

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 13 September 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)

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 asked Ms. Julie LeBlanc to summarize the available funding in the Planning Program. Available funding in the Planning Program as of 13 Sep 06 is \$1,103,385.71. When combined with the FY07 allocation of \$5 million, the available funding totals \$6.1 million. Ms. LeBlanc summarized the requests for funding from the Planning Budget. If the requests listed in agenda items one, two, and three were approved today by the Technical Committee for further approval by the Task Force, there would be an available balance of \$731,000 in the Planning Program.

2. Agenda Item 1: Decision: Approval to Use FY05 “Storm Recovery Procedures” Planning Funds and Request for an Increase in the FY06 “Storm Recovery Procedures” Line Item (Duszynski): In response to Hurricane Katrina and Rita, LDNR completed assessments that exceeded the budgeted amount for storm recovery procedures (total cost of post storm assessments is \$398,358.92). LDNR is requesting approval to use the FY05 budget amount (\$97,534) and the FY06 budget amount (\$97,534) to cover the assessments following Katrina and Rita. In addition LDNR is requesting an additional \$203,358.92 under the FY06 line item for the assessments. The Technical Committee will make a recommendation to the Task Force approving use of FY05/FY06 funds for this effort plus the additional funds under the FY06 Planning Budget. Mr. Tom Podany stated that the Technical Committee must decide on the approval of using FY05 Storm Recovery Procedures Planning funds in addition to the FY06 Storm Recovery Procedures Planning funds for two storm events plus a request for an increase of \$203,358.92 under the FY06 Storm Recovery Procedures line item. Mr. Gerry Duszynski stated that the LDNR, in conjunction with other Federal agencies, was tasked with evaluating projects and determining the status of storm damages.

Mr. Tom Podany called for a motion, but Mr. Darryl Clark requested a discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Darryl Clark stated that he does not have a problem with appropriating the leftover FY05 funds in addition to the FY06 funds allocated for this purpose. However, he understands that there is a recommendation from the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee (P&E) to remove the task from the FY07 Planning Budget. Ms. Julie LeBlanc, P&E Subcommittee Chairman, stated that the P&E recommendation addresses the funds under the proposed FY07 Planning Budget. There is no P&E recommendation on this specific request for an increase. Mr. Clark questioned whether this task should be funded from the Planning or Construction Program. As this is more of a construction-type issue, Mr. Clark suggested that funding could come out of the Construction Program.

Mr. Rick Hartman agreed to a certain degree, but did not believe that funds have to necessarily come out of Phase I or II budgets for individual projects. The program has been working within the \$5M cap for Planning for 16 years. Mr. Hartman would prefer to approve the funding out of the available Construction Program.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski added that if the funds come from the Construction Program, he would like to have a programmatic budget with a rolling total so that it doesn't have to be charged back to individual projects. Mr. Rick Hartman stated that it could be setup like a contingency fund, similar to the Monitoring Contingency Fund. It may be appropriate to classify the contingency fund as "O&M".

Mr. Britt Paul reminded the Technical Committee that they previously had a proposal before to set up an O&M-type contingency fund for this purpose.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to establish a contingency fund for Storm Damage Assessments to be funded out of the Construction Program. The \$203,358.92 for Katrina and Rita efforts would be immediately approved from the established fund. FY05 and FY06 funds would be approved under the Planning Program to cover the remaining costs. The Storm Damage Assessment Contingency Fund would also include a \$100,000 line item in the budget that would cover the assessments for future storm damage (in FY07 and beyond) under the Construction Program. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

3. Agenda Item 2: Decision: FY07 Planning Budget Approval and Presentation of FY07 Outreach Budget (LeBlanc/Wilson): a) The Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee will recommend the FY07 Planning Budget in the amount of \$4,514,834. The Technical Committee will make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY07 Planning Budget. b) The CWPPRA Outreach Committee will present the draft FY07 Outreach Committee Budget in the amount of \$463,858 to the Technical Committee for coordination and discussion purposes only. The Outreach Committee Budget will be recommended to the Task Force by the Outreach Committee. Ms. Julie LeBlanc reported that the P&E Subcommittee's recommended FY07 Planning Budget is \$4,514,834. To keep the budget under the \$5 million limitation, some supplemental planning items included in previous years were reduced or eliminated. Items eliminated in the FY07 Planning Budget include the "Phase 0 Analysis of Impact to Oyster Leases for PPL Project Development" and the aforementioned "Storm Recovery Procedures".

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

Mr. Darryl Clark noted that there is approximately \$1 million in surplus Planning dollars from agencies returning monies from previous years. He asked the Technical Committee if they would want use the surplus to include the deleted supplemental planning items.

Mr. Rick Hartman responded budgets keep increasing, but it does not mean that agencies should expend all their funds and then request additional planning dollars. The Technical Committee can decide to use the surplus Planning funds for construction. Mr. Hartman commended the P&E Subcommittee for being fiscally conscious, thus producing an excellent planning budget.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to accept the P&E Subcommittee's proposed FY07 Planning Budget in the amount of \$4,514,834.00. Ms. Sharon Parrish seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

Mr. Scott Wilson from the CWPPRA Program Outreach Committee presented the FY07 CWPPRA Outreach Committee Planning Budget. The total budget request is \$463,858.00. Items funded from this budget include agency participation, a budget coordinator, an educational outreach assistant, the *WaterMarks* newsletter, training, and travel support for regional and national conferences. This information was presented to the Technical Committee for informational purposes only (no action is required of the committee). Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

4. Agenda Item 3 Decision: CWPPRA FY07 Planning Budget Request - Central and Eastern Terrebonne Freshwater Delivery Complex Project (Clark):*The Central and Eastern Terrebonne Freshwater Delivery Project was approved as a FWS-sponsored complex project on PPL9 (October 7, 1999). The approved Final Project Development Plan provided for a budget of \$664,000. To date, only \$474,000 of the \$664,000 has been requested and obligated (in 2000 and 2001). To ensure funding is available to conduct the needed hydrologic modeling and post-modeling tasks, the FWS is requesting the balance of the approved budget \$190,000 so that the work may be completed.* Mr. Ronny Paille, FWS, provided a status report on the Central and Eastern Terrebonne Freshwater Delivery Complex Project. He described that the project's goal is to enhance the Atchafalaya River influence in Central and Eastern Terrebonne Basin. The study area has a high loss rate. The scope of the project includes enlarging a narrow bayou that receives water from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) to allow for more discharge from the GIWW to reach Central and Eastern Terrebonne Basin marshes. This project was designated as a "complex project" because it requires modeling.

Mr. Paille presented the final approved Project Development Plan. Mr. Paille explained that the budget was trimmed to \$664,000 in the final Project Development Plan. So far, funds have been expended on a contract with LSU to produce an ecological and geological characterization of the area, helicopter over-flights, and Morganza models. Mr. Paille said that the FWS worked with the Corps on their lower Atchafalaya Basin re-evaluation study because both agencies needed to perform modeling in the same area. As the Corps project never received funding, the agencies

parted ways on this project. The project was delayed due to calibration problems with the modified Morganza model, the need to re-survey waterway crossings and revise the Morganza unit model, and the delay in additional Corps funding. The FWS decided to use the EPA Bayou Lafourche Tabs model, which has been fairly successful. The project's next step is to revise the mesh in the Grand Bayou Project area, which would cost a minimum of \$260,000. Mr. Paille noted that unless they receive the balance from the \$664,000 that was approved, which is an increase of \$190,000, the work will not be completed.

