

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 02 December 2009 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Thomas Holden opened the meeting at 9:50 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

- Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Mr. Ken Teague, sitting in for Mr. Brad Crawford, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
- Mr. Thomas Holden, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman
- 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. Holden reviewed the agenda items.

Mr. Rhinehart introduced Dr. Steve Mathies as the new executive director of the Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration.

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Agenda Item 2. Report: Status of Breaux Act Program Funds and Projects (Gay Browning, USACE). Ms. Gay Browning will provide an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding in the Planning and Construction Programs. Ms. Browning gave a brief funding status report and stated that at the end of the October Task Force meeting, with all approvals, there is \$104.6 million left. A more accurate idea of funding will be available after the FY 10 work allowance report is updated in December.

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

Mr. Paul asked about the status of money that was discussed to be returned from the Mud Lake Project at the October 28, 2009 Task Force meeting. He stated that there is currently a bid out to conduct operation and maintenance (O&M) work on that project. A fax vote will be sent to the Technical Committee requesting that money remain in the project and approval of an additional \$50,000 in funds for O&M.

Mr. Hartman asked about how today's funding decisions would affect the available funds. Ms. Browning answered that the current estimate of construction funds is \$104 million and that funding decisions made at this meeting would be subtracted from that amount.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Task Force Fax Vote Approving West Belle Pass Project Scope Change (Ms. Melanie Goodman, USACE). *During the October 28, 2009 Task Force meeting, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Louisiana Office of Coastal Protection and Restoration requested approval for a project scope change for the West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project due to an increase in the project cost. The Task Force deferred making a decision until a final economic analysis was completed and reviewed by the Economic Workgroup. This analysis was completed and the Task Force subsequently approved the project scope change by fax vote.* Ms. Goodman presented the fax vote and stated that the Task Force approved the scope change including an increase in wetland benefits from 299 acres to 305 acres and an increase in the estimated fully funded project cost from \$32,563,747 to \$42,250,417.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. No comments were made.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

5. Agenda Item 4. Report/Discussion: Status of the PPL 1 – West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) (Ms. Cherie Price, USACE). *Ms. Cherie Price will provide a status of the Pilottown Anchorage Area (PAA) dredging and a summary of the West Bay Work Plan, 6 month effort results.* Ms. Price reported that over the last six months, the New Orleans USACE District and the state have been executing a six month work plan effort to reevaluate the amount of shoaling induced by the West Bay Project. The six month actionable report was completed on November 25th and is now under peer review and review by the Technical Committee. Comments are due by December 31st. Dredging is currently underway in the PAA and will be completed soon. It is anticipated that 1.9 million cubic yards will be dredged from the area. As part of this dredging effort, a sediment retention island is being created in the receiving area. The six month work plan results will be presented at the January Task Force meeting.

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

Mr. Clark recommended that the Task Force address, as a decision item at the January meeting, continuation of the work plan on this project for at least another six months.

Mr. Rhinehart agreed that the draft report contains many findings and recommendations and suggested that before the January Task Force meeting, the major conclusions be summarized from the draft report for a more streamlined presentation to the Task Force.

Mr. Teague stated that the EPA supported Mr. Clark and Mr. Rhinehart's suggestions and reiterated that it is important for the Task Force and the Technical Committee to address extending the original six month work plan mandated by Task Force.

Mr. Hartman stated that the project may not require more funding, but that some recommendations, such as to complete the study, should be presented to the Task Force for

decision. He also reiterated that an excellent job has been done by all involved on this project throughout the analysis.

Mr. Holden and Mr. Clark asked if the report is available to the public. Ms. Price answered that a copy of the draft report is on the New Orleans District's public ftp site and that if a member of the public wants a copy, they can email her. Mr. Holden suggested that a copy of the draft report be disseminated through the Breaux Act. Ms. Price agreed that a copy could also be posted on the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) website under the West Bay Project. Ms. Goodman added that a notice will be sent via the Breaux Act *Newsflash*.

Mr. Holden highlighted that the USACE met the schedule for this project. He then added that the Technical Committee has asked for further clarification regarding questions on the draft report, specifically a more focused summary of conclusions/recommendations to present to the Task Force.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

6. Agenda Item 5. Report/Discussion: Status of Technical Committee Scope of Work for Review of the CWPPRA Monitoring Program (Richard Hartman, NMFS). At their October 28, 2009 meeting, the Task Force directed the Technical Committee to develop a scope of work and schedule, to be completed by December 3, 2009, for a plan to look at the estimated life cycle cost of Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS), and if CRMS and project specific monitoring are meeting CWPPRA Program needs in terms of being able to demonstrate if the program investment in coastal restoration projects has been successful.

