

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 14 March 2007 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Troy Constance opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS)

Mr. Troy Constance, Corps of Engineers (Corps)

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

Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

Mr. Tim Landers, substituting for Ms. Sharon Parrish, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

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

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

2. Agenda Item 1: Decision: Selection of 10 Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for Project Priority List (PPL) 17 (Constance). *The committee will consider preliminary costs & benefits, and select 10 projects and up to three demonstration projects as Phase 0 candidates for further analysis for PPL 17. The Technical Committee will also assign a lead agency to each project for further evaluation.* Mr. Constance announced that ten candidate projects and up to three demonstration projects would be selected for evaluation in PPL 17. Mr. Kevin Roy, FWS, presented the 20 project nominees and four demonstration project nominees for PPL 17.

A. Region 1 – Pontchartrain Basin

i. Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. Project features include 135 acres of marsh creation and approximately 27,000 linear feet (lf) of rock shoreline protection along Lake Pontchartrain. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of 13 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$25 to 30 million.

ii. Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. Project features include 78 acres of marsh creation and approximately 21,000 lf of rock shoreline protection. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of 9 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 150 to 200 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$20 to 25 million.

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

i. Red Pass Crevasses Project. Project features include enlarging existing small crevasses, or constructing new ones, to move freshwater and sediment from Red Pass to enhance delta growth in this area. The project will benefit an estimated 50 to 100 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is less than \$5 million.

ii. Pass a Loutre Restoration Project. The main project feature is the dredging of approximately 6 million cubic yards of material for marsh creation. The project would initially create 465 acres of marsh. The project will benefit an estimated 950 to 1,000 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$30 to 35 million.

iii. Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction Project. The main project feature is a 5,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) uncontrolled diversion to reintroduce Mississippi River water into surrounding wetlands. The project will benefit an estimated 400 to 450 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$5 to 10 million.

iv. Caernarvon Outfall Management/Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project. Project features include restoring the southern and western shorelines of Lake Lery, dredging a channel from the Caernarvon Outfall to deliver water to the east, and clearing debris from a distributary channel. 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.

v. West Point a la Hache Marsh Creation Project. Project features include dredging and pumping material from the Mississippi River to create 475 acres of marsh in the project area. 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.

vi. Bayou Dupont Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration Project. Project features include creating approximately 134 acres and nourishing 34 acres of brackish marsh. Marsh creation and nourishment will be achieved by dedicated dredging of sediment from the Mississippi River and bucket dredging material from the bayou to restore 12 acres on the ridge. 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.

vii. Bayou Thunder Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. Project features include extending breakwaters approximately 1,500 feet to provide shoreline protection, creating 100 acres of marsh, nourishing an additional 195 acres of marsh, and protecting the Highway 1 infrastructure. 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.

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

i. Falgout Canal Terracing and Freshwater Enhancement Project. Project features include installation of three sets of culverts under Falgout Canal and construction of 100,000 lf of earthen terraces in a bifurcated design. 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.

ii. Beach and Back Barrier Marsh Restoration – East Island. Project features include creation of a marsh platform and unconfined placement of beach fill. Initially, 200 acres of back barrier marsh would be created through unconfined placement. The project will benefit an estimated 50 to 100 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$20 to 25 million.

iii. Southeast Lake Boudreaux Marsh Creation and Terracing Project. Project features include 250 acres of marsh creation, construction of approximately 30,000 lf of terraces, and buffer protection to the Bayou Petite Caillou Ridge and Highway 56. The project will benefit an estimated 200 to 250 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$15 to 20 million.

iv. East Atchafalaya Bay Sediment Trapping Project. Project features include construction of approximately 120,000 lf of earthen terraces to capture sediment and promote delta growth. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of approximately 11 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 100 to 150 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$5 to 10 million.

v. Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project. The main project feature is the construction of approximately 20,000 lf of foreshore rock dike or rock revetment along the shoreline. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of approximately 13 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 150 to 200 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$20 to 25 million.

vi. Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. Project features include construction of approximately 7,800 lf of rock shoreline protection, marsh creation, and plug installation. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of approximately 56 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$15 to 20 million.

vii. Marone Point Shoreline Protection Project. The main project feature is the construction of approximately 26,000 lf of shoreline protection. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of approximately 15 to 20 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 200 to 250 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 Ship Channel Sediment By-Pass Project. Project features include mining approximately 2 million cubic yards of sediment from the eastern side of the channel and pumping it to the western side. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate up to 15 feet per year. The project will benefit an estimated 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$15 to 20 million.

ii. East Cove Marsh Creation Project. Project features include pumping approximately 3.8 million cubic yards of material from the lower Calcasieu River to open water areas of the Cameron Prairie National Wildlife Refuge to create approximately 592 acres of marsh. The project will benefit an estimated 550 to 600 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$15 to 20 million.

iii. Rockefeller Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization Project, Joseph's Harbor East. The main project feature is the installation of approximately 10,000 lf of segmented breakwaters. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of approximately 35 feet per year.

The project will benefit an estimated 150 to 200 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded cost estimate is \$20 to 25 million.

iv. Southeast White Lake Shoreline and Marsh Creation Project. Project features include installation of approximately 26,000 lf of rock shoreline protection to create approximately 75 acres of marsh. This project addresses an average shoreline erosion rate of approximately 5 feet per year. 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.

Mr. Roy also presented the four demonstration projects nominated for PPL 17.

A. Bioengineered Oyster Reef Project Demonstration. Demonstration features include evaluating the effectiveness of a lightweight shoreline protection structure for use in areas where soils have poor load-bearing capacity. The structures would also provide a surface for oysters to attach and serve as a living oyster reef. The estimated cost plus 25 percent contingency is \$1.1 million.