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked Mr. Ronny Paille about the project's schedule to complete and if the \$190,000 will be enough to complete the Phase 0 evaluation. Mr. Paille responded that unless more problems are encountered, the \$190,000 should be sufficient. Mr. Paille fielded the schedule question to Mr. John Jurgensen, NRCS, who works on a modeling contract to revise the EPA Bayou Lafourche model. Mr. Jurgensen replied that the model may be completed in early spring. As this is a detailed model, each run could take from 30 to 60 days depending on the complexity of the mesh.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked if the Technical Committee will be presented with an estimate of project costs and benefits when the \$190,000 is spent. Mr. Tom Podany agreed that the level of estimate could be at the Phase 0 scope. There should be funds to account for a cost estimate. Mr. Ronny Paille confirmed that funds for the cost estimate are included in the \$664,000.

Mr. Rick Hartman pointed out that the modeling sounds like an engineering and design issue and wondered if it could be funded out of construction costs instead of planning costs, as is done with Phase I activities. Mr. Darryl Clark explained that the difference is that this is a "complex project" that has yet not been approved for Phase I. Mr. Tom Podany agreed with Mr. Clark's statement and suggested that it might be best to let this project run its course.

Mr. Rick Hartman pointed out that if CWPPRA were to use its funds to fulfill the project's request, they would still have \$934,000 available at the end of the year. Mr. Darryl Clark agreed that there is sufficient funding, but the project is not suitable for construction funding at this time. Mr. Clark commented that after the modeling and benefit-cost analysis, the project would have to compete with other projects for Phase I funding.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to recommend the Task Force provide \$190,000 in Phase 0 funds under the Planning Program for the Central and East Terrebonne Freshwater Delivery Complex Project. Mr. Rick Hartman seconded added that the recommendation to the Task Force be made with the understanding that once the planning funds are expended, the project will be ready for a Phase I request. Mr. Clark accepted the motion's revision. Mr. Gerry Duszynski seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

5. Agenda Item 4: Report: Overview of Available Funding in Construction Program/Phase II Requests Expected in Dec 06/Jan 07 (Browning/LeBlanc): Ms. Browning and Ms. LeBlanc will

give an overview of the available funding in the Construction Program and will provide an update on the Phase II requests expected in Dec 06/Jan 07. This information will aid the Technical Committee in making funding recommendations to the Task Force in October 2006.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc provided an overview of the available funding in the Construction Program and the Phase II requests expected in December of 2006. She explained that the Technical Committee has to balance the available money in the Construction Program with the agenda items requested today and for approval at the October Task Force meeting, as well as the Phase II construction requests that will come forward in December 2006/January 2007. Currently, the funds available in the Construction Program total \$22,234. The FY07 Construction Program anticipated Federal funds is \$69.8 million plus the 15% cost share from the State gives a total of \$82,206,000. Currently there are 14 projects that are scheduled to request Phase II Increment 1 funding totaling \$239 million. Items 5, 6, 7, and 8 will be considered today with Construction Program funds.

6. Agenda Item 5: Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Funding (Burkholder): The Technical Committee will consider the request for O&M funding required in FY07. a) PPL 1-8 Projects requesting funding increases in the amount of \$2,329,656. b) PPL 9+ Projects requesting funding of O&M costs beyond Incr. 1 funding in the amount of \$1,847,509. Mr. David Burkholder, LDNR, reported to the Technical Committee that there are four projects that need additional O&M funding for the next fiscal year funding cycle. The first two are non-cash flow projects that have exceeded their 20-year O&M budgets. The requests include 3 years of O&M estimates for these projects.

a. PPL3 Cameron-Creole Maintenance Project (CS-04a)

This project was originally funded through the NRCS Water Resources Program, but no maintenance funding was available after construction. The CWPPRA Program assumed maintenance responsibility for this project in the 1990s. LDNR is requesting a 3-year budget of an additional \$2,103,787 to repair damages from Hurricane Rita. The total 3-year O&M cost is \$4.5M. \$2.4M remains in the CWPPRA O&M budget leaving a balance of \$2.1M needed. Two FEMA claims to the repair the breaches and the structures are pending. If approved, this increase will complete the funding requirement for O&M up to 12 years post-construction. As approved by the Task Force in October 2004, pre-cash flow projects which require additional O&M funds beyond their original 20-year allocation must request funds in 3-year increments to maintain a 3-year rolling amount of funds. The total revised projected budget need for FY09 – FY16 is \$731,014.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked for clarification about how CWPPRA would get reimbursed if LDNR receives the FEMA claim. Mr. David Burkholder replied that if the LDNR were to receive a FEMA claim, they would make accounting adjustments to return the money received for O&M to CWPPRA and then use the money that the State would receive to actually complete the repairs.

b. PPL3 Lake Chapeau Sediment Input and Hydrologic Restoration Project (TE-26)

This project consists of marsh creation near Lake Chapeau, the placement of seven rock weirs across existing oil field canals, and dredging on Locust Bayou to help restore the hydrologic imbalance. The proposed maintenance event includes the placement of 250 linear feet of rock

riprap at Weir No.3. on the perimeter of the island. A 3-year O&M budget of \$225,869 is requested. If approved, this increase will complete the funding requirement for O&M up to 9 years post-construction. As approved by the Task Force in October 2004, pre-cash flow projects which require additional O&M funds beyond their original 20-year allocation must request funds in 3-year increments to maintain a 3-year rolling amount of funds. The total revised projected budget need for FY09 – FY19 is \$549,966.

Due to all the maintenance performed on this project already, Mr. Darryl Clark asked Mr. David Burkholder if larger rocks should have been included in the original construction. Mr. Burkholder responded that there has been an acceleration of the erosion rates since construction. Along with the Federal project sponsors, LDNR considered relocating the weir further inland, but decided that given the remainder of the project life, preventing breaching at the current location of the weir was more cost-effective.

Mr. Rick Hartman pointed out that, due to the dynamic shoreline, the weir will eventually be bypassed by the island. Mr. David Burkholder stated that maintenance work performed on the southern portion of the weir in conjunction with work for another CWPPRA project has been successful in preventing erosion.

c. PPL11 Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b)

This request is for maintaining a rolling three-year budget beyond Increment 1 for the program in the amount of \$1,832,938. Funding was previously approved for O&M in years 1-6 of the program. This funding increase will allow the program to maintain a 3-year rolling amount of funding. The program's O&M will be funded through 2009 if approved.

