

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 3 December 2008 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Thomas Holden opened the meeting at 9:35 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

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

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

Mr. Thomas Holden, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman

[Ms. Melanie Goodman, USACE, served as the Acting Chairman for agenda items #3-5 and #7-14.]

Mr. Tim Landers, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

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

Mr. Kirk Rhinehart, LA Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration (LAOCPR)

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

2. Mr. Landers introduced Mr. Brad Crawford, EPA, as a new Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee member.

3. Agenda Item 1. Report: Status of Breaux Act Program Funds and Projects (Browning). *Ms. Gay Browning, USACE, will provide an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding in the Planning and Construction Programs.* Ms. Browning reported that at the start of this meeting there was \$87.5 million available and \$115 million unobligated in the Construction Program. There is approximately \$184 million in approvals at this meeting.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark stressed that there are some funds promised to projects that have not yet been obligated. Therefore, it is not as critical to have a cushion of \$5 to \$10 million in the Construction budget because CWPPRA has \$115 million unobligated and money is continuously coming back to the program from projects that have money left over after construction.

4. Agenda Item 2. Discussion/Decision: 18th Priority Project List (Holden). *The Environmental Workgroup Chairman will present an overview of the ten PPL 18 candidate projects and three PPL18 candidate demonstration projects. The Technical Committee will vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force for selecting PPL 18 projects for Phase I Engineering and Design.* Mr. Holden announced that up to four candidate projects and all or none of the demonstration projects would be selected for PPL 18. Mr. Kevin Roy, FWS, presented the ten candidate projects for PPL 18.

A. Region 1 – Pontchartrain Basin

i. Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project – The main project feature is to hydraulically dredge material from Lake Borgne to restore 348 acres of bald cypress and tupelo swamp. Treated municipal effluent would also be diverted to the site to provide nutrients and freshwater. The project will benefit 341 acres of swamp over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded cost is \$39 million.

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

i. Bertrandville Siphon – Project features include diverting Mississippi River water via a 2,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) siphon to benefit 15,000 acres and outfall management such as plugs and spoil bank gaps for water distribution. The project will benefit 1,612 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded cost is \$22.6 million.

ii. Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project – Project features include hydraulically dredging and pumping sediment from the Mississippi River via pipeline to create marsh. A bucket dredge would be used to construct a forested ridge. The project will benefit 252 acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$31.4 million.

iii. Pass a Loutre Restoration Project – The main project feature is to dredge 5.6 miles of Pass a Loutre to restore channel flow to historic levels. The dredged sediment would be beneficially used to create 587 acres of marsh and construct 12 crevasses. The project will create and protect 1,133 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded project cost is \$34.4 million.

iv. Elmer’s Island Headland Restoration Project – Project features include hydraulically dredging offshore sediment to rebuild 355 acres of Elmer’s Island and creating 145 acres of dune and beach and 175 acres of back-barrier marsh. The project will benefit 174 net acres of marsh, dune, and beach habitat over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded project cost is \$32.3 million.

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

i. Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project – Project features include protecting 25,550 feet of shoreline with concrete matting and hydraulically dredging sediment to create 163 of marsh and nourish 91 acres of existing marsh. The project will benefit 180 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded project cost is \$32.7 million.

ii. Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project – A main project feature is to install a rock structure to restrict the size of Grand Pass, which would restore the historic ridge function and reduce salinity in marshes north of the ridge. Other project features include modifying the structure in Liners Canal to increase flow by 500 cfs and dredging the mouth of Miner’s Canal. The project will benefit 456 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded project cost is \$16.6 million.

iii. Northwest Vermilion Bay Shoreline Planting and Maintenance Project – This project includes planting smooth cordgrass along 31,415 feet of shoreline with maintenance plantings occurring

during the first four years. The project will benefit 65 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded project cost is \$2.6 million.

D. Region 4 –Mermentau and Calcasieu/Sabine Basins

i. Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project – The main project feature is to hydraulically dredge sediment from the lower Freshwater Bayou Canal or from an offshore site to fill 537 acres of open water and deteriorated marsh. The project will create and protect 274 net acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The estimated fully funded project cost is \$30.6 million.

ii. Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project – Project features include the installation of ten 48-inch culverts along the GIWW to divert 400 cfs of freshwater into the Cameron-Creole Watershed; 8,000 feet of bank protection along the GIWW; 65,000 feet of terraces; and 200 acres of vegetative plantings. Approximately 473 acres of marsh would be created and protected over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$12.8 million.

Mr. Roy also presented the three demonstration candidate projects for PPL 18.

A. EcoSystems Wave Attenuator for Shoreline Protection Demonstration – The demonstration features an evaluation of the effectiveness of the EcoSystems Wave Attenuator in reducing shoreline erosion. The device consists of concrete discs with embedded limestone rocks. The discs are mounted on a piling that is driven into soil. The device is used to reduce wave energy and can be a rock substitute. The fully funded project cost is \$1.86 million.

2. Benefits of Limited Design-Unconfined Disposal Demonstration – The demonstration features quantifying the benefits of constructing barrier islands through an unconfined nature by pumping material in front of an island and letting wave energy help restoration. A dye tracer would be used to mark a small quantity of sand to determine where this sand is transported. The fully funded project cost is \$1.83 million.

3. Non-Rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection – Demonstration features include evaluating the effectiveness of various methods of shoreline protection, such as HESCO baskets, WADS, WhisprWave, SUBMAR Matting, A-Jacks, and Viper-Walls, as substitutes for rock. The fully funded project cost is \$1.91 million.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for Technical Committee comments on the Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project.

Mr. Hartman observed that the elevation for sediment disposal is going to be the elevation suitable for bottomland hardwood establishment. There is no salinity control and this area is still open to the MRGO. He expressed concern that the salinity may not be appropriate for trees. Mr. Roy commented that this factor was considered and noted that the MRGO is going to close in the future and a CIAP project would also divert some freshwater into this site.

