPL9 Castille Pass Channel Sediment Delivery (AT-04): Dr. John Foret, NMFS, explained that this project would hydraulically dredge 2.1 million cubic yards of material to create marsh. This project would create over 577 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score

of 59.50. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$29.0 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$18.9 million.

PPL11 Dedicated Dredging on Barataria Basin Landbridge – Fill Site 1 (BA-36): Mr. Kevin Roy, FWS, described that this project, located in Jefferson Parish, would hydraulically dredge material to create wetlands. The project would create 242 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 56.00. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$15.4 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$15.2 million.

PPL9 East Grand Terre Island Restoration (BA-30): Ms. Rachel Sweeney, NMFS, described that this project would restore the beach and dune to prevent breaching by constructing a 2.8-mile shoreline protection and 450-acre marsh platform. The project would create 335 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 60.00. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$34.4 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$33.9 million.

PPL9 Freshwater Bayou Bank Stab-Belle Isle Canal-Lock (TV-11b): Mr. Greg Miller, Corps, explained that this project would create a 40,000 LF of rock dike to stop shoreline erosion. The project would create 241 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 39.50. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$28.6 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$25.7 million.

PPL10 GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne – Segments 1, 2, and 6 (TE-43): Mr. Ron Boustany, NRCS, explained that this project, located in Terrebonne Parish, is designed to protect the southern bank of the GIWW and the fragile floating marshes. The project was downsized from a 37,000 LF rock dike to a 14,555 LF rock dike to reduce costs. This project would create 132 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 40.25. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$16.0 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$13.2 million.

PPL13 Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation (PO-33): Mr. Kevin Roy, FWS, described that this project, located in St. Tammany Parish, would hydraulically dredge material to create and nourish marsh. The project would create 436 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 53.00. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$19.1 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$19.0 million.

PPL11 Grand Lake Shoreline Protection – with Tebo Point (ME-21): Ms. Melanie Goodman, Corps, explained that this project, located in Cameron Parish, would create a 43,500 LF rock dike to reduce shoreline erosion. This project would create 540 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 61.25. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$23.1 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$20.3 million.

PPL12 Lake Borgne & MRGO Shoreline Protection – MRGO Segment (PO-32b): Mr. Greg Miller, Corps, explained that this request for funding is for the MGRO segment only; the Lake Borgne portion is being constructed with hurricane recovery funds provided by Congress in the 3rd Supplemental. The MRGO segment consists of a 14,360 LF offbank breakwater. This

project would protect 173 acres. The project has a prioritization score of 36.50. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$34.6 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$31.9 million.

PPL10 Rockefeller Refuge (ME-18): Dr. John Foret, NMFS, described that this project, located in Cameron Parish, would construct and monitor four test sections of different shoreline protection designs to determine the constructability and performance of each in order to select the best alternative for the full 9.2-mile project. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$10.5 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$10.5 million.

PPL11 Ship Shoal: Whiskey Island West Flank Restoration (TE-47): Mr. Tim Landers, EPA, explained that this project would mine sand from Ship Shoal and create beach and marsh platforms to restore the West Flank of Whiskey Island. This project would create 195 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 60.00. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$49.2 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$48.9 million.

PPL9 South Lake DeCade – CU 1 (TE-39): Mr. Loland Broussard, NRCS, described that this project, located in Terrebonne Parish, would create an 8,700 LF rock revetment along the south embankment of Lake DeCade. The project would benefit 202 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 74.95. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$3.2 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$2.2 million.

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

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that the East Grand Terre project is also being considered for CIAP funding. If the project happens to get funding by both CWPPRA and CIAP, the CWPPRA funds will be returned to the program.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that the CIAP plan has not been officially released. If projects get funding from both programs, the CWPPRA funds can be adjusted. In the meantime, the Technical Committee will have to vote on the current situation.

Mr. Troy Constance noted that it is difficult to consider the fate of projects without having a firm plans for other efforts.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski asked how to address the previous request on the Lake Borgne O&M (agenda item #4). Mr. Troy Constance suggested ranking the Phase II projects; see how that stands then revisit the Lake Borgne O&M issue. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed.

Mr. Troy Constance opened the floor for comments from the public.