B. Sediment Containment for Marsh Creation Demonstration. Demonstration features include evaluating the effectiveness of a fabric-type structure as a containment system for dredge material and sediment. The estimated cost plus 25 percent contingency is \$590,000.

C. Beach Angel Project – Zigzag/Sand Trap Jetty Project Demonstration. Demonstration features include testing the effectiveness of natural fiber sand bags, placed in a zigzag pattern, to capture sediment over time. The estimated cost plus 25 percent contingency is \$1.6 million.

D. Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Project Demonstration. Demonstration features include testing the effectiveness of a positive displacement pump to deliver sediment slurry over long distances. The estimated cost plus 25 percent contingency is \$1.2 million.

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

Mr. Hartman commented that although a public notice has been issued for the Falgout Canal as a spoil disposal site for material dredged from the Houma Navigation Canal, this does not necessarily mean that it will be used as such. Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Al Levron, Terrebonne Parish, about the alignment of the Morganza Project in relation to the Falgout Canal Project.

Mr. Levron replied that the Morganza alignment would be south of Falgout Canal. The Morganza Project calls for similar culverts under Falgout Canal Road. The spoil disposal area will be closer to the channels, while the proposed terraces will be further away. Mr. Levron added that Terrebonne Parish has applied for Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) funds to deal with the Falgout Canal Marsh Management Area north of Falgout Canal. The CIAP project should not be confused with the proposed CWPPRA project south of Falgout Canal.

Mr. Hartman wanted to make sure that a levee would not be constructed on top of a CWPPRA project sometime in the future.

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

Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, gave his organization's support for the Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project.

Mr. George Winningham, resident of Lake Catherine, said that the erosion rate is more than the reported 9 feet per year. Something must be done with the shoreline and landbridge that is protecting Orleans, Jefferson, St. Charles, and St. Tammany Parishes or the communities are going to be in trouble. He appreciates any help that can be provided.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, City of New Orleans, supports the Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project because the project protects New Orleans, St. Tammany Parish, and the wildlife refuge.

Ms. Barbara McArthur, representing herself and the Chef Menteur Land Company, supports the Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. This project protects the parishes around Lake Pontchartrain from erosion.

Mr. Lee Richardson, Executive Director of the Lake Catherine Civic Association, said that all of the projects presented are worthwhile, urgent, and essential to the overall problem along the Louisiana coast. Mr. Richardson believes that the Orleans Landbridge and its surrounding wetlands are ground zero for the convergence of people, wetlands, coastal restoration, and hurricane protection. He emphasized the urgency of using these wetlands, shorelines, and natural barriers to protect the 850,000 people around the coast of Lake Pontchartrain and the billions of dollars invested in infrastructure to restore the area. Protecting New Orleans and surrounding communities by using the natural barriers and objectives of the CWPPRA Act makes sense to Americans. His organization supports the selection of both the Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project and the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project for the final list for funding. Mr. Richardson agreed with an earlier comment that the 9 feet per year erosion rate was an understatement. Since the 1800's the retreat along the eastern side of the landbridge has been about 1,000 feet, while retreat along the western side was 700 feet. Last year, the national treasure of the Rigolets lighthouse was lost due to erosion. He believes the reported amount of wetlands protected by the Irish Bayou Project understates the real benefit of protecting 2,000 acres of marshlands from further deterioration. People and estuaries depend on CWPPRA to help sustain those vital shorelines and wetlands.

Mr. Billy Marchal, Flood Protection Alliance, echoed points made by Mr. Richardson. The cost and number of acres benefited pale in comparison to the billions of dollars of infrastructure and the hundreds of thousands of lives that depend on the Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project and the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. He asked the Technical Committee to put these two projects on the top of the list.

Ms. Amy Enchelmeyer, speaking on behalf of Councilman Arnie Fieklow, supports the Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project.

Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. This project is part of the Pontchartrain Coastal Management Program.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, City of New Orleans, supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project because the project protects New Orleans, St. Tammany Parish, and the wildlife refuge.

Mr. Jeb Bruneau supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. This project is important to residents of Lake Terrace, Lake Oaks, Lake Vista, Lakeshore, and the Lakeview area.

Ms. Barbara McArthur, representing herself and the Chef Menteur Land Company, supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project. If the landbridge disappears, the height of the current levees will not be sufficient.

Mr. Lee Richardson, Executive Director of the Lake Catherine Civic Association, supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project.

Mr. Billy Marchal, Flood Protection Alliance, supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project.

Ms. Amy Enchelmeyer, speaking on behalf of Councilman Arnie Fieklow, supports the Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project.

Red Pass Crevasses Project

Mr. Sean Duffy, representing the Gulf States Maritime Association, said that his organization represents a number of vessels on the Mississippi and Calcasieu Rivers. He is not familiar with the Red Pass Crevasses Project and asked about the river mile of the project location. Mr. Landers replied that the project would be in the Head of Passes area. Mr. Duffy added that he is concerned about the negative impact of diversions on the deep draft channel. There should be proper modeling and hydrology study. It is important that his organization be aware of all diversion and crevasse proposals to assess the impact. A fully funded cost of \$5 million does not appear to include any potential dredging that may occur as a result of the diversion itself.

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish Coastal Zone Manger (CZM), clarified that the Red Pass Project is not directly attached to the river. The crevasses will be cut off of Red Pass on the west side of the river towards the Gulf. He does not believe there will be any direct effects as far as drawing more water from the river. There has been a tremendous amount of coordination between the Plaquemines Parish, the Coastal Zone Advisory Committee, and several state and Federal agencies to develop proposals. Several of the projects are inexpensive and appeal to efficiency, such as the Red Pass Project.