Mr. Rick Hartman questioned if this amount covers the additional dollar per nutria tail bounty increase. Mr. David Burkholder replied that the amount includes a contingency. Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, added that the budget includes an extra dollar per tail that was warranted this year plus a contingency to purchase additional tails.

d. PPL9 Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18)

O&M funds in the amount of \$14,571 to maintain a 3-year rolling amount are requested for this project. There are no maintenance events planned for the next three years. The requested funds represent the annual inspection costs for the next three years. Funding was previously approved for O&M in years 1-3 of the project. This funding increase will allow the project to maintain a 3-year rolling amount of funding. The project's O&M will be funded through 2009 if approved.

Mr. Rick Hartman asked if annual visits were planned for in the past. Mr. David Burkholder responded that in previous years the LDNR did not ask for an additional \$5,000 each year, but instead waited to reach a significant amount (\$10,000 or \$15,000) before submitting a request.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to approve the request for 3-year O&M funding increases above the 20-year estimates for the non-cash flow projects: PPL3 Cameron-Creole Maintenance Project (CS-04a) in the amount of \$2,103,787 and PPL3 Lake Chapeau Sediment Input and Hydrologic Restoration Project (TE-26) in the amount of \$224,869. His motion also included approving the request for O&M funding amounts

beyond Increment 1 to maintain 3-year rolling budgets for the cash flow projects: PPL11 Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b) in the amount of \$1,832,938 and PPL9 Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18) in the amount of \$14,571. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

Mr. Tom Podany put the Technical Committee on notice that the Corps has identified a need for O&M funding on the PPL1 West Bay Sediment Diversion Project. It is anticipated that an increase will be requested in conjunction with next year's O&M request.

7. Agenda Item 6: Decision: Request for Funding for Administrative Costs for those Projects Beyond Increment 1 Funding (Podany): The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will request funding approval in the amount of \$17,586 for administrative costs for those projects beyond Increment 1 funding. Mr. Tom Podany asked Ms. Gay Browning to provide a summary of the administrative costs for projects beyond Increment 1 funding. Mr. Rick Hartman interjected and recommended that the Technical Committee approve the request as this is a request heard every year.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made a motion to approve the Corps' request for funding in the amount of \$17,586 for administrative costs for those non cash flow projects beyond Increment 1 funding. Mr. Britt Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

8. Agenda Item 7: Decision: Request for FY10 Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS)- Wetlands Monitoring Funds and Project Specific Monitoring Funds for Projects on PPLs 9+ (Steyer): Following a presentation on the status/progress of CRMS over the past year, the following requests will be discussed by the Technical Committee, for recommendation to the Task Force: a) Project specific monitoring funding beyond the first 3-years for projects on PPLs 9+ (in order to maintain a 3-year rolling amount of funding) in the amount of \$121,507. b) CRMS FY10 monitoring request in the amount of \$3,185,809. Mr. Greg Steyer, USGS NWRC, provided a status report on the CRMS program and a summary of the budget request. Landrights have been secured for 486 out of 612 CRMS sites. Standard operating procedures are in place to train all staff. Site characterizations increased from 141 sites in 2005 to 294 sites in 2006. Site approvals increased from 90 to 215 sites and site construction increased from 13 to 153 sites. Although no additional data collection sites were initiated, there are still 91 CRMS stations where data continues to be collected. Future goals for the project include the installation of the remaining benchmarks, the completion of construction for all year 1 sites, and the development of an analytical team to represent agency personnel as well as academic assistance to support base and level assessments when all the CRMS data is received. Mr. Steyer listed the project's budget requests to be \$3.185 million for a replacement of expenditures from FY06 in addition to a total project-specific request of \$121,507 for CS-30 GIWW Bank Stabilization (\$17,863), TE-37 New Cut Dune/Marsh Restoration (\$77,808), TV-18 Four-Mile Cut/Little Vermilion Bay (\$3,215), and BS-11 Delta Management at Fort St. Philip (\$22,621).

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

Mr. Tom Podany asked if Mr. Greg Steyer still had the analysis of an anticipated peak in the funding requirement. Mr. Steyer replied that if they had been fully implementable in 2003, they would be spending around \$5 million over the first few years and then decrease to about \$3 million a year. Right now they would have spent a total of \$12 to \$13 million, but have currently only expended about \$4 million. The timeline for the peak has shifted from 2010 to 2012 or 2013. Mr. Steyer explained that they are still under the target projected costs and believes that they will reduce the cost over the long-term.

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to recommend to the Task Force to approve the 3-year funding for project-specific monitoring in the amount of \$121,507 (CS-30 GIWW Bank Stabilization (\$17,863), TE-37 New Cut Dune/Marsh Restoration (\$77,808), TV-18 Four-Mile Cut/Little Vermilion Bay (\$3,215), and BS-11 Delta Management at Fort St. Philip (\$22,621)) and 3-year funding for Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS)-Wetlands Monitoring in the amount of \$3,185,809. Ms. Sharon Parrish seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Final approval is required by the Task Force at their next meeting.

9. Agenda Item 8: Decision: Recommendation of Projects for the 16th PPL (Podany): *The Technical Committee will review the results of the 16th Priority Project List (PPL 16) candidate and demonstration project evaluations. LDNR will present the draft Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) list of projects to the Technical Committee, if available. The Technical Committee will discuss the schedule for final CIAP approval and the implications to identified CWPPRA projects prior to making a decision on PPL 16. The committee will recommend candidate and demonstration projects to the CWPPRA Task Force for selection on PPL 16.*

Mr. Tom Podany announced that the Technical Committee has 10 candidates and three demonstration projects to review for recommendation as projects for PPL 16. He asked Mr. Kevin Roy, Chairman of the Environmental Workgroup, to present the candidate projects. Mr. Kevin Roy described that the projects were first presented at the Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings, 20 of which were selected as nominees. Two unselected projects from PPL 15 were combined to equal a total of 22 nominees. In March the Technical Committee selected 10 candidate projects and three candidate demos for further evaluation. Project boundaries, cost estimates, and prioritization scores were determined for each project. Mr. Roy summarized the project features by region.

Region 1

Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection: This project primarily addresses the loss that occurred by Hurricane Katrina in an area on the East Orleans Landbridge, which is between Lake Borgne and Lake Pontchartrain. The project components include 494 acres of marsh creation as well as vegetative plantings along the shoreline. Benefits over project life total 330 net acres. The fully funded cost is \$19.6 million.

Violet Siphon Enlargement: Project features include the construction of a gated diversion structure with a 4,000 to 5,000 cfs capacity in the location of the existing siphon and the use of earthen material excavated during project construction to create approximately 49 acres of

marsh. The net benefits total 1,609 net acres and the fully funded cost is \$53.2 million.

Region 2

Breton Landbridge Marsh Restoration: This project is located south of Lake Lery in the Caernarvon Outfall area. This project is designed to address the loss that occurred after Hurricane Katrina by means of marsh creation. Containment dikes would be built in areas where created marsh would be directly exposed to a large body of water. The net benefits total 176 acres and the fully funded cost is \$13.6 million.

Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection: This project is located on the eastern side of Lake Salvador. The project consists of the construction of approximately 48,000 linear feet of rock shoreline protection. The upper portion of this project protects a portion of the Jean Lafitte National Park. Approximately 462 acres of marsh would be created/protected over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost is \$29.8 million.

Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration: This project is located in lower Plaquemines Parish. Project features include the restoration of a natural levee ridge that once existed along Bayou Grand Liard and the creation of a marsh platform on the east bank of the bayou with sediment dredged from the bayou. Restored marsh areas would be planted with smooth cordgrass and the ridge would be planted with appropriate woody vegetation. The ridge would encompass about 31 acres and the sediments would be hydraulically dredged in the Mississippi River to create about 482 acres of marsh. The net benefits total 285 acres. The full funded cost is \$27.8 million.

Region 3

Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing: This project is located in Terrebonne Parish near the community of Montegut in the upper Madison Bay Basin. Project features consist of marsh creation and the construction of 24,600 linear feet of terraces. Net benefits for the project total 372 acres and the fully funded cost is \$32.4 million.

West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration: This project is located in Lafourche Parish. This project focuses on addressing loss from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita by restoring a dune and beach habitat to the West of Belle Pass to pre-storm conditions. Another project feature is to build a marsh platform on the backside of the dunes to protect mainland marshes. The project is designed to prevent breaching of the headlands during the 20-year project life. The net benefits for the project total 299 acres and the fully funded cost is \$32.6 million.

Deer Island Pass Sediment Delivery: This project is located in St. Mary Parish on the Atchafalaya Delta. The project's goals are to divert sediment transport along Deer Island Pass by dredging a channel from the Navigation Channel across the shallow flat to the northern end of Deer Island Pass and to encourage more freshwater and sediment delivery into the Atchafalaya Bay. The net benefits total 216 acres and the fully funded cost is \$8.8 million.

Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection: This project is located in Iberia Parish, along the northern

shore of Vermilion Bay. Project features include the construction of approximately 9,330 linear feet of rock riprap to reconnect the solid bay rim on either side of the breach and to implement a 5-year vegetation planning regime along the 5-mile stretch of shoreline east of Avery Canal. The net benefits totally 132 acres and the fully funded cost is \$9.4 million.

Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection: This project is located in Cameron and Vermilion Parishes. Project features include depositing approximately 4.8 million cubic yards of sediment parallel to 47,900 linear feet of gulf shoreline between Dewitt Canal and Big Constance Lake and creating 417 acres of marsh platform, mud flat, and shallow water. The net benefits total 888 acres and the fully funded cost is \$36.9 million.

Mr. Kevin Roy continued to describe the demonstration projects up for consideration. The following three demonstration candidate projects were selected by the Technical Committee on March 15, 2006 out of the six selected demonstration nominees at the February 1, 2006 coastwide voting meeting.

Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demo: This project focuses on enhancing the cost-effective establishment and growth of key barrier island and salt marsh vegetation. The project applies humic acid and broadcast fertilization techniques to determine which combination and rates work best to promote and enhance dune vegetation. The project will also look into techniques to disburse seeds of black mangrove and groundsel bush. The fully funded cost for this demo is around \$900,000.

Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps through Dedicated Dredging Demo: The goal of this project is to demonstrate how the deposition of differing amounts (depths) of sediment would affect the growth and natural regeneration of bald cypress. Methods of planting bald cypress in the newly deposited dredged material would be tested along with their survival rates. The fully funded cost for that demo is about \$1.5 million.

Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demo: This project tests a sediment containment system in two applications: to contain dredged material in a marsh creation project and to isolate areas to increase sediment retention within the outfall area of a diversion. The project's goal is to demonstrate the effectiveness of a sediment containment system to strategically define areas of accumulation and improve the efficiency of passive sediment retention. The fully funded cost is \$1.1 million.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark pointed out that the Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shore Protection Project's cost of \$36.9 million is the fully funded cost, while the first construction cost is around \$14 million. The quote of \$36.9 million includes four maintenance events that may not have to occur if the material remains in place after the first event.

Mr. Rick Hartman announced that last week he received a letter from St. Bernard Parish indicating that while they are extremely supportive of the Violet Canal Project, they would prefer that it be located at a different site. Mr. Hartman explained that the current location was

chosen because after Hurricane Katrina, much of the infrastructure was displaced and it was thought that the cost of construction and relocations would be significantly decreased. Mr. Hartman believes this project is a lynchpin project in the restoration of New Orleans and St. Bernard Parish. Mr. Hartman noted that an alternative location for the Violet Siphon project is Meraux Pasture. There are fewer infrastructures to move, but relocations would still need to be made. He recommended that if this project were selected, an alternative location could be proposed at the end of Phase I.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, representing the City of New Orleans, urged the Technical Committee to support the Alligator Bend Project because it would restore a lot of marsh that Hurricane Katrina took away and that it acts as a natural levee that protects Orleans, St. Tammany, and Jefferson Parishes.

Mr. Doug Daigle, representing the Mississippi River Basin Alliance, expressed his support for the Alligator Bend Project. This area is very valuable and part of the natural defense. He added that the State of Illinois may provide possible sources of sediment for this project.

Mr. David Frady, a representative for the Lake Catherine Civic Association, stated that he has a lot of interest in securing funding for the Alligator Bend Project because it is a natural barrier island preventing storm surge from entering Lake Pontchartrain, which would impact the 600,000 people who live in those areas.

Dr. John Lopez, representing the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, stated that his organization has prioritized plans for the restoration of this basin. One of the projects on the high priority list for restoration was the New Orleans Landbridge, and after Hurricane Katrina, it became very apparent that this area would be addressed by the Alligator Bend Project. The Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation supports the Alligator Bend Project.

Ms. Marilyn Stoltz, Irish Bayou resident, stated that she has watched the marsh disappear after each storm. She urged the Technical Committee to consider the marsh restoration of Alligator Bend Project as the top priority project.

Ms. Barbara McArthur, St. Charles Parish resident and Vice President of the Chef Menteur Land Company, Ltd, said that most of the land the company owned over the last 100 years has washed away. She recommended that the Technical Committee vote for Alligator Bend Project to protect all the parishes.

Mr. Ken Carter, partner at Cedar Bayou, L.L.C. and owner of Brazalier Island, stated that his property has decreased from 2,400 acres to about 2,000 acres after the 2005 hurricane season. He is in support of the Alligator Bend project.

Mr. Wayne Gagliano, member of the New Orleans Fire Department and commercial fisherman on Lake Catherine, hopes that the Technical Committee will vote for the Alligator Bend project because if nothing happens, Lake Catherine will become part of Lake Borgne.

Mr. Leo Richardson, representing the Board of the Lake Catherine Civic Association and the Venetian Isle Association, urged the Technical Committee to protect the 600,000 people that live in this area by restoring the shorelines and wetlands for the landbridge. It is in America's interest to save the barrier islands. Mr. Richardson requested that the Technical Committee place the welfare of the Pontchartrain communities and New Orleans at the highest level by selecting Alligator Bend as the priority project and giving it a weighted vote of "6".