Mr. Rhinehart asked about potential land rights issues with the project. Mr. Roy said that the project took a prioritization point reduction because of the potential land rights issue. Mr. Hartman added that there is a historic subdivision in the project area. Clearing the land rights for these sites is going

to be a huge issue unless the sponsors actually go through the condemnation procedures to get control of these areas.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for Technical Committee comments on the Bertrandville Siphon Project.

Mr. Clark asked about potential land rights issues with this project since a previous project in this area was deauthorized because of this problem. Mr. Landers responded that there is a need for restoration in this area and the EPA has coordinated with Plaquemines Parish for their ability to contact landowners and identify willing partners for this project.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for Technical Committee comments on the Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for Technical Committee comments on the Pass a Loutre Restoration Project.

Mr. Rhinehart said that the State supports the project in concept, but does not want to set a precedent to use restoration funds to supplement the navigation hopper dredge disposal. The State is concerned that the shoaling is related to the hopper dredge disposal at the head of Pass a Loutre. The State does not feel that this project would be viable for very long. Mr. Rhinehart asked Mr. Cecil Soileau to comment.

Mr. Cecil Soileau, with BCG Engineering and Consulting, Inc., reviewed the Engineering Research and Development Center (ERDC) desktop model that analyzed the cause of shoaling in Pass a Loutre. The initial modeling effort began in 1961 when the distribution of flow in Pass a Loutre was 40 percent of the total Mississippi River flow. Many factors have affected the discharge into Pass a Loutre since 1973. For example, from 1975 to 1991, Baptiste Collette and Tiger Pass downstream of Venice became navigation projects and Southwest Pass became a deep draft navigation project to accommodate ocean-going vessels. The other issue is that the anchorage area on the west side of the river at Pilottown was a building bar. When the shoal was dredged to form an anchorage, more water shifted onto Southwest Pass. The model needs more work to identify the other causes. It wasn't just the natural process that closed Pass a Loutre. There were other factors, such as the deep draft navigation between the Gulf and Baton Rouge that took flow away from Pass a Loutre over time. Although the numerical modeling indicates that there would be additional sedimentation with the Pass a Loutre Project, the model does not indicate that the shoaling in Pass a Loutre is due to anthropogenic effects. A system-wide modeling effort needs to be performed to include the entire delta, instead of just the reach between Venice, Head of Passes, and Pass a Loutre.

Mr. Rhinehart asked Mr. Soileau about the role of the hopper dredge disposal in further reducing flow to this area. Mr. Soileau replied that when a high concentration of sand is discharged, as is done with hopper dredges, the material is not carried far and immediately forms a mound in the bed. Consequently, dumping material in a deep column of water allows some sediment to carry downstream and this contributes to a shallower cross section downstream.

Mr. Clark said that he does not argue with Mr. Soileau and added that he believes in the ERDC report. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Soileau if he believed that the hopper dredge activity was the main reason why shoaling is occurring in Pass a Loutre. Mr. Soileau said that the hopper dredge activity is not the main reason for shoaling, but it is a contributing factor that represents roughly 40 to 50 percent responsibility for shoaling at the mouth of Pass a Loutre.

Mr. Hartman commented that placement of sediment in Pass a Loutre constitutes a significant amount of material that is not being used to beneficially create marsh. He asked why DNR has not withheld consistency and enforced the issue. Mr. Rhinehart answered that the State has annual consistency determination requests for dredging of Southwest Pass. The State requested that the Corps provide information that the hopper dredge disposal was not adversely affecting Pass a Loutre. Mr. Rhinehart is not aware if the State has received this information yet.

Mr. Holden said that he cannot endorse the notion that 100 percent of the issue on Pass a Loutre is due to navigation. It's possible that the hopper dredge is contributing 45 to 50 percent of shoaling at Pass a Loutre, but there is no data to support it. The Corps has dredged 3 to 4 million cubic yards of material that has been used for ecosystem restoration. There is a dynamic shoaling issue in Southwest Pass. Hopper dredges are used instead of cutterheads because of navigation safety. The Corps is working with the State to look at the disposal site as an opportunity, not a villain. The Pass a Loutre Project has a high acre percentage value. This project provides time to get freshwater into Pass a Loutre to improve the ecosystem while CWPPRA tries to find a solution. The opportunities created by the sediment borrow site should be acknowledged, but the associated impacts on the Pass a Loutre Project should not be ignored

Mr. Rhinehart added that the demon with the Pass a Loutre Project is its adverse effects downstream. A dedicated borrow area would not have adverse environmental impacts downstream, which is what is happening with Pass a Loutre. He questions the validity of the model at this time because not all changes in the channel were accounted for. The State would like to use the material when it is first pumped out because it is more expensive for the Corps to deposit the material and then re-mine it at a later date.

Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Rhinehart that first-time beneficial use is the most efficient. Mr. Clark feels that a higher percentage of silting in Pass a Loutre is due to hopper dredge activity. The FWS is concerned about the hopper dredge situation and has written a letter suggesting that the State consider ceasing approval of this activity through the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 and their Consistency Authority.

Ms. Cynthia Duet, speaking on behalf of Mr. Garret Graves with the Governor's Office of Coastal Activities, said that in an ideal world dredged material would be used beneficially at the onset, but there are O&M and funding limitations. She said that Mr. Graves does not believe CWPPRA should pay for a large-scale dredging operation without regard to the placement of dredge material at the head of Pass a Loutre. She believes CWPPRA should not move forward with the Pass a Loutre Project until the science is better understood.