PPL9 Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 – CU 7 (BA-27c(3)) Project

Ms. Charlotte Randolph, Lafourche Parish President, noted that the Barataria Basin Landbridge is a problem and any effort would provide a long-term benefit to the region. In addition to coastal restoration, the area is experiencing increased saltwater in the drinking water supply; this project could help to impede the advancement of saltwater intrusion.

PPL9 Castille Pass Channel Sediment Delivery (AT-04) Project

Mr. Mike Carloss, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF), strongly supported this project. The main delta needs work and the introduction of sediment is important in the areas that have been cut off from the navigation channel.

PPL11 Dedicated Dredging on Barataria Basin Landbridge – Fill Site 1 (BA-36) Project

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, asked that funding for construction be released for this project. This is the third time funding has been requested. She feels confident that the CIAP program will fund the eastern cell of this project.

Mr. Frank Tessier, Rigolets Lease Limited Partnership and landowner, noted that this project would finalize the shoreline protection in the area and help reduce salinity in the marsh. He strongly supports this project.

Ms. Charlotte Randolph, Lafourche Parish President, supported this project, as it will also benefit Lafourche Parish.

PPL9 East Grand Terre Island Restoration (BA-30) Project

No public comments were made.

PPL9 Freshwater Bayou Bank Stab-Belle Isle Canal-Lock (TV-11b) Project

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Corporation, announced that Vermilion Parish strongly supports this project and he would like the Technical Committee to consider it. Mr. Edwards noted that a hydrologic component was removed from the plan because it would take longer to design though the net acres would be higher.

Mr. Sherrill Sagrera, landowner, noted that last year's hurricane season caused the shoreline of the channel to encroach on them and hemmed them in. The landowners support this project and would appreciate the Technical Committee's support.

PPL10 GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne – Segments 1, 2, and 6 (TE-43) Project

Mr. Greg Linscombe, Continental Land & Fur Company, announced that his company supports this project. He is convinced that the open marshes are influenced by the breaches and questions the benefits calculation of the project. Mr. Linscombe noted that much of the floating marsh has been lost and turbid water flows quite a distance through the marsh from the GIWW.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Director of Coastal Restoration and Preservation for Terrebonne Parish, announced that this project was the second priority project for Terrebonne Parish.

PPL13 Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation (PO-33) Project

Mr. Mike Carloss, LDWF, noted that LDWF supports this project, as it will protect some of the St. Tammany Wildlife Management Area.

Mr. Bryan Rogers, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, supported this project because Goose Point is an important feature in the Lake Pontchartrain ecosystem.

PPL11 Grand Lake Shoreline Protection – with Tebo Point (ME-21) Project

No public comments were made.

PPL12 Lake Borgne & MRGO Shoreline Protection – MRGO Segment (PO-32b) Project

No public comments were made.

PPL10 Rockefeller Refuge (ME-18) Project

Mr. Tom Hess, LDWF, announced that LDWF strongly supports this project. Many employees at Rockefeller Refuge have worked to protect the shoreline since 1994. There needs to be a strategy to protect the Gulf Coast shoreline.

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee, agreed that the Gulf shoreline along the western part of Louisiana is protecting a large freshwater marsh area on which agriculture is highly dependent. The shoreline is retreating. Mr. Edwards supports this project.

PPL11 Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration (TE-47) Project

Mr. Mike Carloss, LDWF, announced that LDWF supports this project. Whiskey Island is part of the Isle Dernieres Refuge, which the LDWF owns and manages.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Director of Coastal Restoration and Preservation for Terrebonne Parish, announced that this project would have been the number one priority for Terrebonne Parish, but because of the high cost, was selected as the third highest priority. Ms. Suazo feels this project would be worth the investment.

Mr. Cullen Curole, Lafourche Parish Administrator, announced that Lafourche Parish supported this project because it supports and protects both Lafourche and Terrebonne Parishes.

PPL9 South Lake DeCade – CU 1 (TE-39) Project

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Director of Coastal Restoration and Preservation for Terrebonne Parish, noted that this is the least expensive project under consideration. The landowners have reaffirmed the commitment to pay the State's cost share for this project if it is funded. Ms. Suazo hopes the Technical Committee will consider this project.

Mr. Julie LeBlanc reviewed the voting process. Agencies will rank their projects from seven (highest) to one (lowest). The projects will be ranked first by the number of agency votes received. The sum of weighted scores will be used as necessary as a second measure to break ties. The Technical Committee will recommend a list of projects to the Task Force for Phase II authorization and Increment 1 funding within available construction funding limits.