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, asked for the Technical Committee's support for the Alligator Bend Project as a part of the landbridge which protects Jefferson Parish, as well as Orleans Parish and the Northshore.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Violet Siphon Enlargement Project.

Mr. Junior Rodriguez, President of St. Bernard Parish, said that St. Bernard Parish is in total support of the project. He asked that the program look at alternate sites, however if they are cost prohibitive the parish has no problem with the Violet site. Approximately 67,000 people relocated out of St. Bernard Parish because the whole parish was devastated. There are 3-4 businesses that need to be relocated in Violet Canal area. Mr. Rodriguez also offered to contribute \$2 million to \$4 million of CIAP money to the project's planning stage. He added that the salinity problem must be reduced or freshwater will be lost.

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, stated that the Violet Siphon Enlargement project is one of his organization's top priority projects. Mr. Lopez commented that this project has the largest benefits and potential in the Pontchartrain Basin. This project has significance like Bayou Lafourche and it means more than just the acres that are affected because it serves as a model to the area and to St. Bernard Parish.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing Biloxi Marsh Lands Corporation of Eugenie Land Development Company, supports the Violet Siphon Enlargement project and also supports looking at alternative routes to obtain freshwater.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Breton Landbridge Marsh Restoration.

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, said that this project is one of 10 priority projects for his organization. Approximately 40 square miles of marsh was lost in the area around Lake Lery due to damage from Hurricane Katrina. We can't depend on Caernarvon to benefit this area. He asked for the Technical Committee's support for the Breton Landbridge Marsh Restoration Project.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection.

Ms. Nancy Walters, on behalf of the National Park Service (NPS), supports the Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection project. She explained that in 1978 the NPS was charged with protecting the natural and coastal resources of the Barataria Preserve. The NPS committed their own funds and worked with the State, parish, and Corps to perform shoreline protection. Ms. Walters reported that the restoration projects north of the proposed project area that were protected by rock were not impacted by the storms. However, the unprotected areas experienced severe shoreline retreat up to nearly 200 feet. This project would complete the southern portion of the park that is currently unprotected.

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, strongly supports this project as it completes the protection of the shoreline on the southern part of the park. Ms. Winter explained that the project would protect the only national park in the state, which is valuable for tourism and for teaching people about the importance of wetlands. Ms. Winter also suggested that the Jean Lafitte shoreline would be the ideal location for placing sediment from other dredging projects.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, representing the City of New Orleans, supports the Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection project. It is important to protect this area because the City of New Orleans residents on the Westbank, as well as visitors, have an opportunity to look at the ecosystem and learn about it.

Ms. Vickie Duffour, with the Bayou Segnette Boaters Association, also encouraged the Technical Committee to select the Jean Lafitte project. Ms. Duffour described that the rocks LDNR placed further north saved the strip along Bayou Segnette. She believes that LDNR's similar restoration project was successful and hopes that the Technical Committee will approve this project while there is still time to save the shoreline.

Mr. Jason Smith, who serves as the Board Coordinator of the Jefferson Parish Marine Advisory Board and represents the Jefferson Parish Department of Environmental Affairs, stated that in addition to this project protecting the shoreline, the communities along Crown Point, Lafitte, and Barataria would also be protected.

Mr. Randy Gros, representing the Jefferson Parish Marine Fisheries Advisory Board, recommended that the Technical Committee vote to save this land, the pristine national park, and protect the citizens of Crown Point, Barataria and Lafitte.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project. No public comments were made.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, representing Terrebonne Parish, stated that Terrebonne Basin is one of the most rapidly eroding basins on an average annual basis. This area is particularly problematic and

it is the second time that it has been designated as a top priority. This project has the support of the CZM Committee and the Parish Council. It was the CZM Committee's top priority project for the second year in a row. Ms. Suazo added that the project has the support of the landowner and community. She thinks that construction-wise, the project is doable as a CWPPRA project.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project.

Mr. Vince Melvin, representing Lafourche Parish, pointed out that this is a multi-habitat creation project. He believes this project is valuable because of the dune and marsh creation, which results in infrastructure protection.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Deer Island Pass Sediment Delivery Project.

Mr. Mike Wade who represents Morgan City Terminal District, asked the Technical Committee to support this project as it puts dredging waste from current projects to good use while creating 216 acres of new marshland.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, who represents Continental Land and Fur Company, spoke in support of the Deer Island project. He believes that this project ranks highly in terms of cost-effectiveness. He added that this project captures valuable sediment from the Atchafalaya River, enhances the Delta east of East Pass, and protects shoreline to the north.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection Project.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing Avery Island Incorporated and the McIlhenney Company that owns land to the north of this project and pockets of land within project areas, stated that an important component of this project is vegetative planting. He believes that planting programs involving the children in the community have been successful. Mr. Moertle reported that they have actually accreted five feet into the bay instead of losing shoreline.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public for the Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection Project.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing the M.O. Miller Estates, pointed out that this project ranked number one in the prioritization scoring. This project ranks second for net acres, second for average annual habitat, and third for cost-effectiveness. According to the prioritization matrix this project should score very high and M.O. Miller Estates supports this project.

Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee for the demonstration projects. As there were no comments from members of the Technical Committee, Mr. Podany opened the floor for comments from the public.

Mr. Doug Daigle, representing the Mississippi River Basin Alliance, announced his support for the Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps through Dedicated Dredging Demo. He stated that given the low price tag of this demo project, it seems like a valuable project to pursue to see if it could help stabilize some of the areas in decline and maybe lead to regeneration.

Mr. Tom Podany announced the conclusion of the review and comment period.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc reviewed the voting procedures. Each agency represented in the Technical Committee will cast weighted votes for the six projects. The votes are assigned weighted points scores of one through six. A vote of six indicates the agency's top priority project. The initial rank will be determined based upon the number of votes received for a project, not the weighted score. The projects will then be ranked by the weighted score. The Technical Committee will select up to four projects for Phase I funding. For demo projects, each agency will cast one vote and then the projects are ranked by the number of votes.

Mr. Rick Hartman observed that the CIAP list has not been released. He recommended that the Technical Committee select the top four projects and if the CIAP program comes in and takes one of those projects, the fifth ranked project could automatically be selected and authorized under the CWPPRA program.

Mr. Darryl Clark suggested that the fifth ranked project could be recommended as the alternate. He does not believe that a formal transfer process would be necessary because these projects are not in the construction phase. Mr. Gerry Duszynski pointed out that it depends on how many projects CIAP picks. Mr. Britt Paul added that additional projects will come out of the ranked list.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski suggested that the Technical Committee just recommend four projects with the understanding that if one of is picked up by CIAP, the next project would be taken from the ranked list. Mr. Tom Podany agreed that Mr. Duszynski's recommendation is the simplest way.