Mr. Holden commended Mr. Hartman for taking a leadership role on this challenging task.

Mr. Hartman gave an overview of the action plan. He explained that the mandate from the Task Force was to provide a scope of work for approval at the next Task Force meeting for an action plan to evaluate the CRMS monitoring program. He explained that the Task Force mandate contained three aspects. First, cost reduction measures are to be investigated due to a CRMS monitoring budget increase (from approximately \$3.5 million to \$7 million). The OCPR has developed an itemized cost by monitoring element. The Workgroups and the Academic Advisory Committee will evaluate whether any monitoring stations can be eliminated or if monitoring could be done less frequently while still obtaining the same information from the program. In addition, the United States Geological Survey (USGS) is conducting a coherence analysis to determine if any of the randomly selected stations are providing redundant information and could be reduced.

The second mandate was to determine if the current monitoring efforts are providing sufficient data on which the Task Force can base project O&M decisions. Therefore, the scope of work will include an evaluation of whether projects have or need project specific monitoring components or CRMS monitoring data. OCPR and the Federal sponsoring agencies have representatives within the Monitoring Workgroup and the evaluation of project monitoring needs will be presented back to the Technical Committee who will then determine whether no monitoring,

project specific monitoring or CRMS monitoring is needed as a decision tool for making O&M budget decisions for each project and whether those monitoring needs are being met.

The third mandate was to identify cost sharing partners for monitoring activities. OCPR has provided a list of CRMS stations near LCA projects that are not yet funded, but have a timeline for implementation and could possibly be picked up by LCA as the projects get underway.

Actions not being considered in the scope of work at this time include: 1) a reduction in scope such that CWPPRA would only pay for CRMS sites within CWPPRA project sites; 2) a reduction in scope such that CWPPRA would only fund those monitoring elements useful in evaluating CWPPRA project success; and 3) changing the random design of CRMS monitoring stations. Additionally, individual project goal issues are not being considered as part of this evaluation.

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

Mr. Clark commented that while this evaluation will not change the random station design, there is a possibility of moving stations, but such a discussion will be addressed at a later date. He stated that he felt the action plan was in good shape and that the USFWS supports moving ahead with this scope of work.

Mr. Hartman stated that OCPR has already begun looking at the monitoring plan to see how the current monitoring is related to evaluation of project performance. He suggested that an update of the CWPPRA monitoring plan be given at all Technical Committee meetings in the future. Mr. Clark agreed.

Mr. Teague stated that the EPA supports identifying cost cutting opportunities and cost sharing, but that it is also important to proceed in a very careful fashion so as not to cripple the CRMS program in an effort to cut costs.

Mr. Rhinehart responded that the list of items not being considered indicates that the action plan recognizes that the integrity of the CRMS program must be maintained. He also stated that he supports cost saving measures and recommends that an update of these activities becomes a part of the annual budget request.

Mr. Hartman said that he is pleased to see OCPR taking up this effort, but asks that in addition to the annual report, OCPR notify the Technical Committee of any changes to the monitoring plan via an agenda item.

Mr. Clark stated that this action plan effort should be completed by the September 2010 Technical Committee meeting, if not before, so that a decision can be made at the September meeting. Mr. Hartman agreed.

Mr. Holden added that he will discuss with the USACE environmental lead for the hurricane system work how the CRMS monitoring may be affected by or nest into the hurricane system monitoring efforts in time for the spring Technical Committee meeting for discussion.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that LCA is considering CRMS monitoring as they evaluate monitoring plans for LCA projects.

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

Mr. W.P. Edwards III, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, asked if wetland loss effects from storm surge will be shown in the CRMS monitoring data if there are no CRMS stations in areas largely affected by storm surge. He explained that the CRMS stations are random, but coincidentally, none of the CRMS stations in Vermilion Parish were in areas most impacted by storm surge.

Mr. Greg Steyer, USGS, answered that coastwide data sets are available in addition to CRMS data. This additional data can be evaluated to obtain information for areas near sites that were not monitored under CRMS to help determine wetland loss in these areas.