Voting Results

Ms. Julie LeBlanc presented the results from agency voting. The weighted score is noted in parentheses. Considering the available construction funding limits as well as funding Agenda Items 2 and 3, the top three projects could be funded.

1. PPL11 Dedicated Dredging on Barataria Basin Landbridge – Fill Site 1 (BA-36) – 6 agency votes (33)
2. PPL13 Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation (PO-33) – 5 agency votes (26)
3. PPL11 Grand Lake Shoreline Protection – with Tebo Point (ME-21) – 5 agency votes (15)
4. PPL9 East Grand Terre Island Restoration (BA-30) – 4 agency votes (17)
5. PPL10 GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne – Segments 1, 2, and 6 (TE-43) – 4 agency votes (14)
6. PPL11 Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration (TE-47) – 3 agency votes (15)
7. PPL9 South Lake DeCade – CU 1 (TE-39) – 3 agency votes (13)
8. PPL9 Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 – CU 7 (BA-27c(3)) – 3 agency votes (12)
9. PPL9 Castille Pass Channel Sediment Delivery (AT-04) – 3 agency votes (10)
10. PPL9 Freshwater Bayou Bank Stab-Belle Isle Canal-Lock (TV-11b) – 3 agency votes (6)
11. PPL10 Rockefeller Refuge (ME-18) – 2 agency votes (6)
12. PPL12 Lake Borgne & MRGO Shoreline Protection – MRGO Segment (PO-32b) – 1 agency vote (1)

CWPPRA Technical Committee Ranking for Phase II Approval

PPL	Project No.	Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of Agency Votes	Sum of Weighted Score	Phase II, Increment 1 Funding Request	Cumulative Phase II, Increment 1 Funding
11	BA-36	Dedicated Dredging on Bara Basin LB Fill Site 1	6	7	3	7	5	5	6	33	\$15,231,142	\$15,231,142
13	PO-33	Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation	5	6	4	5	6		5	26	\$18,989,923	\$34,221,065
11	ME-21	Grand Lake Shoreline Protection	7	2		4	1	1	5	15	\$20,331,947	\$54,553,012
9	BA-30	East Grand Terre Island Restoration		3	6	1	7		4	17	\$33,881,341	\$88,434,353
10	TE-43	GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terr - Segments 1,2,6	4	5	2			3	4	14	\$13,175,993	\$101,610,346
11	TE-47	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration		4	7		4		3	15	\$48,901,961	\$150,512,307
9	TE-39	South Lake DeCade - CU1	1			6		6	3	13	\$2,221,045	\$152,733,352
9	BA-27c(3)	Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 - CU7	2			3		7	3	12	\$21,538,790	\$174,272,142
9	AT-04	Castille Pass Channel Sediment Delivery			5	2	3		3	10	\$18,933,969	\$193,206,111
9	TV-11b	Freshwater Bayou Bank Stab-Belle Isle Canal-Lock	3	1				2	3	6	\$25,676,625	\$218,882,736
10	ME-18	Rockefeller Refuge					2	4	2	6	\$10,544,865	\$229,427,601
12	PO-32b	Lake Borgne & MRGO Shoreline Protection - MRGO Segment ONLY			1				1	1	\$31,924,591	\$261,352,192

Mr. Rick Hartman recommended funding the top two projects with the remaining \$22 million to remain in reserve for cost overruns on the projects going to bid this year. If the third project were funded, the program potentially gains one project at the expense of several not being constructed. Mr. Hartman noted there are five to six projects going to construction next year that have not adjusted their budgets. Mr. Darryl Clark supported this rationale.

Mr. Troy Constance asked if any funds are anticipated to be returned from existing projects. Ms. Gay Browning noted that some funds are returned as projects are reconciled for first cost, but she has not looked to see how much might be returned. Mr. Rick Hartman noted that agencies are trying to return as much of the funds as possible. Ms. Browning responded that the amount coming back is probably less than \$5 million.

Mr. Troy Constance noted that Agenda Item 8 discusses the status of unconstructed projects. Ms. Gay Browning noted that approximately \$25-35 million is unexpended on eight pre-cash flow (PPL 1-8) projects.

Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that returning funds and closing out unconstructed projects will not be completed before the next Task Force meeting. Mr. Troy Constance agreed that the decision should be made with the current funds available and the Task Force should be informed of potential funds that could be returned.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman moved to recommend Phase II construction approval and Phase II Increment 1 funding for Dedicated Dredging on Barataria Basin Landbridge – Fill Site 1 (\$15,231,142 Phase II Increment 1 cost) and Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation (\$18,989,923 Phase II Increment 1 cost) to the Task Force. Ms. Sharon Parrish seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at its next meeting.

Mr. Troy Constance opened the floor to further discussion on Agenda Item 4.

Mr. Rick Hartman commented that the O&M approval is not time critical and does not believe that decision needs to be made at this time. Mr. Darryl Clark appreciated the Corps using the supplemental funding to construct this project but would like to wait and see what happens after construction is completed to examine the subsidence. Mr. Duszynski would like to defer this project without prejudice.

DECISION: Mr. Gerry Duszynski made a motion to defer the request for Phase II authorization and approval of Phase II Increment 1 funding (O&M only) the Lake Borgne Segment of the Lake Borgne/MRGO Shoreline Protection Project (PO-32a) until the next funding cycle. Ms. Sharon Parrish seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 6: Discussion/Decision: Transitioning Projects to Other Authorities (LeBlanc). The P&E Subcommittee will give a report to the Technical Committee on the process to transition projects to other authorities. Unanswered questions related to the transfer process will be discussed. The Technical Committee will be asked to approve the transfer process, as recommended by the P&E Subcommittee. Ms. Melanie Goodman, Corps, announced that the Technical Committee and Task Force have been reviewing the procedures to transfer CWPPRA projects to other authorities, such as LCA. At the last Technical Committee meeting, the P&E Subcommittee was directed to simplify and streamline the process. A draft was developed for transitioning projects that met these goals and sent to the P&E on 22 November 2006. The Corps was concerned with one issue in the document and a second draft was developed on 5 December 2006. The section under question is the ‘Principles Governing Transfers’, part of the ‘Directed Transfers’ section. The original version provided the Task Force with the authority to determine whether or not to transfer a CWPPRA project to a Congressionally-authorized project. The Corps proposed an alternative version that more specifically defines the transfer process and clarifies the rules and processes by stating that the Task Force shall transfer a project authorized by a specific Congressional authority.

Mr. Troy Constance noted that the concern is how the Task Force should react to Congressionally-authorized actions. Mr. Hartman does not object to approving the updated draft. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed, but believes the Task Force may want to devote more time to the issue since it is still not legally clear. Mr. Clark noted that both versions could be presented to the Task Force with the issue highlighted. Mr. Constance agreed as long as the caveat is explained. Mr. Clark would feel more comfortable recommending the 22 November 2006 version because it allows the Task Force to vote on whether a project be transferred, even when directed by Congress.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to accept the 22 November 2006 draft version of Appendix I - Transfer of Projects from CWPPRA to another Agency or Authority for Further Action, while explaining the legal implications of the transfer SOP that allows the Task Force to vote to the Task Force. Mr. Rick Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at its next meeting.

8. Agenda Item 7: Discussion: Funding of Environmental Impact Statements (EIS)/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for Transferable CWPPRA Projects (Clark). *The Technical Committee will discuss issue of the CWPPRA Program funding all, part, or none of EIS/NEPA development for projects that may be potentially transferred to other authorities. The results of this discussion will be reported back to the Task Force.* Mr. Darryl Clark announced that the Department of the Interior Task Force representative suggested adding this issue to the Technical Committee Agenda because of concern that CWPPRA would fully funding the development of an EIS for a project that is not anticipated to be constructed by the program. There is a possibility that the project could change, requiring the EIS to be changed as well, leading to CWPPRA funds not being used wisely. CWPPRA could be involved in the draft EIS but stop short of developing a preferred alternative. The recommendation is to have the CWPPRA program fund the preliminary draft EIS up to the selection of the preferred alternative prior to transferring the project to another program.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that this recommendation assumes it is known beforehand that the project would be transferred, which is not always the case. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed that prior knowledge of the transfer would be needed but advance knowledge of the transfer was known for both Myrtle Grove and Bayou Lafourche.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that this program was intended to be a laboratory to get projects constructed. He would not like to hamper that intent by being caught up in small details.

Mr. Darryl Clark noted that the Department of Interior Task Force representative is asking the Technical Committee for guidance. He asked if the Technical Committee has any problems with funding a future draft EIS up to the development of the preferred alternative.