Mr. Rhinehart commented that the reason the material needs to be beneficially used is to create more space so the hopper dredges can place more material at the dump site. Mr. Rhinehart questioned if

building the Pass a Loutre Project would keep the channel deeper and more accessible for dredge material placement. If so, the Corps would not have to pursue the beneficial use cycles to mine it out. What are the savings to the Corps' beneficial use program for mining the hopper dredge material out with the CWPPRA project? The perception is that restoration dollars are being used for a dredging navigation interest, but couldn't this project potentially save the Corps dredging dollars in the end? The State and Corps are working to refine the models and do not want to launch a project right now with this many issues. There are already struggles with the West Bay Project that need to be dealt with before launching the Pass a Loutre Project.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the Elmer's Island Project.

Mr. Clark asked about the status of the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Barataria Basin Barrier Island Project. Ms. Fay Lachney, USACE, replied that the E&D has been completed and the project team will begin writing the decision document. The goal is to have the report available to the public by late spring 2009 and start planning and design by the end of 2008. Mr. Troy Constance, USACE, added that there is a cost share agreement in place for design.

Mr. Hartman noted that the 2007 Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) authorization is not a funding mechanism. Elmer's Island was included in CWPPRA because it is not certain if the WRDA funds will come through and this is a time sensitive project.

Mr. Constance added that there is good indication that the LCA will be funded. The Corps did not consider breaking the plan for this island into multiple pieces because that would mean having to reformulate, redesign, and resubmit the plans. As a result, there may be similar delays for the remaining portion that is in LCA.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation Project. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project.

Mr. Hartman expressed concern about spending a large amount of money on the structure south of Lake Mechant and asked if there was going to be a maintenance issue with this project. He does feel that the components associated with Miner's and Liners Canals have merit. Mr. Paul replied that each piece will be modeled individually and together. Mr. John Jurgensen, NRCS, added that the two structures were evaluated separately from the southern structure.

Mr. Holden was concerned about the increased gradients on high velocities that could be caused by the project and asked about safety concerns for shrimpers and boaters. Mr. Jurgensen stated that the Engineering Workgroup feels that the velocity should be adequate for navigation and is not expected to add any risk.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the Northwest Vermilion Bay Vegetation Plantings Project. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the demonstration projects.

Mr. Hartman commented on how the demonstration projects are staying under \$2 million, which is an artificial cap that was developed years ago. He is concerned that the demonstration projects may not provide useful information if they are not adequately designed with enough replications. He would like for the Technical Advisory and Academic Advisory Groups to review the design and develop recommended costs, not to exceed \$3-4 million, so that the demonstration provides valuable results from which the coastal restoration community can learn.

Mr. Clark said that Mr. Hartman's comments were well received. Mr. Clark recalled the Oyster Reef Demonstration Project where the number of treatments had to be reduced because of cost concerns.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the public on the Pass a Loutre Restoration Project.

Mr. Steven Peyronnin, Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana, said that uncertainties about the Pass a Loutre Restoration Project need to be resolved before moving forward with this project. Time is needed to further analyze the technical and programmatic ramifications. It has been difficult for CWPPRA to go to Congress and demonstrate a wise use of restoration dollars when there are conflicting interests on how to manage the program. Mr. Peyronnin urged the Technical Committee to take more time to evaluate the technical merits of the project before making a decision.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Parish, asked Mr. Holden if the Corps was dredging Southwest Pass using hopper dredges and then depositing the material at the mouth of Pass a Loutre. Mr. Holden replied yes, but that the disposal site is above Pass a Loutre. Mr. Edwards asked if the Corps considered having the hopper dredges open in front of the crevasses to enhance the deposition of sediment to create marsh. Mr. Holden said that it is a concept worth considering and he would pass the idea along.

Mr. Mike Carloss, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF), said that his department realizes that the Pass a Loutre Restoration Project may not be in the Master Plan and understands the implications of dredging on the channel. Mr. Carloss is concerned that if nothing is done, more land will be lost. Time is of the essence. The LDWF brought up the consistency problem with this project and hopper dredging. The problem is who will dredge the channel if the State stops consistency. The Corps is not authorized to dredge that channel because it is not a Federal

navigation channel. What are the other alternatives for dredging? CWPPRA may not be the avenue for this project, but this is a big public use area and there are concerns about how to address the land loss if it is not through CWPPRA.

Mr. Ken Ragas, Plaquemines Parish, commented that the Pass a Loutre Project seems like 50/50 flip-a-coin issue.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the public regarding the remaining candidate and demonstration projects.

Mr. Ken Ragas spoke in favor of the Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project. He believes that the 502 acres benefitted are misleading. Something needs to be done between the back levee and the Gulf. The sediment traps up river need to be considered because as sediment is pumped out above Southwest Pass, there is a reduction in the amount of sediment that has to be dredged from that pass. He doesn't understand why the project includes the east bank when the west bank is the one that needs to be addressed.

Ms. Mary Kelly, with EcoSystems, commented that the Non-Rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project seems redundant as it is a CWPPRA Program within CWPPRA. The proposed products are not new and the results have been mediocre. The EcoSystems product is different in that it's conducive to soft soil conditions. She questioned how the imaginary number of \$2 million was placed on demonstration projects. How can a number of products be studied for the same cost as one product and still get good conclusions? Louisiana needs to be the leader in finding solutions to restore wetlands and the coast.

Mr. Mike Brasher, representing Gulf Coast Joint Venture, said that projects funded through CWPPRA have the potential to contribute to the habitat conservation goals of his organization. The Gulf Coast Joint Venture ranked the candidate projects according to expected benefits to priority migratory birds and the Pass a Loutre Restoration Project was the organization's number one project. The Gulf Coast Joint Venture also offered support for the Bertrandville Siphon, Elmer's Island Headland Restoration, Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration, and the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Projects. He asked the Technical Committee to give favorable consideration to these projects.

Mr. Ryan Bourriaque, with Cameron Planning and Development and speaking on behalf of the Cameron Parish Police Jury, asked for the Technical Committee's support for the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project. He presented a resolution from the Cameron Parish Police Jury showing full support for this project. Mr. Bourriaque added that it has been some time since a Region 4 project has been approved.