Mr. Clark asked if these evaluations are done on an annual basis. Mr. Steyer replied that coastwide aerial photos are flown every three years, but satellite imagery is collected annually.

Mr. Hartman stated that this is an extra effort that was not budgeted, and it is expected that this expense will fall under the agencies' monitoring budgets. Mr. Hartman asked if the Academic Advisory Committee will need an increase in budget to cover these expenses. Dr. Jenneke Visser replied that there will be a small request of about \$20,000 to cover the expenses. Mr. Hartman requested that the budget request be prepared by the January Task Force meeting.

7. Agenda Item 6. Report: Floating Marsh Creation Demonstration Project (LA-05) – Presentation of Major Findings (Dr. Jenneke Visser). *The LA-05 project has reached the end of its final growing season and data collection. Dr. Jenneke Visser will present the major findings from this CWPPRA demonstration project.* Dr. Visser, chair of the Academic Advisory Committee, gave a report regarding field testing results. The objective of the project is to develop methods of restoring open water areas within existing thin and deteriorated floating marsh habitats. Studies at the Floating Marsh Creation Demonstration Project indicated that creation of floating marshes in fresh, open water can be accomplished. The use of planting pots was more advantageous at the beginning to establish root systems, but planting stems are more cost effective and were also successful in establishing plants. The full monitoring report will be presented at the end of March.

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

Mr. Hartman asked why plant material was not colonizing in the open water areas from the sides inward. Dr. Visser answered that wave action prevents colonization and the structures provide some protection long enough for roots to establish.

Mr. Hartman asked if information about species composition would be included in the report. Dr. Visser replied that about 28 different species were found within the project area and that information will be included in the report.

Mr. Hartman asked if a cost per acre value is being developed based on the cost of implementation and acres benefited. Dr. Visser answered yes.

Mr. Clark asked if some areas could be water hyacinth traps, and if placing empty platforms might slow wave action and trap hyacinth without planting *Panicum*. Dr. Visser answered that *Panicum* has strong roots and is advantageous in holding everything together.

Mr. Holden asked how far off an established vegetative shoreline floating marshes could be positioned to grow back into the existing marsh. Dr. Visser answered that the floating marsh structures are placed along the shorelines, but the relative width of the demonstration project is small.

Mr. Hartman asked about using items other than bamboo for the planting structures and asked how long it takes bamboo to break down in an aquatic environment. Dr. Visser said that the bamboo has not broken down and is still floating after four years. She added that their tests showed that other woods became water logged and sank.

Mr. Hartman asked if the material from the structures created a debris issue for landowners and hazard to boats. Dr. Visser answered that signage is needed for these areas.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if additional monitoring is necessary to keep track of whether wave action has deteriorated the floating marshes. Dr. Visser said that in addition to slowing wave action, nutria control is also needed. She recommended nutria trapping in areas with structures. Mr. Rhinehart commented that he saw a news story about sending nutria to China as a food source.

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

A member of the public asked how far the plants spread out into open water from the structures. Dr. Visser answered that about three meters of non-cohesive spread has been found, and that *Panicum* is now growing between structures (three to four feet apart) that were originally attached with rope.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, with Continental Land and Fur, stated that he is excited to see if something on a larger scale is possible. He stated that there is a need for plant protection, to stop high velocity water, and keep nutria out. He stated that Continental uses all mitigation to close breaches and stop water flow. He added that hyacinth overwhelms aquatics, so they want to control growth, but not spray all of them.

8. Agenda Item 7 Report/Discussion: Status of the PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycle II, IV, & V (CS-28-4&5) (Scott Wandell, USACE). Mr. Scott Wandell will provide a status on the construction of the permanent pipeline (Cycle II) and potential construction schedule for Cycles IV and V to meet the Calcasieu Ship Channel FY 11 maintenance cycle in winter of 2010/2011. Mr. Scott Wandell, USACE, the new project manager of the Sabine Marsh Creation Project, gave an overview of the status of the project. The construction cost estimate and cost share agreement have not been completed so no request for

funding Cycles IV and V will be made at this time. The project consists of five marsh creation sites in the Sabine Wildlife Refuge:

- Cycle I was completed in January 2002 and created 200 acres of marsh at a cost of \$3.4 million.
- Cycle II marsh creation was removed from the CWPPRA project in 2008 because the State agreed to pay for this portion. Construction on Cycle II is to begin in March 2010 and is expected to be completed by May 2010. Construction on the permanent pipeline began in summer of 2009 and is expected to be completed by early January 2010.
- Cycle III was completed in March 2007 and constructed 230 acres. Mr. Wandell is currently working on the cost estimate for gapping and creating containment dikes for that site.
- Cycles IV and V would construct 460 acres of marsh; the estimated cost is \$4 to 5 million. There are two alternative construction schedules based on three construction scenarios. After talking with the State and USFWS, they are considering constructing Cycles IV and V at the same time. Mr. Wandell will get all three scenario cost estimates by the January Task Force meeting and will request construction approval and funding at that meeting.

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

Mr. Clark stated that the cost estimates for both alternatives will be evaluated, but the cost may be lower if the permanent pipeline is used for both Cycles IV and V.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the plan is to use a temporary pipeline for Cycle II even if the permanent pipeline is expected to be completed by January. Mr. Wandell answered that using a temporary pipeline is the plan, because it is hard to access the permanent pipeline at the Cycle II reach. Mr. Rhinehart suggested considering the use of the permanent pipeline to save money. Ms. Goodman and Mr. Wandell agreed to check into the feasibility of utilizing the permanent pipeline.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification on the acreage for Cycles IV and V. Ms. Goodman answered that the combined acreage of both cycles is the 460 acres.

Mr. Holden stated that the USACE is committed to resolving the cost share agreement on this project and that he will give a status report at the next Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Holden added that the USACE is excited to work with the State on beneficial use projects despite recent reports that the USACE does not beneficially use material.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report/Discussion: Status of the PPL 9 – Weeks Bay MC and SP/Commercial Canal/Freshwater Redirection Project (TV-19) (Travis Creel, USACE). At the April 15, 2009 meeting, the Technical Committee granted a one-year extension on the Weeks Bay Project so Vermilion and Iberia Parishes could prepare a feasibility report using Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) funds. Mr. Travis Creel will provide a six month progress report on the Vermilion and Iberia Parish efforts. Mr. Creel stated that the last update was received in

October and that the funding request for the feasibility report is still under review; therefore, the request for funding will be made after the review.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee. There was no discussion.

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

Mr. W. P. Edwards III, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, stated that Iberia Parish has applied for and received \$100,000 in CIAP funds and that Vermilion Parish intends to base their grant application on Iberia's. He stated that there is a concept, but the engineers are waiting on funding to begin.

10. Agenda Item 9. Report/Discussion: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Melanie Goodman, USACE). The Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee will report on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects that have been experiencing project delays, including Corps projects that have been delayed due to Cost Sharing Agreement (CSA) issues. The Corps will provide a status on their CSA negotiations with the State and report to the P&E Subcommittee in May 2010 on the progress of those efforts. The P&E Subcommittee will also report on milestones they established for several projects and make recommendations on potential directions to take on program procedures and/or projects as outlined below:

a. The P&E Subcommittee recommends that all unconstructed pre-cash flow projects converting to cash-flow procedures due to scope changes be subject to 30% and 95% design review procedures. Ms. Goodman stated that the P&E Subcommittee will report on specific milestones and give an updated status of unconstructed projects at the next Technical Committee meeting. She then presented the P&E Subcommittee recommendation to change the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP). The SOP change would only affect two projects: West Point a la Hache and North Lake Boudreaux.

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

Mr. Clark recommended that since the project sponsors for these two projects have already agreed to 30 and 95 percent design review meetings, a SOP change may be unnecessary.

Mr. Hartman agreed that he prefers not to change the SOP since the only two affected projects sponsors have already agreed.

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

Mr. W. P. Edwards III, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, asked what stimulus money is available for CWPPRA coastal restoration projects. Mr. Rhinehart responded that stimulus money often has stipulations that certain parameters must be met, such as economic development and urban

drainage features, for which many of the CWPPRA projects do not meet the criteria; however, efforts are always undertaken to try to maximize stimulus funding for these projects.