Mr. Britt Paul asked why not handle this on a case-by-case basis as in the past. Mr. Hartman noted that CWPPRA funds will not be spent on completing an EIS for Myrtle Grove and Bayou LaFourche is no longer a problem. Mr. Rick Hartman does not believe guidance is needed.

Mr. Darryl Clark asked for a recommendation. When this issue is raised at the Task Force meeting, the representatives will ask for the Technical Committee recommendation. The recommendation may be to treat the situation on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Troy Constance noted that this is a discussion item and no action is needed. Mr. Darryl Clark believed that a consensus from the Technical Committee is needed because the Department of Interior Task Force representative would like this issue on the agenda.

Ms. Sharon Parrish would not like this to be perceived as delaying an EIS because of a potential for the project to transfer. Mr. Darryl Clark noted that this is not to delay an EIS; it is suggesting stopping progress at a particular point.

DECISION: The Technical Committee recommended addressing this issue on a case-by-case basis and agreed that a general discussion on the funding of an EIS for transferable CWPPRA projects will be added to the Task Force Meeting agenda in February.

9. Agenda Item 8: Discussion: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Constance). As directed by the Task Force, the Technical Committee will discuss the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects which may be experiencing project delays. The discussions will include individual project delays and potential solutions. The results of this discussion will be reported back to the Task Force.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc noted that the Task Force asked for a review of ongoing projects that potentially have been delayed in the program. An initial list of 50 projects was identified as “possibly being delayed”. The Technical Committee representatives identified 20 projects of the 50 that they believed warranted further discussion.

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

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that many of the projects identified do not have construction funds associated with them. Ms. Gay Browning agreed that it is a combination of projects that have and have not been approved for Phase II funding.

Mr. Darryl Clark stated that the North Lake Mechant Project is no longer delayed because of oyster issues. However, it is past the two-year funding deadline after receipt of Phase II funds. The CWPPRA SOP states that “If construction award has not occurred within 2 years of Phase 2 approval, the Phase 2 funds will be placed on a revocation list for consideration by the Task Force at the next Task Force meeting.” He requested an extension of at least a year from the Technical Committee and recommendation to the Task Force for the North Lake Mechant project. The project will be ready to bid in early 2007.

Mr. Troy Constance believed the thought was to provide the Task Force with this list of projects that need additional discussion. It could take quite a bit of time to make tough decisions. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed to submit the list to the Task Force for informational purposes. Mr. Britt Paul asked if a follow-up meeting would be held to discuss the identified projects in detail. Mr. Constance replied that the P&E Subcommittee could work out the details because decisions on funding require a great deal of time for thought and consideration.

Mr. Rick Hartman believed it is an excellent idea to have the P&E Subcommittee look at each of these projects. Even though projects are supposed to be built within two years, some date back to PPL 2. Considering the current situation, these projects may no longer be warranted.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted there are different types of projects listed: projects in construction, projects where deauthorization has been discussed, and others that need to be looked at further.

In the short term, Mr. Darryl Clark suggested moving the North Lake Mechant project to the list of projects to be discussed.

Mr. Britt Paul did not think that the P&E Subcommittee discussion on the project delays will be able to occur before the Task Force meeting.

Mr. Troy Constance suggested that the P&E Subcommittee meet as soon as possible to begin discussing the list of unconstructed projects. He would like to give them time to do the job right. Mr. Darryl Clark pointed out that it still doesn't resolve the issue with the North Lake Mechant project. Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that Mr. Clark is asking for a decision on a discussion item.

Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that the P&E Subcommittee (along with agency representatives and the State) meet to develop a status sheet that discusses the issues including future problems, timelines, status of available funds, expenditures, available funds, if it could be built with available funds, projected estimated cost, and changes in the benefits. Mr. Troy Constance suggested adding 'probability of success'.

The Technical Committee agreed to consider Mr. Clark's request for a 1-year time extension for the North Lake Mechant Project.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to provide a 1 year extension for the North Lake Mechant Landbridge Restoration Project (TE-44) currently approved for Phase II but not yet under construction. Mr. Rick Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at its next meeting.

