CEMVN-PM-C 4 Apr 2006

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 15 March 2006 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Tom Podany opened meeting at 9:35 a.m. Mr. Podany welcomed everyone to the meeting, including graduate students from Yale University, and previewed the agenda items. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)
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, substituting for Mr. Greg Breerwood, Corps of Engineers (COE)
Mr. Kirk Rhinehart, substituting for Gerry Duszynski, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (LDNR)

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

2. Agenda Item 1: Discussion/Decision: Priority Project List 16 Process (Podany). Mr. Tom Podany announced that the Task Force made the decision at their February 8th, 2006 meeting to select 10 candidate projects under PPL16. In addition, the Task Force asked the Technical Committee to discuss two issues related to the PPL16 process:

a. The Task Force directed the Technical Committee to discuss the number of final PPL 16 projects selected for Phase I approval, currently "up to 4" will be selected. Mr. Tom Podany noted that in the past, availability of funding has not allowed more than four projects to be selected for Phase I. Mr. Podany noted that there are more projects requesting Phase II construction funding than there is funding available, which results in not being a position to select more than four projects for Phase I.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark believes four is a good number for Phase I selection. Since ten projects are being considering this year, that would be a recommendation of 40% of the total under consideration. Typically the cost for engineering and design (Phase I) for four projects is $6-8M. Mr. Clark would like to fund four projects and reserve the rest to build projects. Mr. Clark believes it is important to design projects, get them on the ground, and build them.

Mr. Rick Hartman believes that CWPPRA cannot fund more than four projects for Phase I without adversely affecting the ability to fund a demonstration project or fund construction. Funding construction is the most important. Mr. Hartman recommends staying with four projects for Phase I, which has been a good number in the past.

Mr. Britt Paul noted that he would not be opposed to selecting five projects. New funds from the Energy Bill could help to take care of the backlog of projects awaiting construction. Adding one more project to Phase I would be acceptable, but no more than five.

Mr. Kirk Rhinehart believes that given the number of projects waiting for construction, of which only three or four can be funded each year, funding four Phase I projects is where the CWPPRA program needs to be.

Mr. Rick Hartman believes that the backlog of projects does not mean the number of Phase I projects selected for funding could not be increased to five in future years. He does not see a reason to do it now. He noted that the Energy Bill money would not be available until 2007.

Mr. Darryl Clark noted that by the end of 2006 approximately 85 of the 140 projects ongoing under the program should have completed construction. That means 40 to 50 projects are in engineering and design. Four projects for Phase I is a good number, especially if the Technical Committee is considering setting aside funding for demonstration projects.

Mr. Tom Podany noted that when the Technical Committee recommends up to four projects, the Task Force could always decide to approve more. If the funding situation should improve, more Phase I projects could be selected. Four projects are realistically all that can be selected for Phase I. Mr. Podany stated that this would be reported back to the Task Force as the consensus of the group. No motion was considered.

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

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, noted that he made the suggestion during the Task Force meeting that began this discussion. With the availability of new money, the fact that we have a backlog of CWPPRA projects is positive. LCA has incorporated several CWPPRA projects and WRDA may be moving ahead. Dr. Lopez believes that the backlog of projects is a good thing and that once a project has been vetted through the CWPPRA process, it achieves a certain threshold of creditability.

Mr. Tom Podany believes that examining 10 candidate projects positions the CWPPRA program to work with the Coastal Impact Assessment Program (CIAP) to provide additional ideas.

Ms. Gay Browning added that the federal funding forecast for next year includes approximately $11 million more funds than we received in FY06, for a total of approximately $70 million. Mr. Tom Podany noted that if funding should change dramatically, the issue could be revisited, but for now it is safe and prudent to continue as is.

Mr. Rick Hartman believes that pre-engineering and design on ten candidate projects is moving in the direction of Dr. John Lopez's request.

b. The Task Force directed the Technical Committee to discuss the need to allocate a set amount of funds each year for demonstration projects. Mr. Tom Podany stated that the fact that demonstration projects have not been funded in the past few years was brought up at the last

Task Force meeting. There is a concern that the process asks for demonstration project ideas, people spend time and energy developing these ideas, and then none are funded because of lack of funding. The Task Force asked the Technical Committee to determine if a certain amount of funds should set aside each year specifically for demonstrations to ensure the program maintains a minimum demonstration project program.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that in the last two years, demonstration projects have not been funded because the funding available exactly matched the funds requested for Phase I and Phase II. To fund a demonstration project, one of the Phase I or Phase II projects would have had to go unfunded. Given that construction costs are $10 to 20 million per project, the odds are that money will be left over in future years and could fund demos. Mr. Hartman understands the angst because the act language requires the program to look at demonstration projects, which helps to develop new technology and new tools. Mr. Hartman would not like to see a motion that would force the Task Force to fund a demonstration project instead of funding Phase I of another project. In the past, demonstration projects have been limited to a total of $2 million per year. Mr. Hartman believes that the Task Force should consider funding one demonstration project and recommend that future demos be limited to a $1M budget.