No action was taken by the Technical Committee on the P&E Subcommittee recommendations.

b. The P&E Subcommittee recommends that de-authorization procedures be initiated for the following projects:

1. MR-13 Benney's Bay Sediment Diversion Project (USACE)
2. PO-32 Lake Borgne MRGO Shoreline (USACE)

Ms. Goodman presented the P&E Subcommittee recommendation for de-authorization on the Benney's Bay and Lake Borgne Projects. She added that the Weeks Bay Project also remains on the recommended deauthorization list. The Benney's Bay Project is recommended for de-authorization because the shoaling impacts are higher than the scope of CWPPRA with an estimated O&M amount exceeding \$200 million. The Lake Borgne Project is recommended for de-authorization because the project originally included protecting two reaches of shoreline, but the USACE used supplemental funds after Hurricanes Rita and Katrina to construct one reach and the only remaining reach is located inside the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO). The goal was to prevent further erosion due to heavy boat traffic. Since the MRGO has been closed to boat traffic and the reach is being evaluated under the MRGO restoration feasibility study, it is recommended that the project be removed from CWPPRA.

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

Mr. Rhinehart stated that he felt de-authorizing the Benney's Bay Project sends a message that CWPPRA is not going to do anything relative to the Mississippi River (River) and diversions because of induced shoaling. He added that based on recent efforts and discussions regarding the West Bay Project and shoaling on the River, he thinks it would be premature to deauthorize this project.

Mr. Clark agreed and added that it does not cost CWPPRA to leave the project on the list since there is only about \$100,000 left in the project budget, which is not a substantial amount of money that would get returned into the CWPPRA budget if the project was deauthorized.

Mr. Teague asked what the cost estimate for induced shoaling is technically based on, and how it is related to the discussions regarding the West Bay Project. Mr. Holden responded that these questions will be answered after the public has had the opportunity to review the West Bay Report. He explained that the objective is to develop a hydrologic study of the River and that there is a need to manage the River for a variety of factors, including a better understanding that there is not a linear relationship between removing a volume of water sediment flow from the River and induced shoaling. Mr. Holden agreed that it is premature to deauthorize the Benney's Bay Project at this time since impacts to the River based on other projects are still unknown.

Mr. Rhinehart applauded the USACE for taking a more systematic approach when looking at the River.

Mr. Holden suggested that West Bay data be reviewed and evaluated to see how that information can be used for other projects on the River because there is a need to understand the impacts of all projects to the River system as a whole. He cautioned that you can only tweak the river system as major changes may lead to unintended results.

Mr. Hartman agreed that deauthorization is not recommended at this time, but asked that the remaining \$100,000 be added back into the CWPPRA Program budget. Mr. Clark responded that the remaining money may be needed for a small updated modeling effort now that the West Bay data is available. Ms. Goodman agreed that the West Bay data would be added to the model for the Benney's Bay Project.

Mr. Holden asked that the motion include a task to look at what money was still needed and determine if any funds could be returned to the CWPPRA Program budget.

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

Mr. P. J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in favor of the Benney's Bay Project. He stated that the Parish was against deauthorization of the Spanish Pass Project in the past as well because constant, non-storm related flooding is threatening industry in that area and has led Chevron to consider leaving the area.

Mr. Teague asked for clarification about the milestones. Ms. Goodman answered that the P&E Subcommittee was not making recommendations to the Technical Committee on the milestones at this time, but that there would be follow up with the P&E Subcommittee. Mr. Clark agreed that the milestones did not need to be discussed in detail at this time.

Mr. Clark made a motion to keep the Benney's Bay Project on the PPL and requested that the sponsors determine if any money could be returned to the CWPPRA Program budget. Mr. Hartman pointed out that no motion was necessary since the project is currently on the list. Mr. Holden agreed that the State and USACE will review the remaining project funds and report back at a future meeting.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to approve deauthorization of the PO-32 Lake Borgne MRGO Shoreline Project. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Hartman commented that cost share agreements between the USACE and the State are holding up projects and he wants the public to understand that they are working to resolve this issue. He stated that an update will be given at the next Technical Committee meeting.

Ms. Goodman stated that at the October 28, 2009 Task Force meeting, it was voted to deauthorize the Brown Lake Project, but that the letters for public comment have not been sent out yet. She stated that the 30-day comment period should be concluded by the January Task Force meeting.