Pass a Loutre Restoration Project

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish CZM, said that the Pass a Loutre area is in dire need of dredging and freshwater. Studies have shown that crevasses at the end of Pass a Loutre are not doing as well as the new crevasses cut at the head of the pass. Utilizing 6 million cubic yards of sediment along with the benefit of freshwater toward the end of the passes makes a strong case for constructing this project.

Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction Project

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish CZM, said that the Bohemia Project is an easy project to construct and is relatively inexpensive. This project will address an area of need between several existing river diversions.

Caernarvon Outfall Management/Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish CZM, said that the rim of Lake Lery is in dire need of help. Anything that can be done to reconstruct and fortify the existing lake rim will help prevent Lake Lery from doubling in size.

Dr. John Lopez, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation, said that Caernarvon is an area that was most heavily damaged in the Pontchartrain Basin with about 40 square miles of loss. The diversion appears to be creating a positive response to the wetlands, but there are many areas that are not benefiting. Some areas probably need to be recreated mechanically through marsh creation. This project addresses some of the important needs in the area. Dr. Lopez supports this project.

Mr. Christopher Areas supports the Caernarvon Outfall Project. He feels that more freshwater would allow more openings to help keep the salinity further offshore.

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing the Biloxi Marshlands Corporation and Lake Eugenie Land Development Company, is in favor of the Caernarvon Outfall Management/Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project.

Mr. Junior Rodriguez, St. Bernard Parish President, supports the Caernarvon Outfall Management/Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project. St. Bernard Parish has some money dedicated from CIAP, so the project needs to be assessed to ensure efforts are not duplicated. There seem to be two opportunities with revenue sources.

Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Rodriguez if he was using the CIAP money to address the east side of the lake rim. Mr. Rodriguez confirmed that the CIAP money was for the east side, though both sides need work. Mr. Hartman pointed out that St. Bernard Parish was already investing parish dollars to this high priority project.

Mr. Chris Areas said that dredging is needed in this area as clogged canals are a problem.

West Point a la Hache Marsh Creation Project

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish CZM, said that the West Point a la Hache Project is a good example of synergy among other existing projects. The Parish and State recently developed an operations agreement for the existing siphon. The Parish will also try to utilize other available monies to modify the siphon for more efficient and longer operation.

Bayou Dupont Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration Project

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish CZM, said that the Bayou Dupont Project is strongly supported by Plaquemines and Jefferson Parish. He added that Jefferson Parish has been instrumental in helping to design and move the project forward.

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, supports the Bayou Dupont Project. It is an important project to restore the area's natural hydrology and historic ridges with river sediments. Once restored, the ridge will hold sediments from the Naomi and Myrtle Grove Diversions. She feels that the project is sustainable and will build more land than the numbers reflect. This area is experiencing some of the highest land loss rates. Bayou Dupont is now so open, you can't even tell you are in a bayou. This project, with the sustainable building of land, would protect the West Bank of Jefferson, Algiers, Plaquemines, and Belle Chasse.

Mr. Vince Melvin, Lafourche Parish CZM, supports the Bayou Dupont Project. The project will provide many benefits to the surrounding area.

Mr. Jason Smith, Board Coordinator of the Jefferson Parish Marine Fisheries Advisory Board, gave his support for the Bayou Dupont Project. This area has experienced an extremely rapid rate of marshland loss. This project has the support of both Plaquemines and Lafourche Parish. He believes that sediments are key for this area and establishing the ridges is very important.

Ms. Vickie Duffour, Bayou Segnette Boater's Association, supports the Bayou Dupont Project. The bayou used to be beautiful with hardwood trees and can be that way again. The ridges are the skeletons that are holding the fragile marshes together. By pumping sediment into the area, the skeletal bones can be sustained.

Mr. Chris Areas supports the Bayou Dupont Project. The higher ridges will provide the hurricane protection needed to slow waves and help save the channel. Dredging this channel would provide more freshwater into the system.

Mr. Warren Braai, resident from the lower Lafitte area, said that Hurricane Rita brought six feet of water into his house. Anything that the Technical Committee could do would be greatly appreciated.

Bayou Thunder Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project

Mr. Chris Areas supports the Bayou Thunder Project. The sediment from the river would keep the surge down.

Mr. Vince Melvin, Lafourche Parish CZM, said that this project involves breakwaters, marsh building, and marsh protection along with infrastructure protection of LA 1. Without LA 1, there is no passage to Grand Isle and surrounding areas. He would like to see the Bayou Thunder Project move forward.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, supports the Bayou Thunder Project because it helps protect LA Highway 1 which is important to the area's oil and gas industry. The project also protects Chenier Caminada and Elmer's Island.

Falgout Canal Terracing and Freshwater Enhancement Project

Mr. Al Levron, Terrebonne Parish, said that his parish has few opportunities for freshwater introduction. The Falgout Canal has opportunities for some recovery if freshwater can be introduced. There are numerous strategies in this basin, such as beneficial use of dredge material and hurricane protection. He would appreciate the Technical Committee's consideration of the Falgout Canal Project. There is little opportunity for anyone in Terrebonne Parish to touch and feel coastal restoration. The Falgout Canal and Lake Boudreaux Projects are both near parish roadways where there would be higher visibility and awareness to parish residents.

Beach and Back Barrier Marsh Restoration - East Island Project

Mr. Peter Rhodes, Terrebonne Parish Councilman, requested the Technical Committee's support for the Beach and Back Barrier Marsh Restoration on East Island Project because these islands are vital to Terrebonne Parish and its economy.

Southeast Lake Boudreaux Marsh Creation and Terracing Project

Mr. Al Levron, Terrebonne Parish, said that the Lake Boudreaux Project is another component of an ongoing strategy in the basin. He would appreciate the Technical Committee's assistance.

East Atchafalaya Bay Sediment Trapping Project

There were no comments on the East Atchafalaya Bay Sediment Trapping Project.

Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project

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

Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing Avery Island Incorporated and the McIlhenny Company, is in full support of the Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. This area has 56 feet of shoreline erosion per year. After Hurricane Rita passed through, the erosion was 100 feet. This area is hard to plant, which makes it difficult to achieve shoreline protection. Rocks and marsh creation will help protect this area.

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee Chairman, said that the parish supports the Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project.

Marone Point Shoreline Protection Project

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

Calcasieu Ship Channels Sediment By-Pass Project

There were no comments on the Calcasieu Ship Channels Sediment By-Pass Project.

East Cove Marsh Creation Project

There were no comments on the East Cove Marsh Creation Project.

Rockefeller Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization Project, Joseph's Harbor East

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing the M.O. Miller Estates, is in favor of the Rockefeller Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization Project.

Southeast White Lake Shoreline and Marsh Creation Project

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing the M.O. Miller Estates, supports the Southeast White Lake Shoreline and Marsh Creation Project.

Ms. Nita Hemeter said that she loves living in New Orleans and doesn't want to live any place else. She would appreciate anything the Technical Committee can do to help save the wetlands so she can continue to live in New Orleans.

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee, said that the White Lake Project is Vermilion Parish's project this year. The Corps recently completed another project on White Lake and it appears to be very successful. The two major landowners are in support of this project. He added that the Technical Committee is doing a great job and has some tough decisions to make.

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

Bioengineered Oyster Reef Project Demonstration

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish, supports the Bioengineered Oyster Reef Demonstration Project. He said there isn't a coastal restoration project in front of Marsh Island because of the oyster reefs. Installing a structure on which oysters could attach would strengthen the coastline, while creating an oyster habitat.

Sediment Containment for Marsh Creation Demonstration

Mr. Vince Melvin, Lafourche Parish CZM, said that the Sediment Containment Demonstration Project embodies the spirit of the demonstration project system. Lafourche Parish wholeheartedly stands behind this project and would like to see this it move forward this year.

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Parish, endorses the Sediment Containment Demonstration Project. This could be used in both shallow and deep waters and looks like a good solution to a lot of the coast-wide problems.

Beach Angel Project - Zigzag/Sand Trap Jetty Project Demonstration

There were no comments on the Beach Angel Project - Zigzag/Sand Trap Jetty Project.

Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Project Demonstration

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, supports the Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Demonstration Project. One of the key components of restoring the coast is to move river sediment further out to rebuild the land. This pump has the potential to achieve those goals.

Mr. Andrew MacInnes, Plaquemines Parish CZM, supports the Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Demonstration Project. Anything that can be done to put more sediment into systems that are cut off from the Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers is a good idea. This mobile system can be quickly and easily deployed and doesn't result in a massive dredging operation.

Ms. Vickie Duffour, Bayou Segnette Boater's Association, gave her support for the Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Demonstration Project because of the need for sediment. Demonstration projects are preferable because they move dirt and build a project. She believes the Pump Displacement and Sediment Containment Demos can be linked and demonstrated together.

Ms. LeBlanc said that the Technical Committee will reduce the list of 20 nominees to 10 candidate projects and select up to three demonstration projects that will continue through the PPL 17 process and go through an additional evaluation including field trips, engineering analysis, and environmental analysis to look at the benefits and costs in more detail. The Technical Committee will meet again in September 2007 to recommend up to four projects and one or two demonstration projects for Phase I engineering and design. The recommendation will be made to the Task Force in October 2007 for their final decision.

Ms. LeBlanc described the voting process. For the project nominees, each agency will cast 10 weighted votes, with a weighted score of 10 assigned to the agency's highest project. Each agency will cast 3 weighted votes for the demonstration projects, with a weighted score of 3 given to the agency's highest priority. The projects will be ranked first by the number of agency votes received and then by the weighted score. The decision will be reported to the Task Force at their next meeting.

Voting Results

Ms. LeBlanc presented the results from the agency voting. The weighted score is noted in parentheses.

PPL 17 Projects:

1. West Point a la Hache Marsh Creation Project – 6 agency votes (40)
2. Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project – 6 agency votes (29)
3. East Cove Marsh Creation Project – 5 agency votes (29)
4. Bayou Dupont Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration Project – 5 agency votes (22)
5. Southeast Lake Boudreaux Marsh Creation and Terracing Project – 5 agency votes (18)
6. Caernarvon Outfall Management/ Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project – 4 agency votes (35)
7. Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction Project – 4 agency votes (30)
8. Beach and Back Barrier Marsh Restoration - East Island Project – 4 agency votes (30)
9. Pass a Loutre Restoration Project – 3 agency votes (16)
10. Bayou Thunder Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project – 3 agency votes (15)

CWPPRA PPL 17 Projects – Technical Committee Final Vote

Region	Basin	Type	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	State	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
2	BA	MC	West Point a la Hache Marsh Creation Project	6	8	3	8	5	10	6	40
1	PO	MC/S P	Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project	7	1	8	4	4	5	6	29
4	CS	MC	East Cove Marsh Creation Project	10	7	7		1	4	5	29
2	BA	MC	Bayou Dupont Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration Project		6	1	6	2	7	5	22
3	TE	MC/T R	Southeast Lake Boudreaux Marsh Creation and Terracing Project	3	2	6	5		2	5	18
2	BS	MC/S P/HR	Caernarvon Outfall Management/ Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project	8		10	9	8		4	35
2	BS	FD	Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction Project		10	2	10		8	4	30
3	TE	MC	Beach and Back Barrier Marsh Restoration - East Island Project	2	9		3		9	4	23
2	MR	MC	Pass a Loutre Restoration Project	9	3	4				3	16
2	BA	MC/S P	Bayou Thunder Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project	5			7		3	3	15
4	ME	SP	Southeast White Lake Shoreline Protection	1				7	1	3	9
3	TE	TR	Falgout Canal Terracing and Freshwater Enhancement Project		4			10		2	14
3	TV	SP	Marone Point Shoreline Protection Project			5		6		2	11
4	ME	SP	Rockefeller Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization Project, Joseph's Harbor East Project			9	2			2	11
1	PO	MC/S P	Orleans Landbridge Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project	4					6	2	10
3	TV	MC/S P	Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project				1	9		2	10
2	MR	FD	Red Pass Crevasses Project		5					1	5
3	AT	TR	East Atchafalaya Bay Sediment Trapping Project					3		1	3
3	AT	SP	Point Chevreuil Shoreline Protection Project							0	0
4	CS	MC	Calcasieu Ship Channel Sediment By-Pass Project							0	0