Mr. Ralph Libersat, representing Cameron Parish, spoke in favor of the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project. Cameron Parish is in need of support from CWPPRA due to the devastating effects to infrastructure and coastal restoration from past hurricanes.

Mr. Ryan Lambert, President of Cajun Fishing Adventures in Buras, spoke in favor of the Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project. He has witnessed the erosion between Bastion Bay and

Grand Liard; the area is 99 percent gone. Grand Liard is the only foothold left to save any marsh in Buras. Mr. Lambert estimates there is 70 percent marsh loss between Grand Liard and Spanish Pass. Yellow Cotton Bay and Hospital Bay have gone from 89 feet deep to 35 feet deep due to eroding marsh filling in the area. For the first time ever, the hydrilla and milfoil in this marsh were killed by a high tide; it didn't take a tidal surge to kill it. The priority for the Grand Liard Project is immense. Mr. Lambert stated that the marsh on the west side of Grand Liard has deteriorated 40 percent in the last three years and now the area has breached.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, Director of the Mayor's Office of Environmental Affairs for the City of New Orleans, spoke in favor of the Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project. This project offers ecological and public health benefits. The project would protect the sewer and water treatment plant and parts of St. Bernard and Orleans Parishes. In regard to the land rights issues, Ms. Fisher said that the citizens of Orleans Parish recently voted to include a force of law in the comprehensive zoning ordinance. They are in the process of writing the comprehensive zoning ordinance and could include provisions that prevent development or allow the city to take the land if it has ecological benefits. Ms. Fisher submitted a petition from Ninth Ward residents asking for the Technical Committee's support for the Bayou Bienvenue Project.

Ms. Pam Deshiell, representing the Holy Cross Neighborhood Association and the Lower Ninth Ward Sustainability Center, spoke on behalf of the Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project. This project deserves praise and has the highest endorsement from the community. The city has a significant portion of the land in that area and all other property owners have been identified. While the land rights issue is a difficult one, it is being addressed through a public/private/corporate non-profit partnership that has already begun working through the issues. Ms. Deshiell believes the public benefits far outweigh the cost of this project. This project also offers a premier educational opportunity to the Lower and Upper Ninth Ward communities.

Mr. Steve Ringo, resident of the Lower Ninth Ward, wishes that all of the projects could be funded. He spoke in favor of the Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project. This project has educational merit. He has witnessed the storm surge in this area twice. Lives have been lost. He asked the Technical Committee to not let property rights get in the way of this project.

Ms. Cynthia Willard-Lewis, Councilperson for District E in the City of New Orleans representing the historic Lower Ninth Ward, New Orleans East, and the Desire neighborhoods, gave her support for the Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project. This project has a multiplicity of benefits and geographic impacts that would enhance the quality of life. The project offers wetland restoration, storm surge protection, and ecological benefits as well as economic drivers for building citizen confidence in the rebuilding and redevelopment of areas devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The project also has the opportunity to serve as a living educational model to students in the community. This is an opportunity to mitigate the negative impacts of saltwater intrusion and the degradation of a once vibrant cypress forest. The project would protect critical sewer and water treatment assets for the City of New Orleans. Ms. Willard-Lewis added that the City of New Orleans owns 40 percent of the land in this project area and that the non-profit group consisting of public, private, and non-private sectors is working to remove roadblocks for this critical project.

Mr. Ed Landgraf, resident of Terrebonne Parish, Vice-Chairman of the Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management (CZM) and member of the Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program (BTNEP) Management Conference, supports the Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project. This project can make big differences from small changes. Mr. Landgraf also spoke in favor of the Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection Project as it is critical to protect the infrastructure along Terrebonne Bay.

Mr. Mohan Menon, representing Terrebonne Parish and with the consulting firm Halcrow, Inc., gave his support for the Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project. This project would meet objectives stated in previous strategy documents including the Coast 2050 Plan and the State's Master Plan. The project would help to control salinity as well as introduce freshwater to this area. This project would reinforce the Lake Mechant Project currently under construction.

Mr. Dan Arceneaux, Coastal Advisor for St. Bernard Parish, spoke on behalf of the Bayou Bienvenue Project. The parish had a CWPPRA project once before, but it was deauthorized because the water depth was too deep to terrace or plant trees in the area. He does not want contaminated material from the Industrial Canal Project dumped into the Orleans side of Bayou Bienvenue. The Corps does not believe the material is contaminated enough to destroy anything, but the Pontchartrain Basin Foundation conducted a study that determined that the material is 100 times worse than what the Corps says. The Corps has to stop dumping polluted material into the bayou or the fishing industry will die. The St. Bernard Parish Government supports the Bayou Bienvenue Project 100 percent and would like the project to get fully funded without the pollution.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Director for Coastal Zone Management in Plaquemines Parish, supports the Bertrandville Siphon, Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration, and the Pass a Loutre Restoration Projects. The Grand Liard Project is critical to the port of Venice. Mr. Hahn asked the Technical Committee to consider implications for storm protection rather than just marsh creation.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, listed the parish's top three projects: 1. Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project, 2. Bertrandville Siphon Project, and 3. Pass a Loutre Restoration Project. The Grand Liard Project is vital and would help to sustain marsh life. Ms. Kimble believes that Pass a Loutre should be opened to flow naturally.

Mr. Al Levron, representing Terrebonne Parish President Michel Claudet, spoke in favor of the Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project. Terrebonne Bay and Bayou Terrebonne are quickly washing away. He understands that it is a very expensive effort and may be too big for this CWPPRA endeavor, but it needs to be done. Mr. Levron also believes the Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project is a good project as it would work in concert with several other CWPPRA projects such as the Lake Mechant Project, the Penchant Basin Project, and the Landbridge along the Barrier Island shoreline.