Mr. Darryl Clark agrees that the recommendation to the Task Force should consider at least one demonstration project limited to no more than $1 million, if funds are available. Mr. Britt Paul agreed that one project with a cap of $1 million would be economical.

Mr. Tom Podany asked for clarification on how this would change the current process. Mr. Darryl Clark replied that over the last couple years, the Technical Committee has not recommended demonstration projects because there were no funds available after projects were funded for Phase I and Phase II, which is why the potential motion includes "if funds are available." Mr. Podany clarified that there is a possibility of not recommending funding for a demonstration project. Mr. Clark agreed that is a possibility but the Technical Committee should try to recommend one.

Mr. Britt Paul noted that the current guidance allows up to $2 million for demonstration projects in a year. Mr. Paul asked if the motion is to change that guidance to $1 million. Ms. Sharon Parrish stated that her impression of the Task Force discussion is that they really wanted the Technical Committee to find the means to fund one demonstration. Ms. Parrish believes the Technical Committee should recommend one, but she also liked the idea of capping demonstration projects at $1 million each.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted there are several demonstrations on PPL16 that exceed $1 million. Mr. Tom Podany and Mr. Darryl Clark stated that the sponsoring agency could look at repackaging these demos to be less than $1 million.

Mr. Kirk Rhinehart asked the agencies to consider incorporating demonstration techniques into other projects. These demonstrations could be included in a similar project, which would increase the opportunity to incorporate these new ideas. Mr. Rhinehart also wanted to ensure that the projects actually demonstrate techniques that could be used coast-wide.

**DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark moved that the Technical Committee recommend that the Task Force consider funding at least one demonstration project for PPL 16 at $1 million or less, if funds are available after funding construction (Phase II) and engineering and design (Phase I). Mr. Rick Hartman seconded and the motion was passed by the Technical Committee.**

3. Agenda Item 2: Decision: Selection of Ten (10) Candidate Projects and up to Three (3) Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 16 (Podany). Mr. Tom Podany announced that ten candidate projects and three demonstrations projects would be selected under PPL 16 for a detailed evaluation including engineering, design, and environmental benefits. These candidate projects will compete for Phase I funding later this year (September/October 2006).

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn went over the PPL16 process completed thus far. He stated that the Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings were held from January 10-12th, 2006, where nominations for projects and demonstration projects were accepted. At the February 1, 2006 coast-wide voting meeting, 20 projects and 6 demonstrations were selected as nominees. Two projects from PPL 15 were rolled over and included in PPL 16 for a total of 22 projects. However, since the RPT voting meeting, the South Terrebonne Terracing Project, a rollover from PPL 15, was withdrawn at the request of Terrebonne Parish. The Wisner Wildlife Management Area Project was withdrawn at the request of the landowners. The Calcasieu River Sediment Bypass Project and the Mermentau River Sediment Bypass Project were combined into one project at the request of DNR. The Dredge Containment Demonstration has been withdrawn at the request of the nominating party. With these changes, there are now 19 nominees and 5 demonstration nominees up for consideration today.

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn continued with the presentation of the 19 nominees and 5 demonstration nominees for PPL 16.

A. Region 1 – Pontchartrain Basin

i. Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project. Project features include mining material from Lake Borgne for marsh creation and 2 miles of shoreline plantings. The project will benefit an estimated 500 to 550 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $20 to 25 million.

ii. Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project. Project features include the expansion of the current siphons and mining material from the Mississippi River for marsh creation and nourishment. The project will benefit an estimated 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded cost estimate is $40 to 50 million.

B. Region 2 – Barataria, Breton Sound, and Mississippi River Delta Basins

i. Romere Pass Marsh Creation Project. Project features include mining material from Main Pass or the Mississippi River for marsh creation. The project will benefit an estimated 350 to 400 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $20 to 25 million.

ii. Delta National Wildlife Refuge Marsh Creation Project. Project features include mining material from Pass a Loutre or the Mississippi River for marsh creation. The project will benefit an estimated 500 to 550 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $30 to 35 million.

iii. Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. Project features include mining material from the Mississippi River for marsh creation and nourishment and vegetative plantings. The project will benefit an estimated 650 to 700 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $30 to 35 million.

iv. Wills Point Marsh Creation Project. Project features include mining material from the Mississippi River for marsh creation. The project will benefit an estimated 650 to 700 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $35 to 40 million.

v. Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. Project features include shoreline protection and marsh creation and nourishment. The project will benefit an estimated 400 to 450 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $20 to 25 million.

vi. Grand Liard Ridge and Fringe Marsh Restoration Project. Project features include mining material most likely from the Mississippi River to restore the ridge and fringe marsh. The project will benefit an estimated 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $30 to 35 million.