Voting Results

Ms. Julie LeBlanc 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 (25)
2. Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection Project- 6 agency votes (20)
3. Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project- 6 agency votes, weighted score of 17
4. West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration- 5 agency votes, weighted score of 19
5. Violet Siphon Enlargement Project- 3 agency votes, weighted score of 18
6. Jean Lafitte Shoreline Protection Project- 3 agency votes, weighted score of 9
7. Vermillion Bay Shoreline Protection- 2 agency votes, weighted score of 7
8. Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration- 2 agency votes, weighted score of 6

9. Deer Island Sediment Delivery- 2 agency votes, weighted score of 2
10. Breton Landbridge Marsh Restoration- 1 agency vote, weighted score of 3

PPL 16 Demonstration Projects:

1. Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demo- 3 agency votes
2. Sediment Contamination System for Marsh Creation Demo- 2 agency votes
3. Nourishment of Permanently Flooded Cypress Swamps Through Dedicated Dredging Demo- 1 agency vote

DECISION: Mr. Darryl Clark moved to accept the top four PPL 16 candidate projects (Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project, Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection Project, Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project, and West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration) and the top PPL 16 demonstration project (Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demo). Mr. Rick Hartman seconded the motion. Mr. Clark added to the motion that if CIAP takes on one (or more) of the projects, the next ranked project(s) on the list of PPL 16 projects would be automatically recommended for Phase I funding. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc reviewed how the aforementioned decision would affect the overall funding situation under the Construction Program. She reported that the proposed October 2006 Task Force approvals now total \$17 million, which includes the \$9.5 million for PPL 16, Phase I. While the funds available after October 2006 approvals are about \$65 million to fund Phase II approvals, Ms. LeBlanc reminded the Technical Committee that 14 projects are requesting approximately \$239 million for Phase II approval in December 2006/January 2007.

10. Agenda Item 9: Decision: Request to Modify the Scope of the East Sabine Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project (CS-32) (Clark/Paul): The FWS, NRCS, and DNR request Technical Committee approval to modify the project scope to: 1) discontinue further design of the large Construction Unit 2 water control structures at Willow, Three, Greens, and Right Prong Black bayous, 2) transfer \$250,000 in surplus construction funding to O&M to repair the Pines Ridge Weir damaged by Hurricane Rita, 3) add additional duck-wing earthen terraces from surplus Construction Unit 1 budget funds, and 4) notify the Technical Committee of the intent to modify the recently constructed 3,000 foot-long foreshore dike to add four 50-foot wide gaps also with surplus construction funding. All requested modifications can be made without increasing the project's approved budget. Mr. Darryl Clark explained the requested modifications to the project scope. The project was originally approved for engineering and design, which included 185,000 linear feet of earthen terraces, four large structures at Willow Bayou, Three Bayou, Greens Bayou and Right Prong Black Bayou, 11 miles of shoreline planting, 3,000 linear feet of foreshore dike at Willow Bayou and Sabine Lake, Pines Ridge Weir, a small rock plug, and the re-connection of Bridge Bayou to the marshes east of the Bridge Bayou by a water control structure. Mr. Clark explained that the planting had subsequently been removed from the project and communicated with the Technical Committee a couple of years ago as not being feasible because three test sections failed. Mr. Clark reported that construction of all the features except the four large structures and the vegetative planting will be complete by the end of this month.

The project benefits include the reduction of marsh conversion to open water by restoring the marsh and shoreline. The benefits can be achieved by reducing shoreline erosion, increasing aquatic vegetation around the terraces, reducing elevated salinities, and maintaining habitat diversity. The fully funded project cost originally was \$19.4 million, but the Phase I, Construction Unit 1 Increment 1 cost was \$4 million, which leaves a remainder of \$15 million for Construction Unit 2. The Construction Unit 2 costs have been reduced to approximately \$12 million.

Mr. Darryl Clark reported that modeling of the large Construction Unit 2 structures indicated that rock weirs with a 10-foot wide, 4-foot deep boat bays, would not reduce salinity. The model also revealed that fixed-crest weirs did not have an effect on salinities, while adjustable structures as seen at Station 6, Gage 6, decreased salinities. However, the adjustable structures would have negative effects in terms of increased cost and O&M, and reduced fisheries and boater access. Mr. Clark explained that after reviewing the modeling exercise, the NRCS and LDNR decided to abandon further engineering design of Construction Unit 2.

Mr. Darryl Clark pointed out that the change in scope of the project has decreased the benefits to 31% of the original benefits. The project sponsors are requesting the use of surplus construction dollars estimated to be \$1.2 million for additional O&M and construction. The project sponsors request \$250,000 for O&M of the Pine Ridge Weir, \$750,000 for additional terraces, and \$60,000 to cut gaps in the foreshore dike. Mr. Clark reminded the Technical Committee that all requested modifications can be made without increasing the project's approved budget.

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

Mr. Tom Podany expressed concern about the reduction of benefits while the cost would remain the same. Would this project still rank reasonably high especially in terms of cost versus benefits? Mr. Darryl Clark responded that the project sponsors did not perform an updated prioritization scoring. However, the cost for Construction Unit 1 is \$4 million, so as the original project benefits have gone down, so have the costs.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc asked if this project has approval for Construction Units 1 and 2. Mr. Darryl Clark responded that only Construction Unit 1 has been approved for construction. Mr. Britt Paul added that Construction Unit 2 is still being modeled. The reason they did the model was to determine whether they needed to spend the money designing and building the Construction Unit 2 structures to get the benefits. Since the benefits would not be achieved by the Construction Unit 2 structures, they are not going to proceed with their construction. Mr. Clark added that the project is more cost-effective than the original project because costs have gone down, but there are still a number of benefits.

Mr. Rick Hartman expressed concern about the request for additional terraces. He supports the O&M of the Pines Ridge Weir and the addition of gaps at the foreshore dike. He is concerned about setting a precedent for other agencies with additional funds to increase the scope of the project just to use up the available funds. Mr. Hartman advised that surplus funds be returned for future projects. Mr. Darryl Clark compared this request to that of the New Cut Barrier Island Project in which additional funds were requested. Mr. Hartman contended that Mr. Clark's

statement was a dissimilar comparison. Mr. Britt Paul added that requesting additional funds to add terracing is justified because the area benefiting from the terracing is the same area as the project was established to benefit.

Decision: Mr. Darryl Clark made a motion to recommend that the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force approval for the project sponsor to remove Construction Unit 2 from the East Sabine Lake Project, to transfer \$250,000 from surplus construction funding to O&M for the Pines Ridge Weir rehabilitation, and modify the foreshore dike by adding gaps. The motion was seconded by Mr. Britt Paul. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Decision: Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to recommend the Task Force approve the construction of additional duck-wing earthen terraces from surplus Construction Unit 1 budget funds. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. Mr. Rick Hartman voted against the motion, while Mr. Clark, Mr. Paul, Ms. Sharon Parrish, and Mr. Gerry Duszynski voted in favor. The motion was passed by the Technical Committee by a vote of 4 to 1.