Ms. Susan Testroet-Bergeron, BTNEP, gave her full support for the Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project because it is a preservation project. BTNEP also supports the Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project and the Elmer's Island Headland Restoration Project. Her organization is concerned that the Federal deficit may keep the Elmer's Island Project from being funded in the LCA.

Mr. James Miller, Terrebonne Parish Coastal Zone Management, said that the biggest problem with the Lake Mechant Landbridge is Grand Pass which is 900 feet across and 36 feet deep. The velocity is probably greater than the Mississippi River and this is causing deterioration of the marshes. The parish's number one project is the Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project. This project would complement the \$43 million Lake Mechant Landbridge Project that is currently under construction. The Central Terrebonne Project would also complement the Brady Canal Project and South Lake de Cade and provide protection for 48,000 acres of interior marsh. The Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project is also needed.

Mr. Sherrill Segrera, Vermilion Parish, gave his support for the Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project. There is a problem in the Mermentau Basin with leaks and saltwater intrusion. It is very important to get the Freshwater Bayou Project done or the Leland Bowman and Schooner Bayou locks may have to be closed.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, III, President of the Vermilion Corporation and Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee Chair, spoke on behalf of the Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project. As manager of the property on which this project would be built, he assured the Technical Committee that there would be no land rights issues. Land loss rates in Vermilion Parish are catching up to Terrebonne Parish. The Freshwater Bayou Project complements the existing ME-4 Freshwater Bayou Wetlands rock dike. Mr. Edwards agreed with Mr. Segrera that this project would help maintain the integrity of the Mermentau Basin and that not doing this project would lead to removal of the Leland Bowman and Schooner Bayou locks. He believes that CWPPRA should be able to tie in the cost of maintenance dredging with the Corps' regular routine maintenance to save considerable cost to the project.

Mr. Mike Carloss, LDWF, supports the Northwest Vermilion Bay Vegetative Plantings Project. In regard to the Pass a Loutre Restoration Project, if consistency is denied by DNR, agencies need to ensure that the Corps is not forced by budget problems to use the old disposal sites.

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, spoke in favor of the Elmer's Island Headland Restoration Project. The Jefferson Parish Council, Grand Isle Mayor David Carmadelle, and the Jefferson Parish Marine Fisheries Advisory Board have all provided resolutions stating support for this project. Jefferson Parish wants the project done as quickly as possible. There is a breach in Elmer's Island that occurred from Hurricane Katrina. Flooding threatens the Caminada community and LA 1. She is concerned that funding this project through LCA means the project would not be constructed until 2011. Jefferson Parish cannot wait two years; the breach should at least be dealt with now on an emergency basis. She wondered if it would be reasonable to take the Elmer's Island segment of the Caminada Headland out of LCA and do it as a CWPPRA project.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to additional comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman commented that demonstrations should be selected based on the project and not necessarily the design; the design would be selected later on. Mr. Paul added that the intention was to request proposals from anyone who has a device that could be used as a demonstration for

shoreline protection. The designs would be developed by the sponsors, Engineering Workgroup, and the bidders.

Mr. Hartman asked Dr. Jenneke Visser if the Academic Advisory Committee could provide positive input into the selection of the design. Dr. Visser replied that it would be a good use time to help design the demonstration project.

Mr. Holden announced the conclusion of the comment period.

Voting Results

Mr. Holden presented the results from the agency voting. The weighted score is listed in parentheses.

PPL 18 Projects:

1. Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project – 6 agency votes (25)
2. Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project – 6 agency votes (20)
3. Bertrandville Siphon Project – 5 agency votes (28)
4. Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project – 5 agency votes (13)
5. Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project – 4 agency votes (11)
6. Northwest Vermilion Bay Vegetative Plantings Project – 3 agency votes (6)
7. Pass a Loutre Restoration Project – 2 agency votes (9)
8. Bayou Bienvenue Restoration Project – 2 agency votes (6)
9. Elmer’s Island Headland Restoration Project – 2 agency votes (6)
10. Terrebonne Bay Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project – 1 agency vote (2)

PPL 18 Demonstration Projects:

1. Non-Rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection Demonstration – 5 agency votes
2. Benefits of Limited Design/Unconfined Beach Fill for Restoration of LA Barrier Islands Demonstration – 1 agency vote
3. EcoSystems Wave Attenuator Demonstration – 0 agency votes

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to accept the four PPL 18 candidate projects with five agency votes or higher (Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project, Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project, Bertrandville Siphon Project, and Central Terrebonne Freshwater Enhancement Project). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to accept the top PPL 18 demonstration project (Non-Rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection Demonstration). Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Hartman offered an amended motion to include that lead agencies consult the Technical Advisory, Engineering, and Academic Advisory Workgroups to develop the scope of work and revised budgets and report back to the Technical Committee for budget approval. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

ACTION ITEM: The Technical Committee will recommend approval of the top four PPL 18 candidate projects and the top demonstration project at the January 21, 2009 Task Force Meeting.

5. Agenda Item 3. Discussion/Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Holden). *The Technical Committee will consider requests for Phase II authorization and approval of Increment 1 funding for cash flow projects, for recommendation to the Task Force. Due to limited funding, the Technical Committee will recommend a list of projects for Task Force approval within available program construction funding limits. Each project listed in the following table will be discussed individually by its sponsoring agency. Following presentations and discussion on individual projects, the Technical Committee will rank all projects to aid in deciding which to recommend to the Task Force for Phase II authorization and funding.* Ms. Goodman announced that there are six projects to review for recommendation for Phase II Increment 1 funding. The projects are listed in the table below.