C. Region 3 – Atchafalaya, Teche/Vermilion, and Terrebonne Basins

i. Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project. Project features include mining material from Madison Bay for marsh creation and terrace construction. The project will benefit an estimated 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $20 to 25 million.

ii. West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project. Project features include hydraulically dredging material for the creation of a dune and shoreline habitat and a marsh creation platform behind the new habitat. The project will benefit an estimated 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $20 to 25 million.

iii. Falgout Canal Freshwater Enhancement Project. Project features include the creation of terraces and the installation of culverts to allow freshwater into the project area. The project will benefit an estimated 50 to 100 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $5 to 10 million.

iv. Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project. Project features include 20,000 linear feet of rock shoreline protection from Point Chevreuil to Bayou Sale. The project will benefit an estimated 100 to 150 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $10 to 15 million.

v. Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project. Project features include the excavation of a mile long channel from the existing pass to encourage more flow and create more marsh in the bay. The project will benefit an estimated 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $5 to 10 million.

vi. Vermilion Bay Shoreline Beach Restoration/Vegetative Planting and Maintenance Project. Project features include 8,300 linear feet of rock shoreline protection and vegetative plantings. The project will benefit an estimated 150 to 200 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $10 to 15 million.

vii. South Marsh Island Hydrologic Restoration Project. Project features include dredging of Oyster Bayou for marsh creation and improved drainage. The project will benefit an estimated 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $10 to 15 million.

viii. Bird Island/Southwest Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project (PPL15 rollover). Project features include shoreline protection, marsh creation on Tojan Island, and the construction of a new bird island. The project will benefit an estimated 100 to 150 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $15 to 20 million.

D. Region 4 – Calcasieu/Sabine and Mermentau Basins

i. Calcasieu River Ship Channel Sediment Bypass/Restoration of Longshore Sediment Flow Across the Mouth of the Mermentau Ship Channel Project. Project features include mining material from the east sides of the Calcasieu River and the Mermentau Ship Channel jetties for shoreline nourishment on the west side of the jetties. The project will benefit an estimated 50 to 100 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $15 to 20 million.

ii. North Black Lake Marsh Creation Project. Project features include a rock dike and mining material from the Calcasieu Ship Channel for marsh creation in an open water area. The project will benefit an estimated 450 to 500 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $30 to 35 million based on the dedicated dredging (not in conjunction with a maintenance dredging event).

iii. Southwest LA Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project. Project features include mining material offshore for shoreline restoration in two areas south of Pecan Island and Rockefeller Refuge. The project will benefit an estimated 800 to 850 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is $15 to 20 million.

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn noted that a cost/benefit matrix for these 19 projects is available comparing the projects, costs, acres benefited, and potential issues. Potential issues are identified as items that may have to be considered and dealt with as the project progresses.

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn also presented the five demonstration projects nominated for PPL 16, all of which meet the definition of a demonstration project.

A. Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demonstration. Demonstration features include the use of a new sediment containment system consisting of a filter cloth or geo-textile fabric anchored by a chain and floated on the surface by an absorbent boom to trap sediment in the outfall of a freshwater introduction site. The fully funded cost estimate is $740,806.

B. Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration. Demonstration features include using humic acid and broadcast fertilization regimes to enhance barrier island and salt marsh plantings. The fully funded cost estimate is $845,187.

C. Barrier Island Sand Blowing Demonstration. Demonstration features include a sand blowing technique using upland dry sand from disposal sites to restore barrier islands. The fully funded cost estimate is $1.92 million.

D. Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps Through Dedicated Dredging Demonstration. Demonstration features include applying varying heights of dredge material in three containment sites of cypress/tupelo swamp. The goal is to examine the impact of the deposited material on the growth of the trees. The fully funded cost estimate is $1.55 million.

E. Evaluation of Bioengineered Reefs Performing as Submerged Breakwaters Demonstration. Demonstration features include construction and monitoring of submerged oyster breakwaters to investigate specific bioengineered designs. The fully funded cost estimate is $1.42 million.

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked if the Engineering Workgroup had a sense that the demonstration projects that have a fully funded cost greater than $1 million could be reshaped to less than $1 million each. Mr. Rick Hartman said that the demonstration project nominated by NMFS could be reshaped to less than $1 million. Mr. John Petitbon stated that the workgroup would have to look at the projects, but added that it may be difficult for a few of the demonstration projects. Mr. Tom Podany noted that this will have to be looked into further.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments on the nominee projects from the public.

*Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project.*

Mr. Lee Richardson, Lake Catherine Civic Association, stated that in the past, he has described the urgency of preserving the East Orleans Landbridge to protect the communities along Lake Pontchartrain from storm surge. The loss of wetlands in the project area is threatening to provide a new pathway through the middle of the barrier island for higher volumes of storm surge. This is just one of many parts of the landbridge that are deteriorating. The loss of the wetland and the inattention to its restoration is a direct threat to everyone around Lake Pontchartrain. Mr. Richardson asked the Technical Committee to seriously consider the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, City of New Orleans, asked the Technical Committee to consider the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project. This project protects populated areas and critical infrastructure and the surrounding parishes. Hurricane Katrina destroyed a lot of the wetlands and marshlands and they need to be built up again.