PPL 17 Demonstration Projects:

1. Bioengineered Oyster Reef Project Demo– 6 agency votes (14)
2. Sediment Containment for Marsh Creation Demo– 6 agency votes (14)
3. Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Project Demo– 6 agency votes (8)

CWPPRA PPL 17 Demonstration Projects – Technical Committee Final Vote

Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	State	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
Bioengineered Oyster Reef Project Demo	2	3	3	3	2	1	6	14
Sediment Containment System for Marsh Creation Demo	3	2	2	2	3	2	6	14
Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Project Demo	1	1	1	1	1	3	6	8
Beach Angel Project - Zigzag/Sand Trap Jetty Project Demo							0	0

Mr. Hartman asked the Technical Committee if there was any interest in limiting the demonstration projects to the first two since these projects are ahead of the third in votes. Mr. Clark said that two would be fine; this would reduce the amount of work by the workgroups. Mr. Duszynski felt that all three demonstration projects should be reviewed and Mr. Landers agreed.

Mr. Paul added that it shouldn't take much more time to review the third demonstration project. Some information may be found during the review that may make the Technical Committee change its mind. Mr. Clark agreed that reviewing three demonstration projects was fine.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to accept the top ten PPL 17 candidate projects [West Point a la Hache Marsh Creation Project, Irish Bayou Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project, East Cove Marsh Creation Project, Bayou Dupont Marsh Creation and Ridge Restoration Project, Southeast Lake Boudreaux Marsh Creation and Terracing Project, Caernarvon Outfall Management/ Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project, Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction Project, Beach and Back Barrier Marsh Restoration - East Island Project, Pass a Loutre Restoration Project, and Bayou Thunder Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection Project]. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to accept the top three PPL 17 demonstration projects [Bioengineered Oyster Reef Project Demo, Sediment Containment for Marsh Creation Project Demo, and Positive Displacement Pump Solution Restoration Project Demo]. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Agenda Item 2: Decision: Prioritization Criteria (Roy and Petitbon). The Engineering and Environmental Workgroup Chairmen will present proposed changes to the CWPPRA prioritization criteria, for consideration by the Technical Committee. Mr. Roy discussed the changes to the prioritization criteria.

Criterion 1 – Cost-effectiveness: The ranges for scoring categories in terms of cost per net acre were adjusted to account for the cost of restoration since the criteria were developed and to obtain a more even distribution in the scoring categories.

Criterion 2 – Address Area of Need, High Loss Area: Initially the scoring tables were organized by basin. Higher scores were assigned to basins with higher loss. This was revised to eliminate the basin bias that was built into the scoring criterion. There is now one scoring table applied coast-wide, regardless of where the project is located.

Criterion 8 – Landscape Features: In the past, a project had to be critical to maintaining the integrity of a mapping unit for it to score any points and also had to protect or create a landscape feature. Because the scope of most CWPPRA projects is small, there were few projects believed to be critical to maintaining the integrity an entire mapping unit. Therefore the reference to maintaining the integrity of a mapping unit was removed.

Mr. Constance asked if this decision has to be ratified by the Task Force. Mr. Paul replied that changes to the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) can be approved by the Technical Committee. A subset of the Technical Committee developed the prioritization and the Technical Committee finalized it. The decision did not go to the Task Force.

Mr. Constance also asked if this is retroactively applied to projects that have already been scored. Mr. Roy replied that any repeat projects that are up for Phase II approval would have to be rescored. You would not be able to compare previously scored prioritizations to new ones.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to approve the proposed changes to the prioritization criteria as recommended by the Engineering and Environmental Workgroup. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Dr. John Lopez commented that the prioritization does not specifically consider a flood protection element. Mr. Hartman replied that it weighs in when deciding how to vote. An acre of marsh that protects a levee or road is more important than an acre of marsh out in a wide basin. Location is critical in deciding how to vote on projects. Dr. Lopez added that some degree of institutionalizing may be needed to make sure that everyone understands that it is part of the process and that agencies do consider flood protection elements.

Mr. Constance noted that the intent of this Act is wetlands restoration, but considering the flood protection element is intrinsic in the formal decision process.

4. Agenda Item 3: Decision: Proposed Changes to the CWPPRA SOP (LeBlanc). Ms. LeBlanc will present proposed changes to the CWPPRA SOP as recommended by the CWPPRA Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Committee for approval of the Technical Committee. Prior to the request for a decision to approve the proposed changes, the P&E Subcommittee will also discuss the Technical Committee's 13 September 2006 clarification regarding the Engineering Workgroup's review and approval of Phase II cost estimates. In addition, the P&E Subcommittee will request a discussion on the appendix entitled "Transitioning Projects to other Authorities," as approved by the Task Force on 15 February 2007 and how it meshes with requirements under Section 6.p.

of the SOP. Ms. LeBlanc announced that the P&E Subcommittee has made changes to the SOP that were previously approved by the Task Force or Technical Committee. Appendix J outlines all changes made to the SOP for historical record. Changes to the SOP are listed below:

- Changes were made to the PPL 17 dates in Appendix A.
- Appendix E was revised to incorporate the Task Force’s decision to fund one credible demonstration project annually.
- Appendix C was revised to clarify that the Engineering Workgroup must review and approve Phase II estimates prior to fully funding costs.
- The CIAP-CWPPRA partnership was added to Appendix G.
- Appendix I “Transitioning Projects to Other Authorities” was added.