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Construction Start Date	Total Fully Funded Cost Est.	Net Benefit Acres	Total Cost per Acre	Prioritization Score
NRCS	BA-27c(3)	9	Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph 3-CU 7	June 2009	\$32,583,477	180	\$121,852	40.5
NRCS	TE-43	10	GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne	June 2009	\$15,304,924	65	\$235,441	34.2
EPA	TE-47	11	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration	May 2009	\$52,140,861	195	\$267,389	60
NRCS	BA-41b	14	South Shore of the Pen - CU 2	June 2009	\$9,682,932	55	\$175,959	55.5
EPA	TV-21	14	East Marsh Island	Jan 2010	\$23,025,451	169	\$132,450	36.8
FWS	BA-42	15	Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation	Sep 2009	\$38,040,158	447	\$85,101	48.5

Project Presentations

A. Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 - CU7(BA-27c(3)): Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, described that the goal of this project is to eliminate shoreline erosion by installing 23,000 feet of rock dike/revetment along the west bank of Bayou Perot and the north shore of Little Lake. A total of 180 net acres will benefit over the project’s 20-year life. The project has a prioritization score of 40.45. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$32 million. The Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$26.6 million.

B. GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne (TE-43): Mr. Kinler explained that the goals of the project are to stop bankline erosion into the fragile floating marshes of the Penchant Basin and to maintain the freshwater conveyance function of the GIWW. The main project feature is to install approximately 8,833 linear feet (lf) of foreshore rock rip-rap to provide shoreline protection. The project will benefit 65 net acres over the project’s 20-year life.

The project has a prioritization score of 34.2. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$13.6 million, and the Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$11.4 million.

C. South Shore of the Pen – CU2 (BA-41): Mr. Kinler said that the goals of this project are to provide approximately 11,000 feet of shoreline protection, create 63 acres of marsh, and nourish 14 acres of emergent marsh. The project will benefit 55 net acres over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 55.5. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$9.7 million, and the Phase II Increment 1 cost is also \$9.7 million.

D. Ship Shoal: Whiskey Island West Flank Restoration (TE-47): Mr. Brad Crawford, EPA, described that the main goal of this project is to demonstrate the feasibility of moving Ship Shoal sand to the Isle Dernieres for future restoration projects. The project would create 500 acres of intertidal, supratidal, and dune habitat and 203 acres of subtidal habitat with the placement of 3.85 million cubic yards of sand. The project would benefit 195 net acres of island habitat over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 60. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$52.1 million, and the Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$48.2 million.

E. East Marsh Island Marsh Creation Project (TV-21): Ms. Melanie Magee, EPA, explained that goal of this project is to create approximately 165 acres of marsh and nourish an additional 197 acres to reinforce the northeast tip of the island and prevent future breaches or excess tidal scour. Sediment will be hydraulically dredged from East Cote Blanch Bay and added to the project area through confined containment. Project features also include an earthen plug and vegetative plantings. The project will benefit 169 net acres of marsh over the 20-year life and has a prioritization score of 36.8. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$23.0 million, and the Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$21.4 million.

F. Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation (BA-42): Mr. Roy said that the project goals are to create and nourish 549 acres of marsh in open water areas, restore the eastern Lake Hermitage shoreline by rebuilding the shoreline rim, and to create 6.5 acres of emergent habitat by constructing 7,300 lf of terraces. The area will be filled with sediment from the Mississippi River. The project will benefit 447 net acres of marsh over the 20-year project life and has a prioritization score of 48.5. The Phase II fully funded total cost is \$380 million, and the Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$36.7 million.

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments/discussion from the Technical Committee. There were no comments from the Technical Committee.

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments from the public.

Mr. Mike Carloss, LDWF, said that as a landowner and manager of the project areas, LDWF supports the East Marsh Island Marsh Creation Project and the Ship Shoal: Whiskey Island West Flank Restoration Project.

Mr. Mike Brasher, Gulf Coast Joint Venture, gave his support for the Ship Shoal: Whiskey Island West Flank Restoration Project and the Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, spoke in favor of the South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish, gave her support for the Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project.

Ms. Goodman announced the conclusion of the comment period.

Ms. Goodman described the voting procedures. Each agency will vote on four of the six projects. The votes are assigned weighted point scores of one through four, with a four indicating the agency's top project. The projects will be sorted first by the number of agency votes and then by the weighted score.

Voting Results

Ms. Goodman presented the results from agency voting for Phase II request. The weighted score is listed in parentheses.

Phase II Approval:

1. Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project – 6 agency votes (22)
2. East Marsh Island Project – 5 agency votes (14)
3. South Shore of the Pen, CU 2 Project – 5 agency votes (12)
4. Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3, CU7 Project– 3 agency votes (6)
5. Ship Shoal: Whiskey Island West Flank Restoration Project – 3 agency votes (4)
6. GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne Project – 2 agency votes (2)

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee on the voting results.

Mr. Rhinehart noted that there is \$8.5 million left after the top three projects are funded. He suggested, in an effort to maximize the number of projects constructed, that the Technical Committee select a fourth project for Phase II approval. Mr. Hartman said that he would be opposed to selecting a last place project that only had the support of two agencies and that there will be a larger number of projects up for Phase II approval next year. Mr. Rhinehart noted that even a last place project has made it through the process up to this point and it is still a much needed restoration project that is ready for construction.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to accept the top three projects (Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project, East Marsh Island Project, and South Shore of the Pen - CU 2 Project) for Phase II construction funding approval. Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Rhinehart amended Mr. Clark's motion to include selection of a fourth project (GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne Project).

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments on the amended motion from the Technical Committee.

Ms. Goodman noted that an additional \$2.78 million would be required to fully fund the GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne Project.

Mr. Hartman said that the GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne Project is a phased project and the more cost-effective areas were picked up by CIAP. Mr. Paul said that there are still critical areas that are needed and he supports the amendment.

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments from the public on the amended motion. There were none.