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Coastal Management, stated that St. Tammany Parish supports both Region 1 projects, and in particular the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project because of the direct relationship to St. Tammany's north shore communities. This project has a direct relationship to the north shore of the lake, which was severely impacted by the storm. Extensive marsh restoration work has been included in the parish's CIAP proposal and this project will contribute to the long-term health of the marshes in St. Tammany Parish.

Mr. Kenny Tucker, representing Senator Walter Boasso's office, stated that this project would help to protect the areas and parishes surrounding Lake Pontchartrain. Mr. Tucker believes that after Hurricane Katrina, more thought about regionalism is needed. This project would benefit every parish that borders Lake Pontchartrain. Mr. Tucker asked the Technical Committee to fully support the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project.

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, stated that the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation has selected several priority landscape features in the Pontchartrain Basin, including the East Orleans Landbridge. The East Orleans Landbridge is vital for habitat and flood protection for the parishes and residents surrounding Lake Pontchartrain.

Ms. Marnie Winter stated that Jefferson Parish supports the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project since it is a critical line of defense against storm surge. It will protect the whole area around Lake Pontchartrain.

*Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project.*

Mr. Junior Rodriguez, St. Bernard Parish President, supports the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project. This project is badly needed and would complement the stabilization of the MRGO.

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, believes that, in the long-term, the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project will help re-establish a historic estuarine system in St. Bernard Parish. This is a keystone project for the entire lower estuary. The Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation highly supports this project.

Ms. Marnie Winter noted that Jefferson Parish also supports the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project for the same reasons as Dr. Lopez.

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish, supports the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project and any project that contributes to the ecological health of the region and Lake Pontchartrain Basin.

Mr. Kenny Tucker, representing Senator Walter Boasso's office, stated that Violet is in St. Bernard Parish, which was 100% affected by Hurricane Katrina. Any crucial restoration of marshland would help parishes in future storms. Senator Boasso is in favor of the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project.

Mr. Randy Moertle, Biloxi Marshland Corporation and Lake Eugenie Land Development, is in support of the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project. If freshwater moves into the Violet Canal, there is an opportunity in the future to move it into the Biloxi marshes, down the MRGO, and through Bayou la Loutre.

Mr. Chris Andry, St. Bernard Parish – CZM Program, supports the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project. It is a good project that is going to benefit the marsh.

Mr. Bob Schroeder, C.H. Fenstermaker and Associates, believes special emphasis should be given to projects such as the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project and the Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation Project because of the direct relationship to Hurricane Katrina. This provides an opportunity for the Technical Committee to be in a leadership position of doing something for coastal preservation purposes and to prevent future impacts.

*Romere Pass Marsh Creation Project.*

There were no comments on the Romere Pass Marsh Creation Project.

*Delta National Wildlife Refuge Marsh Creation Project.*

There were no comments on the Delta National Wildlife Refuge Marsh Creation Project.

*Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project.*

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, stated that the Breton Landbridge is a relatively new feature requiring restoration. The area experienced massive wetland loss during Hurricane Katrina between the St. Bernard levee and the project area. There is hope that the marsh elevation is relatively good, which will allow the marsh to be rebuilt with less sediment. If delayed, the area will probably lose more of the platform. The area is beyond the reach of Caernarvon and Dr. Lopez believes this is the best restoration technique for the area.

Mr. Andrew MacInnes stated that Plaquemines Parish supports the Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. According to USGS analysis, the Breton Sound Basin lost 57 square miles of wetlands due to Hurricane Katrina. The average yearly wetland loss rate is roughly 25 square miles. This project would help to keep the upper basin protected.

Ms. Marnie Winter stated that Jefferson Parish supports the Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project because it provides a line of defense for the upper basin.

Mr. Junior Rodriguez, St. Bernard Parish President, supports the Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. Mr. Rodriguez believes that the local public and the rest of the country now see the importance of the wetlands for the safety and well being of the people in St. Bernard, Orleans, and the surrounding areas.

*Wills Point Marsh Creation Project.*

There were no comments on the Wills Point Marsh Creation Project.

*Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project.*

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that this project was nominated on PPL15 but failed to make the cut. This project protects the only national park in Louisiana, the Jean Lafitte National Park, as well as maintains the separation between the freshwater and intermediate areas. Jefferson Parish believes the Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project is an important project.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher added that the City of New Orleans supports this project. It does protect a national park that New Orleans citizens utilize.

*Grand Liard Ridge and Fringe Marsh Creation Project.*

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish, believes that the Grand Liard Ridge and Fringe Marsh Creation Project is important because there are features remaining in that area upon which to build. There is a chance to utilize the existing resources in the lower Barataria Basin to respond to the storm. This is one of the last ridges in the area and ignoring the problem will allow for an accelerated rate of loss. Plaquemines Parish supports this project.

*Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project.*

Mr. Noland Bergeron, Chairman of the Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Committee, believes the Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project will protect a portion of the hurricane levees and reduce the amount of saltwater entering the marsh. It protects Highway 55. This project will show how to utilize this type of project in order to save marshes adjacent to hurricane protection levees. Mr. Bergeron believes this is necessary to protect the marshes in Terrebonne Parish. Mr. Bergeron asked for the Technical Committee's support.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish, stated that the project area is rapidly converting to open water, which was exacerbated by a levee collapse during Hurricane Rita. The Terrebonne Parish CZM Committee ranked this project first out of the eight potential projects. This project has generated a lot of community support including support from the Chamber of Commerce, the

South Central Industrial Association, and the Terrebonne Parish Council. Ms. Suazo asked the Technical Committee to consider the Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project.

*West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project.*

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Committee, supports the West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project. It will reduce saltwater entering the area, reduce the surge from the east, and protect Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes. Mr. Bergeron asked the Technical Committee to consider this project.

Mr. Jess Curole, representing Lafourche Parish, stated that Lafourche Parish fully supports the West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project and would appreciate any effort to move the project forward.

*Falgout Canal Freshwater Enhancement Project.*

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Committee, believes that the Falgout Canal Freshwater Enhancement Project will bring freshwater and sediment to the southern part of the Falgout Canal and it will induce vegetation growth. This area, once a cypress swamp, is turning into saltwater and mud. This project will protect a highway, a large mitigation project to the north, people in Grand Caillou and Bayou Du Large, and existing and planned levees.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish, stated that the Falgout Canal Freshwater Enhancement Project was ranked Number 2 by the CZM Committee; the Parish Council agrees. What once was a thriving area has been reduced to a stagnant saltwater and mud pond. Ms. Suazo noticed this project is listed as potentially having landrights issues; there have been preliminary discussions with landowners and they have been very receptive and willing to address the needs in the project area.

Mr. Tyrone Foreman, New Orleans citizen, believes that if the Falgout Canal Freshwater Enhancement Project moves forward, reforestation could be addressed, which is crucial. This would be a great opportunity to look at and monitor saltwater tolerant plants, including cypress.

*Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project.*

There were no comments on the Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project.

*Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project.*

Mr. Edmond Mouton, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, stated that the Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project is located in the Atchafalaya Delta Wildlife Management area. This project provides further deltaic enhancement on the east side of the river, where sediment deposition is needed. It provides shoreline protection for marshes to the north and east.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, Continental Land and Fur Company, stated that Continental owns the land on the east side of the river. The Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project would utilize the sediment to enhance the delta development and protect the shoreline. Sedimentation could accelerate along the south shoreline of Deer Island Bayou, where the loss rate is high. The project is reasonably priced and does not have many issues associated with it. This is a diversion in an area with a great deal of available sediment that can have significant benefits. This project is supported by Continental Land and Fur Company.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Committee, supports the Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project. Mr. Bergeron stated that one of the only methods of saving the marsh in western Terrebonne Parish is a diversion from the Atchafalaya River. In the future, we should look at using the Atchafalaya River to control the saltwater content to reduce the effects on western marshes.

*Vermilion Bay Shoreline Beach Restoration/Vegetative Planting and Maintenance Project.*

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing Avery Island Incorporated and McIlhenny Company, supports the Vermilion Bay Shoreline Beach Restoration/Vegetative Planting and Maintenance Project. Avery Island Incorporated has maintained the plantings of some NRCS projects in the area, which has resulted in an additional five feet of shoreline. After Hurricane Rita, the area planted in smooth cord grass was not affected; areas without the vegetation were scoured out. Mr. Moertle believes that a five-year vegetation maintenance program and sedimentation will accrete land.

*South Marsh Island Hydrologic Restoration Project.*

Mr. Edmond Mouton, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, stated that the South Marsh Island Hydrologic Restoration Project is located on Marsh Island Refuge in Vermilion Bay, which is managed by the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. This project is important to restore the hydrologic link between Oyster Bayou to the Gulf of Mexico. Hurricanes Lili and Rita plugged many of the drainage waterways, which accelerated the deterioration of the interior marshes. The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries strongly supports this project.

*Bird Island/Southwest Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project (PPL 15 rollover).*

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee, stated that the Bird Island/Southwest Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project is designed to maintain the current size of Southwest Pass. This is Vermilion Parish's Number 1 priority. Mr. Edwards is not sure why landrights are listed as an issue because the landowners, the Audubon Society and the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, fully support this project. Mr. Tom Podany replied that the fact landrights are listed as an issue does not mean that it will be an insurmountable problem.

Mr. Edmond Mouton, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, stated that part of the project is located on the southwest end of Marsh Island, which will be important to protect the integrity of the island. Marsh Island is serving as a barrier island by buffering the tidal surge

from Hurricanes Lili and Rita. The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries supports the Bird Island/Southwest Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project.