The P&E Subcommittee would like to discuss two issues with the Technical Committee: 1. Clarification of the role of the Engineering Workgroup in reviewing and approving Phase II cost estimates, and 2. Issues related to the new Appendix I – Transitioning Projects to Other Authorities.

Ms. LeBlanc said that Appendix I does not mesh with section 6.p. of the SOP. There may be duplicate efforts. For example, it is stated that the Federal and local sponsors as well as the Technical Committee will send letters to stakeholders.

Mr. Clark said that the text should reflect what the group would like to do and the text and appendices should mesh together. The Technical Committee needs to decide what to do about sending letters to stakeholders.

Mr. John Jurgensen, NRCS, said that the Engineering Workgroup felt that it was an unnecessary step in the review process to re-evaluate priorities that have already been through a 95 percent review phase.

Ms. LeBlanc said that this change was made in the SOP based on a 13 September 2006 Technical Committee decision to clarify that the Engineering Workgroup must review and approve Phase II estimates prior to fully funding the project.

Mr. Hartman said that this was added to the SOP because there could be a year or two lag in the 95 percent design and the cost of doing business could increase in that time. The Technical Committee wanted to make sure there was a recent evaluation of cost estimates and the Engineering Workgroup would be the appropriate group to do this.

Mr. Paul said that it should be part of the SOP that the state and lead Federal agency must update costs estimates before requesting Phase II approval.

Ms. LeBlanc added that whenever a project has come before the Task Force for a cost increase, the Technical Committee has been able to say that the Engineering Workgroup reviewed the project. If that is no longer a requirement, then the Technical Committee may not be able to make that statement to the Task Force.

Mr. Jurgensen said that the Engineering Workgroup feels that it is the responsibility of the Federal and state agencies to update the costs and make the determination themselves. He felt it was an unnecessary step for the Engineering Workgroup to review someone else's design. If the agencies believe there should be another review, the agency could then choose to send it the Engineering Workgroup.

Mr. Constance said that it seem like the Engineering Workgroup is duplicating work. He suggested insisting on some certification before it goes to the workgroup. Mr. Clark agreed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the proposed changes to the SOP including changes to the prioritization criteria. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

The Technical Committee had a further discussion on the role of the Engineering Workgroup in reviewing and approving Phase II cost estimates.

Mr. Constance said that review comes in many forms and sometimes it is just a matter of certification that can verify the latest cost. It may place a burden upon the agencies to certify that they have looked at impacts and made the necessary changes.

Mr. Hartman said that the real issue is that there should be adequate review of the project before it comes up for Phase II funding. LDNR is the common denominator in that they are reviewing and cost-sharing on all projects. If LDNR is unhappy with the costs of one of the Federal partners, then LDNR could always bring it up.

Mr. Paul said that it was part of the workgroup's suggestion to leave that open; if somebody had a problem with a unit price, it could be brought to the Engineering Workgroup for them to ratify. One of the checklist items for Phase II is a current cost estimate.

Mr. Constance said that it is just a block on a checklist for which someone has to be responsible.

Mr. Landers said that it comes down to the question of: Given limited resources, is it an efficient use of the Engineering Workgroup and whether or not it is a value added to the process?

Mr. Clark said that he would like to have the option remain for agencies to remand cost increases and Phase II costs to the Engineering Workgroup.

Ms. LeBlanc asked if the Engineering Workgroup changed any of the cost estimates for the 12 projects review last year. Mr. Jurgensen replied: Yes. He added that he felt like the Engineering Workgroup was introducing another potential impediment that could slow or delay the process. If one of the agencies feels like the project should be reviewed then they could ask that the project be sent to the Engineering Workgroup. Do not make it a mandatory step in the process because you have already had your 30 and 95 percent milestones.

Mr. Clark would like a clause added to the Appendices that states 'unless one or more agencies request remanding to the Engineering Workgroup' as recommended by the workgroup.

Mr. Constance said that the intent is to ensure that there are no surprises. He agreed with Mr. Clark that there needs to be a safeguard for verification.

Mr. Hartman didn't think a change to the SOP was needed. Review is a generally defined term. The Engineering Workgroup could look at the projects and certify them without going into an in-depth review unless a specific request was made. If there are no concerns, the Engineering Workgroup could give a stamp of approval.

Mr. Clark asked if the cost estimates could be sent out by email.

Mr. Paul said that there needs to be a timeline built into the milestones that allows enough time for the Engineering Workgroup's review. Mr. Hartman added that the Engineering Workgroup could set the deadline when cost estimates are due. Mr. Paul agreed as long as it is understood that the Engineering Workgroup is not required to go through every project.

Mr. Landers asked if the projects coming up for Phase II authorization at the end of the year would have to be reworked by the Engineering Workgroup. Mr. Clark answered that most of the projects could be reviewed quickly. The procedure for cost increases should be the same and be sent to the Engineering Workgroup for review. The depth of review will depend on the complexity of the project and the changes recommended.

Mr. Clark requested an additional discussion on the transitioning of projects.

Mr. Constance suggested having the P&E Subcommittee clarify the text of the SOP dealing with transitioning of projects so that the two sections mesh. Mr. Hartman and Mr. Clark agreed.