DECISION: The Technical Committee members voted on the amended motion to approve the top three projects for Phase II approval as well as the GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne Project. Mr. Clark and Mr. Paul voted in favor of the amended motion. Mr. Hartman and Mr. Landers voted against the amended motion. Mr. Rhinehart could not vote because it is a funding issue. The vote ended in a 2 to 2 tie. Ms. Goodman opted not to vote and let the Task Force make the final decision.

6. Agenda Item 4. Discussion/Decision: Request for Project Scope Change for PPL 16 - Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project (PO-34) (Paul). *The NRCS in coordination with the State of Louisiana will request a change in the project scope of the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project because the landowner is proceeding to establish a wetland mitigation bank in the same area as the CWPPRA Project. The scope change would eliminate marsh creation and nourishment in the interior marsh and include shoreline protection along approximately 26,700 feet of shoreline using a foreshore rock dike and approximately 21,700 feet of shoreline using earthen terraces and vegetative plantings.* Mr. Kinler said that the original project consisted of 410 acres of marsh creation and nourishment and 38,140 feet of vegetative plantings. After project approval, the project team found out that the landowner had received a wetland mitigation bank permit to create marsh in the same area as the CWPPRA project. The proposed change in scope includes the addition of a foreshore rock dike to protect about 26,700 feet of shoreline and a combination of terracing and vegetative plantings. The marsh creation and nourishment feature would be removed from the original project scope. The revised project cost is \$29.9 million, which is an increase of 52 percent over the original cost of \$19.6 million. Net acres benefitted were decreased by 63 percent from 330 to 121 acres. This CWPPRA project, the landowner's wetland mitigation project, and a CIAP project along Lake Borgne would work together to provide protection for the Orleans Landbridge. Mr. Kinler asked the Technical Committee to allow the NRCS and LAOCPR to proceed with Phase I of the revised project.

Ms. Goodman opened the floor to comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Hartman commented that terracing in Lake Borgne is not a very cost-effective project. He asked how much CWPPRA would have to invest to get the project to the 30 percent design. Mr. Kinler replied that they are currently at the beginning of the design process. Mr. Hartman does not think that the revised project would have made it through the PPL process and does not believe the project has a chance at being cost-effective. Mr. Paul said that it would take less than \$1 million to get the project to the 30 percent design and that the fully funded Phase I cost is less than \$2 million. Mr.

Paul feels the project would provide benefits in protecting the landbridge and working with other projects in the area.

Mr. Clark also expressed concern about the terracing and noted that the cost-effectiveness is on the low end at \$247,933 per acre. Mr. Clark proposed allowing the NRCS and the State to move to the 30 percent design level. The project could then be re-evaluated to determine if it should continue.

Mr. Rhinehart agreed with Mr. Paul that the project is in a critical area where there is synergy with the mitigation effort and ongoing CIAP efforts. He feels it is worth the investment to continue to the 30 percent design.

Mr. Landers said that the NRCS and State have been upfront about the technical uncertainties to this point. Proceeding to the 30 percent design milestone will provide answers to the technical uncertainties associated with this project.

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments from the public.

Mr. Leo Richardson, Executive Director of the Lake Catherine Civic Association, gave the Technical Committee a letter of support for the change in scope for the Alligator Bend Project.

Ms. Wynecta Fisher, Director of the Mayor's Office of Environmental Affairs, City of New Orleans, supports the scope change for the Alligator Bend Project.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend that the Task Force approve the change in scope for the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection Project and allow the project to proceed to the 30 percent design milestone. After the milestone is met, the project will be re-evaluated by the Technical Committee and Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Clark, Landers, Paul, and Rhinehart voted in favor of the motion, and Mr. Hartman did not. The motion was passed by the Technical Committee.

7. Agenda Item 5. Report/Discussion: Status of the PPL 8 - Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycle 2 (CS-28-2) (Holden). Ms. Fay Lachney will provide a status on the changes to the Plans and Specifications and schedule for advertising the construction contract for the Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project permanent pipeline feature. Ms. Lachney reported that in an effort to increase the bid-ability of the project, the contract will allow for API and AWWA type pipes. There have also been slight changes to the welding requirements, and the contract time has been increased. The contract will be advertised in January 2009, with an award made in March 2009, and a notice to proceed issued in April 2009. Construction is anticipated to begin in June or July of 2009.

8. Agenda Item 6. Report: Status of the PPL 1 – West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) (Holden). The Corps of Engineers will provide a status on the West Bay Project and efforts to develop a Work Plan with CPRA/OCPR to address the overall induced shoaling issue as directed by the Task Force at their November 5, 2008 meeting. Ms. Cherie Price, USACE, reported that there have been several ongoing efforts over the past year to take a comprehensive look at multiple diversions on the river and determine how the diversion impacts will affect navigation

and flood control. First, a Mississippi River Diversion Modeling Team was assembled in July 2008 to review existing river models and help develop new models to assess hydrodynamic and sediment transport impacts on the river. Secondly, the Corps and State's Science and Technology Group developed a technical document on river diversion and induced shoaling. The document describes the current knowledge of potential impacts of diversions on channel morphology, outlines strategies for existing tools, and lists the needs for development of better tools. Lastly, there is an effort led by the USACE New Orleans District and Division to identify upstream river boundary conditions, sediment and nutrient influx, channel response, and impacts after the diversions are implemented.

In November 2008, the USACE sent a list of preliminary items to the State for inclusion in the West Bay Work Plan. The list included items such as hydrodynamic and sediment transport modeling, analysis of elevation change in the West Bay receiving area, analysis of surveys and discharge measurements in the conveyance channel, evaluation of alternatives outside of CWPPRA, and completion of the Diversion Closure Plan. An outline for the Work Plan will be available for the January 21, 2009 Task Force Meeting.

Mr. Holden opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark asked if material from the 2009 Pilottown Anchorage Area dredging event could be placed in West Bay to help hold more sediment in the area. Ms. Price replied: Yes.