*Calcasieu River Ship Channel Sediment Bypass/Restoration of Longshore Sediment Flow Across the Mouth of the Mermentau Ship Channel Project.*

There were no comments on the Calcasieu River Ship Channel Sediment Bypass/Restoration of Longshore Sediment Flow Across the Mouth of the Mermentau Ship Channel Project.

*North Black Lake Marsh Creation Project.*

There were no comments on the North Black Lake Marsh Creation Project.

*Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project.*

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish and Vermilion Corporation, stated that this project is mimicking a maintenance dredging project. This project would provide a quarter mile of accretion, would benefit Vermilion Parish, and would protect Pecan Island and Rockefeller Refuge. It is an inexpensive alternative to rock dikes proposed in other CWPPRA projects. This project has the support of the Vermilion Parish.

Mr. Edmond Mouton, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, stated that the Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project is located east of Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge. It would address the beach erosion problems at the refuge. The Department of Wildlife and Fisheries supports this project.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing M.O. Miller Estates, the Vermilion Parish landowner, also supports the Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project for all the reasons mentioned.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments on the nominee demonstration projects from the public.

*Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demonstration.*

There were no comments on the Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demonstration.

*Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration.*

There were no comments on the Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration.

*Barrier Island Sand Blowing Demonstration.*

There were no comments on the Barrier Island Sand Blowing Demonstration.

*Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps through Dedicated Dredging Demonstration.*

Mr. Tyrone Foreman, New Orleans citizen, is trying to re-vegetate the LaBranche wetlands using seeds from trees that were not impacted by Hurricane Georges. Mr. Foreman has been in touch with scientists from LSU, the Wetland Center, and others conducting cypress studies. Mr. Foreman's goal is to get to the point of wetland restoration to include reforestation. There is a possibility to use salt tolerant selection of cypress and other trees. To reverse the wetland loss, cypress reforestation is on the top tier.

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish Coastal Management, supports the Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps through Dedicated Dredging Demonstration. St. Tammany Parish at one time, had thriving cypress forests that were logged out. The data from this demonstration would provide substantial benefit toward efforts to restore or enhance the remaining cypress swamps.

*Evaluation of Bioengineered Reefs Performing as Submerged Breakwaters Demonstration.*

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee, believes that the bioengineered reefs could serve as submerged breakwaters. One of the biggest tasks facing CWPPRA is looking at sediment and freshwater diversion projects in a new light and more aggressively as the only real salvation and hope for Louisiana. The main obstruction is the oyster fishermen. If bioengineered reefs can relocate the grounds for fishermen, there may be more benefits to this project.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, speaking as a concerned citizen, supported the five demonstration projects; each demonstrates a method of saving the marshes and islands. If a poll were taken in Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes, the citizens would support these types of studies.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc described the voting process previously agreed upon by the Technical Committee. Each agency will cast weighted votes for ten projects and three demonstration projects. The projects will be ranked first by the number of agency votes received and second by the weighted score. The Technical Committee will select 10 candidate projects and 3 candidate demonstration projects without further ratification from the Task Force. The results will be presented to the Task Force at their April 12th meeting.

**Voting Results**

Mr. Tom Podany presented the results from the agency voting. The weighted score is noted in parentheses.

PPL 16 Projects:
1. Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project – 6 agency votes (45)
2. Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project – 5 agency votes (37)
3. West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project – 5 agency votes (33)
4. Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project – 5 agency votes (26)
5. Southwest LA Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project – 5 agency votes (26)

6. Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project – 5 agency votes (22)
7. Vermilion Bay Shoreline Beach Restoration/Vegetative Planting and Maintenance Project – 5 agency votes (21)
8. Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation – 4 agency votes (35)
9. Grand Liard Ridge and Fringe Marsh Restoration Project – 4 agency votes (28)
10. Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project – 4 agency votes (10)