5. Agenda Item 4: Decision/Discussion: Long-Term Operations and Maintenance (O&M) of CWPPRA Projects (Constance). As directed by the Task Force at their 15 February 2007 meeting, the Technical Committee will discuss issues related to O&M, specifically: the identification of projects where O&M funds can be returned to the program (i.e. convert PPL 1-8 projects to a "cash flow" status); determine, by project type, if O&M can better be planned in project design and construction (which may cost more on the design/construction end) to minimize O&M burden in the long term (i.e. build more sustainable projects that reduce O&M needs); and layout ways to approach (through a process or evaluation) to determine if increasing individual project O&M funding is "justifiable" based on a project's observed benefits, performance (effectiveness), and total costs (this would include considering the cost/legal implications of de-authorizing/discontinuing project O&M). Mr. Constance announced that the Task Force directed the Technical Committee to discuss issues related to O&M and identify PPL 1-8 projects where funds could be returned to the program, look at ways to improve design by project type, and develop an approach to see if change in O&M costs would lead to continued justification of those projects. Also, there needs to be discussion about the legal implications of the way the Technical Committee changes projects and estimate costs.

Mr. Constance opened the floor for discussion from the Technical Committee on the identification of returning funds to the program.

Mr. Clark said that his agency assessed a couple of PPL 1-8 projects that have been constructed for 10 years and have not needed much O&M. His agency could possibly reduce the O&M cost and return the rest of the money to the program. In particular, the rock shoreline stabilization projects in the Chenier Plain have not needed much O&M in the past 10 years. One project is on the Intracoastal Waterway where there is always a chance a barge can damage it.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that this was considered several years ago. After a lot of time and analysis, it looked like the most that would be freed up would be \$20 million.

Mr. Clark said that unobligated funds were reviewed in 2003 and the total was \$20 to 23 million. Mr. Clark is not talking about unobligated funds, but obligated funds that have been MIPR'd to FWS. Ms. LeBlanc asked Mr. Clark why he couldn't just let Ms. Gay Browning know about the change in cost estimate and that there was additional money available. Mr. Clark replied that he wanted other agencies to participate too.

Mr. Hartman noted that there is currently \$46 million in unexpended O&M.

Ms. LeBlanc said that as of April 2003 for PPLs 1-8, the estimated O&M and monitoring was \$84.2 million. Obligations were \$9.4 million with an estimated need of \$14.4 million. The total that could potentially move to cash flow was \$55.4 million.

Ms. Gay Browning said that for PPLs 1-8, the unobligated balance is \$23.6 million, and the unexpended balance is \$50.8 million. The Federal portion is missing. Ms. LeBlanc clarified that the unobligated balance is lower than the unexpended balance because there are MIPR's on all projects for 20 years to the agencies.

Mr. Clark said that he is talking about the obligated funds. Agencies can coordinate with their state partners on projects where there is no movement on O&M. He urged the other agencies or the P&E Subcommittee to analyze the projects to see where O&M is not needed.

Mr. Paul suggested tasking the P&E Subcommittee with a review of the O&M impact of constructed projects on PPLs 1-8 since the P&E are currently tasked with looking at unconstructed projects. Mr. Clark agreed.

Mr. Duszynski said that the decision is if the remaining O&M budget in non-cash flow projects can be rolled into cash flow. He finds it easier to keep track of O&M costs if they are all done on a cash flow basis. The downside will be the amount of paperwork. Mr. Duszynski was ready in 2003 to roll the remaining O&M budget into cash flow and build projects with it. Mr. Clark said that his agency is willing to do the paperwork required.

Mr. Constance felt the choices are to re-analyze O&M. There are projects that are faring much better than originally envisioned. There is risk in making decisions on 20-year projections. More clarity is needed before a decision can be made. The easier route would be to switch to cash flow. He agreed to send this idea to the P&E Subcommittee.

Mr. Clark said that he doesn't have a problem with the cash flow idea. Regardless of the cash flow decision, O&M and monitoring funds for all projects on PPLs 1-8 should be analyzed. He prefers to go the cash flow route.

Mr. Hartman reminded the Technical Committee that when this was reviewed in 2003, some agencies said that they could not move funds unless it would be done across the board. There are agreements to landowners that the structures will be maintained for 20 years. If the money is given back, then the agreement is no longer valid. It doesn't bother Mr. Hartman to move all projects into cash flow, but it shouldn't be done on a piecemeal-basis.

Mr. Paul suggested that the P&E Subcommittee review the 2003 list of pros and cons to see if they are still valid. Mr. Clark agreed.

Mr. Clark said that some cost-share agreements may have to be amended. He did not see any clauses in some land rights agreements that necessarily restricted agencies to maintain projects for 20 years.

Mr. Hartman said that the P&E Subcommittee will review the list of issues and say they are still valid. We should ask the P&E Subcommittee to explain why these projects should not be converted into cash flow. The land rights issues have not gone away.

Mr. Duszynski said that since 2003, cash flow projects with signed cost-share and land rights agreements have been cut. He is comfortable in not setting aside money and still signing agreements.

Mr. Constance asked if a legal opinion has been provided on whether or not moving to cash flow would create an issue with existing agreements. The commitment within the agreement is to perform O&M, not necessarily provide all the funding for 20 years.

Mr. Clark said that Mr. John Saia, former Technical Committee Chairman, stated in 2003 that the Corps would consult their attorneys on whether or not the cost-share agreements would need to be amended. Mr. Clark does not recall an answer to this. All cost-share agreements have a clause that states that if there is insufficient funding for the continuation of the contract, the contract shall terminate.

Mr. Hartman said that the issue isn't the cost-share agreement, but the land rights. Mr. Constance agreed.