Mr. Landers asked if other agencies would be given the opportunity to participate in the Work Plan development. Ms. Price said that they are currently developing scopes of work for the comprehensive effort and there is opportunity for input from other agencies. Ms. Goodman added that agency coordination and review can be included in the Work Plan.

Ms. Goodman pointed out that once the modeling is complete, it may be appropriate to modify the NEPA documentation.

Mr. Rhinehart said that partnership is paramount to the Work Plan's success. Information has been presented that shows opposing results on the shoaling issue. Technical details such as sediment transport and velocities must be understood. Mr. Clark and Mr. Constance agreed.

Mr. Rhinehart made an additional comment regarding funding and shoaling issues. He does not want to put restoration at odds with navigation by arguing over percentages to determine who should pay for shoaling. The Work Plan needs to identify the policy issues associated with addressing induced shoaling financially. Mr. Clark would like have a solution that is more than just saying that West Bay is causing a certain percentage of induced shoaling at the Pilottown Anchorage Area.

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

Mr. Ken Ragas, Plaquemines Parish, said that it seems like there is no way to model the impacts of diversions on the river system. There will never be a diversion at Buras, Port Sulphur, or Empire. The only way to deal with populated areas is to pump the sand via pipelines.

Mr. Dan Arceneaux, St. Bernard Parish Coastal Advisor, commented that the Corps knows how to control the river from Morganza to Cupids Gap. The Corps could dump the hopper dredges into West Bay to give Plaquemines Parish more sediment. Earlier in the meeting, Mr. Arceneaux commented that he felt that the West Bay Diversion was not properly designed from the start. He presented the Technical Committee with a sketch to explain why the sediment is settling at the anchorage area. He believes that the project is worth keeping, but needs to be redesigned so that the bulk of the sediment enters the marshes as needed. Mr. Clark commented that the project's current design reflects a concern of diverting too much water into this area.

9. Agenda Item 7. Report/Discussion: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Paul and Goodman). *Mr. Britt Paul will provide a status on the Brown Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project.* Mr. Paul asked Mr. Rhinehart to provide the update. Mr. Rhinehart reported that the State was not in favor of proceeding with the project, but that local stakeholders asked the State to reconsider. After reviewing new information, the State has developed potential alternatives for moving forward. The State is in the process of scheduling a meeting with the NRCS, the landowners, and stakeholders to discuss the project.

10. Agenda Item 8. Report/Discussion: Impacts of Hurricanes Gustav and Ike (Holden and Broussard). *Mr. Garrett Broussard, CPRA, will discuss the status of impacts of Hurricanes Gustav and Ike on CWPPRA projects.* Mr. Broussard reported that all 151 CWPPRA projects have been assessed for damages from Hurricanes Gustav and Ike. Overall, wetland projects fared well. Many projects had minor damage to signs and lights. There are 18 FEMA claims at an estimated value of \$60 million, with barrier island claims alone totaling \$40 million. Repairs will begin on existing projects with available funds. A meeting with FEMA will be held on December 8, 2008 to officially start the claim process.

Ms. Goodman opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Clark commented on the two large breaches that the local Drainage District cut into the Cameron-Creole levee to drain water from the watershed. Engineers have said that the water would have drained through the structures a few days later. It is controversial whether the cuts were needed in the first place. Mr. Clark asserted that the Drainage District should definitely bear the cost of repairing the levee. Mr. Broussard added that they did not ask permission and have agreed to repair the cuts.

Mr. Clark remarked that the FWS is moving forward with critical repairs using funds from the existing O&M budgets with the hope of being reimbursed by FEMA.

11. Agenda Item 9. Additional Agenda Items (Holden). Mr. Hartman initiated a discussion on the use of prioritization scores. He believes the prioritization process is outdated and recommended changing the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to eliminate the development of prioritization scores. Mr. Clark supported the idea.

Mr. Rhinehart commented that he agrees with doing away with the prioritization scores, but noted that the information used to develop the prioritization scores is still needed. Mr. Hartman agreed that the information should still be used in the decision-making process. Mr. Hartman does not want

to spend planning funds to develop prioritization scores that have become unnecessary. Mr. Britt voiced his agreement in doing away with prioritization scores.

Mr. Rhinehart noted that the State is developing a prioritization tool as part of their annual planning effort. Mr. Landers does not suggest replacing one tool with a new one, but is in favor of retiring the prioritization system. Mr. Landers suggested that the Academic Advisory Group provide input on the relative merits of candidate projects.

Mr. Clark noted that there is nothing preventing the Academic Advisory or Technical Advisory Workgroups from offering input now. Mr. Hartman added that the Academic Advisory Workgroup should be encouraged to point out concerns about various projects to aid the Technical Committee in the decision-making process.

Dr. Jenneke Visser agreed with Mr. Hartman and added that the prioritization score has outlived its usefulness. Dr. Visser offered to ask Academic Advisory Workgroup members to provide input on nominee and candidate projects next year. This task should not require additional funding.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made the motion to revise the SOP by removing the requirement for the Engineering Workgroup to develop prioritization scores for each project. Mr. Rhinehart seconded the motion. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

12. Agenda Item 10. Request for Public Comments (Holden). There were no additional public comments.

13. Agenda Item 11. Announcement: Priority Project List 19 Regional Planning Team (RPT) Meetings (Goodman). Ms. Goodman announced that the RPT meetings meeting would be held January 27-29, 2009. Meeting locations are included in the agenda (**Encl 1**). The Coast-wide RPT voting meeting will be held on February 18, 2009 in Baton Rouge.

14. Agenda Item 12. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Goodman). *The Task Force meeting will be held January 21, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana in the District Assembly Room (DARM).*

15. Agenda Item 13. Announcement: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Goodman). Dates and locations of future program meetings through April 2009 can be found on the agenda (**Encl 1**).

16. Agenda Item 14: Adjourn. Ms. Goodman adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.