10. Agenda Item 9: Discussion: Long-Term O&M of CWPPRA Projects Including a Breakdown of O&M by Project Type (Constance). As directed by the Task Force, the Technical Committee will discuss the funding of long-term O&M of CWPPRA projects. This discussion will include issues such as increases in O&M costs over time, breakdown of O&M cost by project type, and the cost/benefit of continuing O&M activities. The results of this discussion will be reported back to the Task Force. Ms. Julie LeBlanc reviewed the O&M costs for the various project types. The total first construction cost is \$1.35 billion with the majority of the funds spent on shoreline protection (31%), barrier islands (22%), marsh creation (17%), and diversion (14%) projects. The total O&M cost is \$349.7 million with the majority spent on shoreline protection (54%) and diversion (23%) projects. While barrier islands have an average construction cost of over \$20 million, the average O&M is low because barrier island projects have not included O&M. Shoreline protection projects have an average construction cost of \$12 million, but the O&M is higher at an average of \$5 million. Ms. LeBlanc presented other graphs comparing the costs from PPL 1-8 and PPL9+ (approved for Phase II and not approved for Phase II).

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

Mr. Troy Constance believed that this information should be presented to the Task Force. He noted that O&M is improving versus the total project cost. Mr. Constance would like to suggest to the Task Force to take a harder look at improving performance.

Mr. Rick Hartman was concerned that as more projects are constructed and O&M commitments increase, the CWPPRA program will not be able to fund additional construction projects. Currently, all projects get three years of full O&M funding. He is concerned that projects not performing well are still being maintained. Mr. Darryl Clark had the same concerns. In the past, O&M funding has been almost automatic but he believes it needs to be looked at much harder. Future recommendations might require hard decisions such as less O&M or not completing certain items. Ms. Sharon Parrish also has similar concerns. She attributes it to the fact that a more thorough review of projects post-construction has not been accepted.

Mr. Troy Constance noted that the Task Force specifically wanted to know if there should be a process to aid in determining if increasing individual project O&M funding is justifiable.

Mr. Darryl Clark noted that USFWS has an informal process of reviewing O&M increase requests by examining the initial benefits of the project, and the effect of continued O&M on those benefits.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski added that the cost of deauthorization must be considered if the project is not going to be maintained. He asked what would happen to the O&M funds set aside for the 20-year project life for Phase II projects approved in PPLs 1 through 8.

Mr. Troy Constance asked about performing an analysis of O&M costs by project type or the contracting out of a scientific assessment that may allow the project to reduce O&M costs. He believes the Task Force is looking to the Technical Committee to make a request for this effort. He wondered if the Technical Committee is suggesting a formal process to look at this better than we have or handle it in a different way. Mr. Darryl Clark was not sure about spending money for a scientific technical assessment of the program in order to reduce O&M costs. The Engineering Workgroup has been reviewing these and trying to bring down O&M costs, but it is difficult when unit construction costs are increasing. Costs can be reduced by not completing O&M, but Mr. Clark was not sure he is ready to do that. Mr. Rick Hartman did not mind an audit to analyze O&M costs and determine if there is a better way. He suggested not automatically rolling over every year to fund another year of O&M for each project. He did not want to contract an outside source to look at O&M.

Mr. Darryl Clark noted that the staff had done a very good job of analyzing the O&M costs by project type. He believed that the way to lower O&M costs is to construct sustainable projects that do not require significant maintenance.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski would like to have this presented to the Task Force with a more in-depth discussion later (at the next Technical Committee meeting or at a separate meeting). As a

program, we can make the decision to only fund projects that do not require O&M or fund projects that are protecting areas for a reason and need O&M.

Mr. Troy Constance noted that contracting out is not the way to go; we should take it upon ourselves. Mr. Darryl Clark agrees that this should be discussed within CWPPRA.

Mr. Rick Hartman suggested a more focused discussion by the Task Force after the presentation about their concerns. Mr. Britt Paul agreed that more specific direction would be good and the Engineering Workgroup might need to conduct some analysis. Ms. Sharon Parrish noted that the EPA will look at its priorities to see where things fall out.

DECISION: The Technical Committee agreed that the review of the O&M costs for the various project types would be presented to the Task Force in February for further discussion and direction.

11. Agenda Item 10: Discussion: Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) – Wetland Monitoring (Constance). *The Technical Committee will discuss the status and funding of the CRMS program to get a better understanding of the yearly funding requirements and program efforts.* Mr. Rick Raynie, LDNR, provided the Technical Committee with a document in response to questions submitted to him via email. These questions were compiled from the comments made by the Task Force at its last meeting.