11. Agenda Item 10: Discussion: Transitioning Projects from CWPPRA to Other Authorities (Podany): The Technical Committee will discuss the Task Force directive to review transfer options to other Federal agencies or authorities beyond LCA and continued work on the draft transfer process, keying in on shortfalls noted during the Task Force meeting. The Corps will present updates to the draft process for discussion by the Technical Committee. Mr. Bob Bosenberg, LCA Corps, provided a summary of the how to complete a transfer of a project from CWPPRA to the LCA WRDA authority. A summary presentation and a process diagram of how one would go through the formal process of transferring a CWPPRA project to LCA WRDA was provided. Mr. Bosenberg recommended that there be a conference committee formed between the CWPPRA entity and the potential receiving entity. The committee would perform a “gap analysis” to determine how the project matches up during the transfer. As directed by the Task Force, a table that examined other authorities (33 were identified) with potential of receiving CWPPRA projects was also developed. Mr. Bosenberg explained that by reviewing the table, it was apparent that there are every few authorities that are in position financially to accept a project on the scale of a CWPPRA project.

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

Mr. Darryl Clark stated that additional work on the transfer narrative had to be done before the Task Force meeting. He suggested that the flow chart could be presented to the Task Force. However, the draft Project Transfer Plan - Revised Draft Standard Operating Procedures, particularly paragraph 3, needs work. Mr. Clark added that the Technical Committee should not support any transfer proposal that stated that CWPPRA should try to make the project fit the guidelines of the receiving agency. Instead the CWPPRA project management team (PMT) and the receiving agency PMT should meet to determine the current progress of the project being transferred. Mr. Clark also suggested that the transfer process be streamlined before submittal to the Task Force.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski recommended that the items summarized by Mr. Bob Bosenberg go back to the P&E Subcommittee for further work. Mr. Tom Podany suggested that the P&E Subcommittee look at better ways to transfer the project instead of just handing over a box of project documents to the receiving agency. Mr. Troy Constance, Corps, replied that the intent is to deliver a product that the receiving agency can understand so that efforts already completed are not repeated. Mr. Podany agreed with Mr. Constance and suggested that additional information be provided to make the transfer a wise expenditure of Federal dollars on both sides.

Mr. Rick Harman stated that the transfer process presented seemed overly bureaucratic and hoped that the P&E Subcommittee would simplify the process. Mr. Darryl Clark added that, for example, notification to the interested public landowners and elected officials is mentioned three times in the six steps in the draft narrative. Mr. Clark recommended that the Technical Committee work with the P&E Subcommittee to smooth out the process before presenting it to the Task Force.

Mr. Britt Paul asked if the documents need to be presented at the October Task Force meeting. His opinion is that they should not. Mr. Darryl Clark responded that the Task Force could be presented with the flow chart and the spreadsheet showing the 33 authorities Mr. Bob Bosenberg mentioned and could be informed of the status of delegating the task to the P&E Subcommittee.

Mr. Rick Hartman questioned whether the spreadsheet of authorities is even needed. Ms. Julie LeBlanc and Mr. Tom Podany replied that the Colonel and Task Force specifically asked for a comparison of potential receiving programs.

DECISION: The Technical Committee agreed that a report on the status of the effort would be presented to the Task Force in October, to include letting the Task Force know that the task had been delegated to the P&E Subcommittee for further work.

12. Agenda Item 11: Report: PPL 10 Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove Project (BA-33) (Podany): The Corps project management team (PMT) will give a report to the Technical Committee on the potential unanswered questions related to the transfer process raised by the Task Force at the July 12th meeting. Mr. Tim Axtman stated that Corps PMT will continue the process of outlining the transfer of the Delta Building Diversion at Myrtle Grove Project to LCA. The Corps PMT has provided the Technical Committee with a draft letter that will go out to all stakeholders and public officials making them aware of the potential transfer of the project from CWPPRA to the LCA. The draft letter will be sent out by Monday September 18th to allow for a 30-day window before the October 18th Task Force meeting. Mr. Axtman also stated that this is an “elective transfer.” If Congress acts on the WRDA bill this year, the Corps PMT will move to a directed transfer on this project.

Mr. Tom Podany asked Mr. Tim Axtman what the next step would be in LCA once we were completed with the transfer, including the timeline for the LCA to complete the next steps. Mr. Axtman replied that once comments are received, significant concerns will be addressed. The Corps PMT followed a project development formulation process and have had to administratively formalize the funding cost share issues related to the CWPPRA project to close the books. The Project Management Plan has already been developed and is under review by the

State. The project is fairly close to being in the position for transfer. The modeling and subsequent steps will be under the LCA authority.

Mr. Darryl Clark asked if Mr. Tim Axtman saw any problems with the Task Force acting on transfer at the next meeting. Mr. Axtman responded that he does have a problem with the Task Force acting on transfer at this time. To efficiently transfer from CWPPRA to LCA there needs to be a clear understanding of what has already happened. Fortunately, for this project, the Corps and LDNR are working on it, so both agencies know what is going on. But for the two other projects in CWPPRA, Bayou Lafourche and Hope Canal, the Corps PMT does not have a clear picture of what has happened. He is also concerned about finances and how to close the books under CWPPRA to start efforts under the LCA. Mr. Axtman believes that transferring the project to LCA now is premature.

Mr. Darryl Clark responded that there is a period to close out the books after the decision is made to transfer a project. In addition, the issue at hand is Myrtle Grove and not the other two projects. The only reason not to have the Task Force act on the transfer is because LCA has not yet been approved. Mr. Troy Constance did not understand why Mr. Clark said that the Technical Committee is not prepared to present the transfer process to the Task Force, but now wants to transfer a project without clear guidance on how to do it. Mr. Clark responded that there is a current procedure for transfer and clarified that he was concerned by the recommended changes in paragraph three, which needs to be reworded because CWPPRA cannot take on the responsibility of the additional funding for these projects to make them compatible with the receiving agency. Mr. Constance stated that he was in agreement with Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark continued that most of the material in the recommended "Transfer Process Plan" was straight out of the existing CWPPRA SOP, except for paragraph 3.

Mr. Tom Podany believes the issue at hand is timing. Mr. Podany recommended that the PMT tell the Task Force when it would be a good time to transfer the project. The PMT could tell the Task Force that they are preparing for transfer. Mr. Gerry Duszynski believes it is premature to go to the Task Force. Once the current task they are working on is complete, then the project can be transferred.

Mr. Darryl Clark suggested that the PMT should be prepared to tell the Task Force that they are not asking for the transfer at the October meeting, that the two agencies are working together for the transfer, and that the project will be ready for transfer once the modeling has been completed.

Mr. Tim Axtman suggested that the letter also make the recipients aware that the close-out date for comments is the same date as the Task Force meeting and there would be an opportunity for the public to make comment at the Task Force meeting.

13. Agenda Item 12: Discussion: Draft CWPPRA Strategic Vision Document (Podany): *The Technical Committee will review and discuss the CWPPRA Strategic Vision document. The discussion will also include a review of "lessons learned", demonstration projects, and program requirements for completion reports and demonstration project reports. The Parishes Against Coastal Erosion (PACE) and the public will also have an opportunity to comment on the document.* Ms. Julie LeBlanc stated that the Task Force-approved outline of the schedule for

completing the Strategic Vision document which will be a part of the 2006 Report to Congress. The draft document was sent to individual parishes, the PACE group, and program managers for CIAP, LACPR, the State Master Plan, and LCA for review and comment. Ms. LeBlanc stated that no comments have been submitted to-date, but public comment can be made at today's Technical Committee meeting. The completion and approval of the draft document is set for the October 18th Task Force meeting. Ms. LeBlanc announced that comments can be sent to herself or to Mr. Quin Kinler. The revised due date for comments is September 25.