Mr. Clark said that the cost-share agreement was an issue. Some thought that it would be difficult to change the cost-share agreements. His agency is willing to do it for their projects. He is not suggesting that CWPPRA walk away from any particular project. There are already clauses in land rights agreements that consider a situation of possibly not having sufficient money in the future to perform maintenance.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to task the P&E Subcommittee with assessing the level of effort to redo the cost-share agreements and check the land rights agreements to determine

if there is an agreement to go to a cash flow approach on non-cash flow projects by the next Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Constance opened the floor for discussion from the Technical Committee on improving design to decrease O&M by project type.

Mr. Constance said that the issue is more project specific than by project type. CWPPRA should attempt to design projects that minimize O&M. This can be achieved two ways: maximizing first cost and minimizing O&M or the reverse and then selecting the one that provides the best overall life cycle. It is a matter of design and evaluation. This is being done; it just needs to be demonstrated to the Task Force.

Mr. Clark said that the engineers, biologists, and planners are trying to build the best projects they can that have the least amount of O&M with the amount of money available. There are certain projects that will require more O&M than others.

Mr. Constance said that the issue is giving the Task Force the comfort zone to know that the project was designed appropriately for the life cycle. This is done, but is infrequently displayed. The solution is for the agencies to show that they have considered the possibilities and selected the least costly alternative for the life cycle when presenting to the Task Force. Mr. Paul agreed. Mr. Hartman suggested directing the Engineering Workgroup to make sure that is being done.

Mr. Landers agreed that partner agencies should work toward devising self-sustaining projects to the maximum extent practicable given available resources. What group would certify that dual analysis has been done? In the future, how is CWPPRA going to account for improved information on sea level rise and those implications on the longevity of the types of projects CWPPRA is planning to maintain for 20 years?

Mr. Constance said that there are instances where higher O&M costs are better than up front costs. He wouldn't blindly suggest that CWPPRA walk away from a high O&M project.

Mr. Paul said that the optimization of construction cost versus O&M should be addressed at the 30 and 95 percent design and review meetings. Mr. Clark agreed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to request that construction versus O&M cost be addressed at the 30 and 95 percent design review meetings. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Constance opened the floor for discussion from the Technical Committee on developing an approach to justify increasing O&M based on project performance.

Mr. Hartman said that the basic issue is that every year projects request additional O&M funds. There is concern that O&M will start to outweigh construction and pretty soon the emphasis will be on project maintenance. The Technical Committee needs to develop a decision-making

process on whether to fund additional O&M. At some point in time, the Technical Committee needs to make the hard decision of de-authorizing projects. Mr. Constance and Mr. Clark agreed.

Mr. Clark suggested that a report be submitted to the Technical Committee whenever a project requests additional money over their budgeted O&M. The report should include a monitoring analysis to see if the benefits of the project are still worthwhile and worth increasing the O&M.

Mr. Hartman wants to ask the P&E Subcommittee to develop a proposal on how to handle project cost increases. Somewhere down the line, the Technical Committee will have to discuss whether or not a project should get that additional year's worth of O&M based on monitoring results. Does CWPPRA want to continue to invest in a project if the monitoring shows that it is not producing? Mr. Constance and Mr. Landers agreed that the P&E Subcommittee should deliver a report outlining the process to the Technical Committee.

DECISION: The Technical Committee tasked the P&E Subcommittee with developing an approach to handling O&M increases by the next Technical Committee meeting.

6. Agenda Item 5: Discussion: CWPPRA Projects Identified Under Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) (Duszynski). Six ongoing CWPPRA projects have been identified (in their entirety or in part) under the State's draft CIAP plan. These six projects are: BS-13 Bayou Lamoque, BA-30 East Grand Terre, ME-21 Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, BA-36 Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge, ME-18 Rockefeller Refuge, and TE-43 GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas of Terrebonne. All but one project, BS-13 Bayou Lamoque, have completed design under CWPPRA. LDNR would like to discuss their intention to build (and design, in the case of Bayou Lamoque) these projects currently ongoing under CWPPRA. No formal decision will be requested at this time. Mr. Duszynski announced that this was a notification of the projects that are envisioned to be removed from the CWPPRA list for construction. Mr. Greg Grandy, LDNR, reviewed the list of CWPPRA projects identified under the State's draft CIAP plan:

- A. East Grand Terre Island Project (BA-30): LDNR anticipates bidding the project out in late spring or early summer of 2007.
- B. Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge (BA-36): The project is expected to go out to bid in October 2007.
- C. Grand Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-21): LDNR is reviewing and revising plans for the portion from Superior Canal to Tebo Point and anticipates the project will go to bid later this year.
- D. GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas of Terrebonne (TE-43): LDNR is reviewing and revising plans for four breaches. Currently, there is no date on anticipated bidding for this project.
- E. Rockefeller Shoreline Protection Demo Project (ME-18): LDNR will bid, construct, and monitor the demonstration section of the Rockefeller Shoreline.
- F. Bayou Lamoque Floodgate Removal (BS-13): LDNR has initiated Phase I engineering, design, land rights, and permitting for this project.

Mr. Grandy added that the Task Force has directed LDNR to coordinate activities on several projects with ongoing Corps and CIAP plans to make sure those projects work in synergy. He announced that the comment period for the draft CIAP plan closes April 2nd. The plan will be submitted to Minerals Management Service with approval anticipated on May 1st.

7. Agenda Item 6: Additional Agenda Items (Constance). Mr. Landers announced an Open House hosted by LDNR, EPA, and St. John Parish taking place 14 March 2007 at 5 p.m. in Reserve, LA to discuss progress on the Maurepas CWPPRA project.

8. Agenda Item 7: Date of Upcoming Task Force Meeting (LeBlanc). Ms. LeBlanc announced that the next Task Force meeting will be held on 3 May 2007 at 9:30 a.m. in Lafayette.

9. Agenda Item 8: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (LeBlanc). Dates and locations of future program meetings through February 2009 can be found on the agenda.

10. Adjourn. Mr. Constance adjourned the meeting at 12:45 p.m.