CWPPRA PPL 16 Projects - Technical Committee Final Vote

| Region | Basin | Type | Project | COE | DNR | EPA | FWS | NMFS | NCRS | No. of Votes | Sum of Point Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Pont | MC | Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project | 9 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 45 |
| 3 | Terr | MC/TR | Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project | 7 | 9 | | 9 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 37 |
| 3 | Terr | BI | West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project | 5 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 5 | 33 |
| 2 | Barat | SP/MC | Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project | 8 | 6 | | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 26 |
| 4 | Merm | MC | Southwest LA Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project | 10 | | 8 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 26 |
| 2 | Breton | MC/SP | Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 2 | | 5 | 22 |
| 3 | T-Verm | SP | Vermilion Bay Shoreline Beach Restoration/ Vegetative Planting and Maintenance Project | 1 | 7 | 2 | | 1 | 10 | 5 | 21 |
| 1 | Pont | DV | Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation | | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | 4 | 35 |
| 2 | Barat | MC | Grand Liard Ridge and Fringe Marsh Restoration Project | | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | | 4 | 28 |
| 3 | Atchaf | DV/MC | Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project | 2 | | 1 | 5 | | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| 4 | Calc-Sab | MC/SP | North Black Lake Marsh Creation Project | 3 | 4 | | | | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| 3 | Terr | DV/TR | Falgout Canal Freshwater Enhancement Project | | | 3 | | | 7 | 2 | 10 |
| 4 | Calc-Sab/Merm | MC | Calcasieu River Ship Channel Sediment Bypass/Restoration of Longshore Sediment Flow Across the Mouth of the Mermentau Ship Channel | | 1 | 4 | | | | 2 | 5 |
| 3 | T-Verm | MC/SP | Bird Island/Southwest Pass Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection (PPL 15 rollover) | | | | | | 9 | 1 | 9 |
| 3 | T-Verm | HR/MC | South Marsh Island Hydrologic Restoration Project | | | | | 5 | | 1 | 5 |
| 2 | Breton | MC | Wills Point Marsh Creation Project | 4 | | | | | | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | Miss Riv | MC | Romere Pass Marsh Creation Project | | | | 2 | | | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | Atchaf | SP | Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | Miss Riv | MC | Delta National Wildlife Refuge Marsh Creation Project | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |

PPL 16 Demonstration Projects:
1. Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demo – 5 agency votes (12)
2. Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps Through Dedicated Dredging Demo – 5 agency votes (11)
3. Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demo – 3 agency votes (5)

CWPPRA PPL 16 Demonstration Projects - Technical Committee Final Vote

| Lead Agency | Project | COE | DNR | EPA | FWS | NMFS | NCRS | No. of Votes | Sum of Point Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EPA | Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demo | 2 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | 2 | 5 | 12 |
| FWS | Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps Through Dedicated Dredging Demo | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 5 | 11 |
| NRCS | Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demo | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| NMFS | Evaluation of Bioengineered Reefs Performing as Submerged Breakwaters Demo | | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| USACE | Barrier Island Sand Blowing Demo | 3 | | | 1 | | | 2 | 4 |

**DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark moved to accept the top ten PPL 16 candidate projects [Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project, Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project, West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project, Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project, Southwest LA Gulf Shoreline Restoration Project, Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project, Vermilion Bay Shoreline Beach Restoration/Vegetative Planting & Maintenance Project, Mississippi River Reintroduction at Violet (Violet Siphon Enlargement) and Marsh Creation, Grand Liard Ridge and Fringe Marsh Restoration Project, and Deer Island Pass Re-Alignment Project] and the top three PPL 16 demonstration projects [Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demo, Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps Through Dedicated Dredging Demo, and Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demo]. Mr. Britt Paul seconded and the motion was passed by the Technical Committee.**

4. Agenda Item 3: Report: Mississippi River Reintroduction into Bayou Lafourche Project (Parrish). Ms. Sharon Parrish, EPA, asked Mr. Brad Crawford to present the project report. Mr. Brad Crawford, EPA, presented an update on the Mississippi Reintroduction into Bayou Lafourche Project, which was originally proposed in PPL 5 as a 2,000-cfs siphon that would operate during high water stages, but it was met with public concerns. A new project concept, a 1,000-cfs siphon operating year-round would have minimal impacts to the bayou and greater benefits. Additional features include a sand trap, weirs, monitoring stations, and channel improvements. The purpose of the project is to nourish and protect the marshes of the Barataria and Terrebonne Basins through the reintroduction of freshwater, sediment and nutrients from the Mississippi River. An added benefit is that this project helps to ensure a long-term freshwater supply to communities and industries served by the Bayou Lafourche Freshwater District.

This project received Phase I approval in late 2001 with five stipulations: (1) the State of Louisiana would pay 50% of the approved funding for Phase I engineering and design; (2)

allocation of Phase I funds did not commit the Task Force to a specific level of Phase II funding; (3) to proceed beyond the 30% design review, a decision is required from the Task Force; (4) an update on the cost and benefits, an assessment of the effects of this project on other water quality control structures and diversion projects, a preliminary cost allocation among beneficiaries, and a preliminary assessment of the potential cost sharing partners must be included in the 30% design; and (5) assurances that the project cost would be shared in proportion to the benefits received by the cost sharing partners.

Under the feasibility phase, a wide-range of alternatives was considered. The 30% design report is currently in draft form and is expected to be released around March 27th with a 30% design review around April 24th. With a successful 30% design, EPA and DNR will seek approval from the Task Force to proceed beyond the 30% design milestone. Depending on the answer from the Task Force, an increase in Phase I funding will be needed to complete the engineering and design. The draft EIS will be available early to mid summer. The final plans and specifications can be completed within 18 to 24 months.