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

Dr. John Lopez believes that CWPPRA has always been very public and transparent. Asking for the public's comments is consistent with CWPPRA's characteristics and Dr. Lopez thinks it affords that opportunity the public continue to participate in the future of O&M.

Ms. Marnie Winter asked when the draft document was sent because she does not remember hearing anything from PACE. Ms. Julie LeBlanc stated that the document should have been sent to Ms. Winter on August 28th for forwarding to the PACE group. Ms. Winter replied that she did not remember seeing the document and asked if Ms. LeBlanc would resend it to her. Ms. LeBlanc added that Parish CZM contacts were sent the draft document via email.

14. Agenda Item 13: Discussion: PPL 5 Mississippi River Reintroduction into Bayou Lafourche Project - BA-25b (Podany): *The Technical Committee will review and discuss the status of the Bayou Lafourche project in light of the State's decision to fund 100% of the remaining engineering and design, and the request for EPA to continue the project under CWPPRA funding to complete the draft EIS.* Ms. Sharon Parrish stated that the State has decided to fund 100 percent of the remaining engineering and design. The EPA's plan is to proceed with the final EIS. There are sufficient funds available in the existing CWPPRA budget. She added that the Corps is a cooperating agency on the EIS with whom the EPA will work closely. Most, if not all, of the agency's 30% design review comments will be addressed and there will be internal discussions about the modeling effort as well.

Mr. Darryl Clark expressed concern about assumptions used in the model, especially the assumption that most of the sediment and nutrients coming down the bayou will get on the marsh somewhere and benefit the marsh. The modeling assumptions will need to be reviewed.

Mr. Britt Paul asked about the timeline. Mr. Gerry Duszynski replied that they are actively negotiating the final design phase of the scoping and waiting to hear from the contractor with a proposed budget. Mr. Duszynski suggested that they are willing to set up a monitoring assumption workshop for CWPPRA members. Mr. Duszynski announced that they are getting ready to sign a contract to continue with the final design.

Mr. Britt Paul asked if the EIS will proceed during the final design. Mr. Brad Crawford answered affirmatively.

Mr. Tom Podany stated that the Task Force asked for three things to be addressed: 1) identification of \$2.5 million in Federal dollars within the existing projects, 2) addressing the

legality of proceeding with plans and specs under one program, only to turn over the project at the end of the planning phase to another program to perform a feasibility study, and 3) conducting an independent technical review and answering the agencies' questions from the 30% design review. Mr. Podany suggested that those items have been taken over by events/decisions of the State. The only new item to discuss is the final accounting of funds billable to CWPPRA. Mr. Podany requested that Ms. Sharon Parrish coordinate with Ms. Gay Browning to determine a process schedule for final accounting.

Ms. Gay Browning asked if work is continuing on either the LDNR or EPA side under the CWPPRA program or were all expenditures stopped. Mr. Gerry Duszynski responded that he has already given the word to stop work from the State's perspective. Once the final invoice from the consultant has been received then he will work with the EPA to close everything. Ms. Sharon Parrish stated that EPA is spending CWPPRA dollars and added that the EPA has a contract to work on the EIS, which is funded by CWPPRA dollars.

Mr. Tom Podany reminded everyone that the Task Force approved the EPA to complete the 30 percent design, but the Task Force had to review and approve any work beyond 30 percent.

Although this agenda item is a "discussion" item, Mr. Darryl Clark believes the Technical Committee would have to make a recommendation to the Task Force for continuation beyond 30 percent to the extent that the EPA finishes the EIS with CWPPRA funds.

Before a motion was called, Mr. Gerry Duszynski requested clarification on what is considered to be 30 percent. Mr. Darryl Clark responded that NEPA is not typically completed by 30 percent. The SOP states that the draft environmental assessment should be out 30 days prior to the Technical Committee meeting during which Phase II approval is requested, so NEPA is not normally completed at 30 percent.

Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that there be a provisional closeout of the books for everything that is not contracted out to the NEPA documents. Then the NEPA document can be completed with a separate budget. He believes the easiest resolution is to scrub the books, identify additional funds, and authorize that amount.

Mr. Tom Podany asked Ms. Sharon Parrish how much money is available. He then asked Ms. Gay Browning to state the available CWPPRA funds. Ms. Browning responded that the project has \$4.8 million, which is 50 percent obligated on the Federal side and \$2.4 million has been expended of that \$4.8 million.

Mr. Rick Hartman recommended that the EPA suspend any future funding of anything that is not directly NEPA related. He suggested that the EPA report their expenditures to date and the expected expenditures to complete the EIS. The EPA can then return the amount plus the contingency they need to complete the EIS, so that they have a pot of funds to complete it. Mr. Clark indicated that the Technical Committee would have liked to have had the numbers in time for the meeting today. The committee could approve the request, contingent upon receiving a budget from EPA.

DECISION: Mr. Rick Hartman made the motion to recommend to the Task Force, contingent upon receiving the budget in time for the Oct 18th Task Force meeting, that the EPA be authorized and funded to proceed with the EIS on the Bayou Lafourche Project including a closeout of other funds expended on the project. Mr. Darryl Clark seconded. All the Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

15. Agenda Item 14: Additional Agenda Items: (Podany). Ms. Julie LeBlanc indicated that there was a discussion via email about having the agency's revised construction estimates reviewed and approved by the Engineering Workgroup prior to fully funding the estimates to account for cost increases post-Katrina. Ms. LeBlanc suggested that the Technical Committee have a discussion because the Technical Committee may want to direct the Engineering Workgroup to review those estimates for consistency.

Mr. Darryl Clark stated that he thought the Engineering Workgroup automatically performed that task because there is a line item in the Planning Budget for Environmental Workgroups to review the fully funding cost.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski asked if that includes the projects that are pending funding. His concern is that after a storm, costs can increase up to 50 percent and the agency may not be able to build the project with an estimate from last year.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc stated that agencies are required to update their estimates but there is no required check and she suggested that the Engineering Workgroup should review the estimates to ensure consistency.

DECISION: The Technical Committee approved Engineering Workgroup review and approval of agency's Phase II cost estimates prior to fully funding. Mr. Rick Hartman suggested that the P&E Subcommittee modify the SOP to require this every year.

16. Agenda Item 15: Announcement: Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (LeBlanc): Mr. Tom Podany announced that the next Task Force meeting will be held on October 18, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. in New Orleans, Louisiana.

17. Agenda Item 16: Announcement: Dates and Locations of Upcoming CWPPRA Meetings (LeBlanc). Dates and locations of future program meeting can be found on the agenda.

18. Adjourn. Mr. Tom Podany adjourned the meeting at 1:45 pm.