The first question was relative to the availability of collected data. Mr. Rick Raynie noted that the data is available on the LDNR website, through the USGS, and the CRMS project page on the CWPPRA website. The monitoring program is still being set up, but the data that has been collected include continuous hydrographic, salinity, soil, surface elevations, aerial photographs, and satellite imagery at various sites along the coast. Data that will be available shortly include vegetation and additional continuous hydrographic and aerial photographs.

The second question was relative to landrights and issues with certain landowners. Mr. Rick Raynie reported that most of those issues have been resolved except for one area around the Biloxi Marshes. The program has obtained landrights in the vicinity exclusive of that landowner and since this location is isolated with only one landowner, it does not affect the design. Currently, landrights have been secured for nearly all CRMS year-one sites.

The third question was relative to the starting point. CRMS was authorized in 2003. Since then the program has been securing contracts, conducting fieldwork, and establishing monitoring stations. The anticipated starting point for the first full year will be March 2007. A comprehensive data summary will be available after one full year's worth of data collection in the summer of 2008 for CWPPRA planning in 2008.

The fourth question was relative to the funding requested versus originally anticipated. For 2007, the requested funds and the authorized funds match. Expenses have been lower than anticipated because implementation is slower due to the hurricanes. The Task Force also wanted to know if there were a lot of carryover funds. Mr. Rick Raynie is anticipating that expenditures will increase in 2007 with the escalation of implementation. A technical and fiscal review will

be completed in 2007, which will review the implementation of CRMS, the frequency of sampling, and previous projections. This review will allow a more realistic estimate of actual costs to implement the program and achieve a steady state of expenditures.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark was surprised this was on the Technical Committee's agenda. He thought most of the questions were answered at the Task Force meeting. Mr. Clark did not think the Task Force had many outstanding questions because they approved CRMS program funding. He suggests not including it on the Task Force agenda.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski believes that the concern was on the amount of money carried over. He asked for an additional year to catch up from the lag of the hurricanes. He had initially suggested asking for funds on a yearly basis of the projected expenditures.

Ms. Sharon Parrish noted that several Task Force members focused on the third question. She was not sure they would be satisfied with this presentation as it suggests the data collected would not be available for utilization until 2008. Mr. Rick Raynie responded that the data is available now and a coast-wide summary analysis will be available in 2008. Ms. Sharon Parrish does not expect to analyze the data; it is expected that the CRMS team will. Mr. Raynie noted that annual reports will incorporate whatever data is available.

Mr. Troy Constance asked if this should be presented to the Task Force. Mr. Rick Hartman believed it should be if there was enough concern about the program. It was also noted that the Task Force did not specifically ask for this discussion, Mr. Tom Podany did because he felt there were some unanswered questions. Mr. Gerry Duszynski did not want to clog the Task Force agenda with this.

DECISION: The Technical Committee agreed that a presentation on the CRMS program would not be required at the Task Force meeting in February.

12. Agenda Item 11: Additional Agenda Items (Constance). Mr. Gerry Duszynski thanked Mr. Tom Podany for his service as Acting Chairman. He requested that Mr. Troy Constance allow the Technical Committee to meet off-site to discuss operational protocol to aid in the preparation of the Technical Committee meetings as each agency operates differently. Mr. Darryl Clark suggested discussing the O&M situation as well. Mr. Troy Constance asked Ms. Julie LeBlanc to coordinate schedules for a future meeting.

13. Agenda Item 12: Announcement: Priority Project List 17 Regional Planning Team Meetings (LeBlanc). Ms. Julie LeBlanc announced the dates and times of the Regional Planning Team Meetings for PPL17, which can be found on the agenda. She also noted that the final PPL17 process was provided to the public as a handout.

14. Agenda Item 13: Announcement: Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (LeBlanc). Ms. Julie LeBlanc announced that the next Task Force meeting will be held on 31 January 2007 at

9:30 a.m. in Baton Rouge. The meeting has since been rescheduled to 15 February 2007 in New Orleans, LA.

15. Agenda Item 14: Announcement: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (LeBlanc). Dates and locations of future program meetings through January 2008 can be found on the agenda.

16. Adjourn. Mr. Troy Constance adjourned the meeting at 2:10 pm.