Mr. Brad Crawford asked for comments/discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Darryl Clark noted that since the 30% design review is scheduled after the April 12th Task Force meeting, it would be unfair to request any action at the April meeting. Mr. Brad Crawford agreed and noted that they were trying to get the 30% design review completed before the April Task Force meeting but backed off to allow for more review time. Mr. Crawford could provide an update for the Task Force in April, but at this point, it is not necessary. Mr. Clark agreed that the Technical Committee and Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee members could update their Task Force representatives in lieu of a presentation in April.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked if the most likely cost partners have been identified. Mr. Bob Roberts, project manager for DNR, replied that they have found that 90% of the benefits are expected to be wetland benefits. There are a few potential cost-sharing partners for water quality and freshwater benefits, but the cost is minimal.

Mr. Tom Podany asked if this project or a form of this project was recommended in the LCA feasibility report that was transmitted to Congress in late 2005. Mr. Brad Crawford confirmed that this project was included. Mr. Podany asked if there is a point where engineering and design would be finished under CWPPRA and the project would be moved to LCA. Mr. Crawford could not answer, but he did not want to see the project lose momentum.

Mr. Darryl Clark asked what the anticipated cost is to finish engineering and design. Mr. Bob Roberts responded that the costs are being put together and a definite answer will be available once the 30% design is finished.

Mr. Troy Constance, Chief of Coastal Restoration Branch with the New Orleans District Corps of Engineers, noted there are several things the LCA program would need to know with respect to moving the project to LCA. Specifically, if there were a component for water management purposes, the cost would be 100% non-federal. In addition, coordination with the Mississippi River Commission (MRC) would be needed because they have jurisdiction over the levee

systems. Finally, the duration of operation and maintenance (O&M) needs to be considered; MRC will require an indefinite O&M plan while CWPPRA provides 20 years of O&M. If kept under CWPPRA, there would have to be a close-out procedure after 20 years that would close the structure, remove it, or have it adopted by the state for continued maintenance. These concerns will need to be answered if the goal is to move the project to the LCA program.

Mr. Judge Edwards asked Mr. Constance about the 20 year O&M issue and its effect on other CWPPRA projects. Mr. Constance replied that federal projects are authorized by Congress and are budgeted for a certain amount of time; CWPPRA projects are authorized for 20 years of O&M. Mr. Edwards asked if there were no funds beyond 20 years, what would be done at the end of the maintenance period. Mr. Constance noted that if a CWPPRA project were impacting a federal project authorized by Congress, someone would have to assume the maintenance. The only entity that can authorize an increase or change in federal maintenance is Congress. Mr. Darryl Clark added that if this project were transferred from CWPPRA to the LCA program, it would have a 50-year lifespan. Mr. Constance replied that the LCA projects have an indefinite life span; the period of analysis is 50 years to project the benefits.

Mr. Darryl Clark asked if CWPPRA were to fund the full engineering and design for the Bayou Lafourche project and it was transferred to the LCA program, would the Corps have to do additional engineering and design to fit LCA requirements. Mr. Troy Constance replied that he hoped there would not have to be further analysis, but he would like the opportunity to coordinate and join the discussions with the project managers as the project progresses. He added that he was unaware of any detailed coordination with the Corps' LCA staff, but it appears that now is the time to join the discussions.

Mr. Rick Hartman added that prior to providing funds for the 95% design milestone, there needs to be assurance that the communication that Mr. Constance mentioned was going to occur so that the funds invested by CWPPRA would not be wasted.

5. Agenda Item 4: Discussion: Initial Discussion Regarding FY07 Budget Development (Process, Size, Funding, etc) (Podany). Mr. Tom Podany announced that the FY07 Planning Budget needs to be developed. A skeleton budget similar to FY06 has been prepared for the Technical Committee's review.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark believes the budget should be a bit less than FY06 because there may not be the Report to Congress efforts in FY07. Those efforts should be completed in FY06. Mr. Kirk Rhinehart asked if work is still needed for the Programmatic Assessment. Mr. Clark agreed work is still needed and Mr. Tom Podany noted that the funds would balance out.

Mr. Rick Hartman noted that there is an increase in rates and that the budget was based on six candidate projects and there are now ten. He does not see the budget needing to be any smaller.

Mr. Tom Podany asked each agency to look at the line items and ensure that all tasks have been covered for FY07.

6. Agenda Item 5: Additional Agenda Items (Podany). There were not additional agenda items.

7. Agenda Item 6: Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (Podany). Mr. Podany announced that the next Task Force meeting would be held on April 12, 2006 in Lafayette.

8. Agenda Item 7: Dates of Future Program Meetings (LeBlanc). Ms. LeBlanc noted that the July Task Force meeting has been moved to Baton Rouge due to traffic problems in the New Orleans area. Ms. LeBlanc announced that the dates for the 2007 meetings have been scheduled on Colonel Wagenaar's schedule. Ms. LeBlanc requested that the Technical Committee members check their schedules for future conflicts and let her know if changes are needed.

9. Agenda Item 8: Adjourn. Mr. Darryl Clark moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rick Hartman seconded and the Technical Committee passed the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 pm.