11. Agenda Item 10. Discussion/Decision: 19th Priority Project List (Tom Holden, USACE). The Environmental Workgroup Chairman will present an overview of the ten PPL 19 candidate projects and three PPL 19 candidate demonstration projects. The Technical Committee will vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force for selecting PPL 19 projects for Phase I Engineering and Design. Mr. John Jurgensen presented the ten PPL 19 candidate projects:

- a) Fritchie Marsh Terracing and Marsh Creation Project (Region 1) – Project features include approximately 130,000 linear feet of terraces, 450 net acres of marsh creation over the project life, and the addition of culverts. The fully funded project cost is \$24 million.
- b) Labranche East Marsh Creation Project (Region 1) – Project features include marsh creation and the introduction of 10,000 linear feet of tidal creeks. The project would benefit 931 acres of marsh and will result in 715 net acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$32 million.
- c) Monsecour Siphon (Region 2) – The project includes construction of a 2,000 cubic foot per second (cfs) maximum flow siphon from the Mississippi River into an outfall area. The project would benefit 12,255 acres of marsh and create approximately 990 net acres of marsh over the project life. The fully funded project cost is \$11 million.
- d) Dedicated Sediment Delivery and Water Conveyance for Marsh Creation Near Big Mar Project (Region 2) – The project includes hydraulically dredging material from Lake Lery to create 434 acres of marsh. A 7,850 foot long conveyance channel would be cut across Big Mar to better convey and distribute the material from the Caernarvon structure to areas further west. The project would benefit 6,311 acres of marsh and create approximately 853 net acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$20 million.
- e) Breton Marsh Restoration Project (Region 2) – The project includes creating 436 acres of marsh by hydraulically dredging material from Lake Lery. The project should create/protect 275 acres of marsh over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$15 million.
- f) Bayou Dupont to Bayou Barataria Marsh Creation Project (Region 2) – This project would create approximately 311 acres of marsh, contain 200 acres of marsh nourishment and restore 19 acres of bottomland hardwood ridge using dredged material. The project would create/protect 292 acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$38 million.
- g) Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration Project (Region 2) – This project would take material from the Gulf of Mexico and create beach/dune platforms and marsh. The project will benefit 408 acres of island beach/dune and back barrier marsh and adjacent open water and create/protect 234 acres of beach/dune and back barrier marsh over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$44 million.

- h) Lost Lake Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration Project (Region 3) – Project features include 465 acres of marsh creation between Lake Pagie and Bayou DeCade, replacement of six fixed-crest weirs and two plugs with variable crest structures to increase freshwater sediment delivery, and the construction of 30,000 linear feet of terraces. The project will create/protect 750 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$23 million.
- i) Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project (Region 4) – Project features include creating 401 acres of marsh with material from the Gulf of Mexico. The project will create 279 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$26 million.
- j) Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation Project (Region 4) – This project will take material from Calcasieu Lake to create and nourish 617 acres of marsh. The project will create/protect approximately 550 net acres over the 20-year project life. The fully funded project cost is \$23 million.

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

Mr. Hartman asked what actions have been taken on the LaBranche Project to prevent impoundment and/or breaches in the containment dikes by landowners, which has happened in the past on other projects. Mr. Jurgensen answered that the surrounding landowners have been spoken to and that full containment may not be needed in this area. Mr. Jurgensen added that the project includes a component for breach in the containment by year three. He also answered that the permittee will be the parish, the landowner, or the conservation district.

Mr. Hartman followed up by asking about landowners blocking breaches with debris. Mr. Jurgensen answered that if this project is chosen, then the concern about this matter will be addressed with the involved entities and landowners. Mr. Hartman reiterated that there is much concern over landowners impounding marsh creation projects in the past and that it needs to be addressed.

Mr. Hartman commented that the Monsecour Siphon Project overlaps with the LCA White Ditch area and cautioned that some agencies may vote against the Monsecour Project because of that, but clarified that the cost estimate on White Ditch is so high that it may require reauthorization and is therefore not definite. Mr. Holden expressed concern over this comment and stated that there is an ongoing study and it is premature to present the White Ditch status in this forum.

Mr. Hartman asked if there was an expectation that the Monsecour diversion would have to be modeled under the Mississippi River modeling effort prior to construction. Mr. Teague answered that the EPA does not have a significant concern over small diversions, but that he can see how some agencies may request modeling on the River for diversions.

Mr. Holden agreed that it is important to look at diverting water out of the River and that the USACE believes it is a technical issue that should be reviewed under the technical evaluation. He added that a diversion is just one aspect of river management that needs to be considered and that no diversion should be categorized as small; all diversions should be evaluated.

Mr. Teague clarified that this project has a maximum diversion of 2,000 cfs.

Mr. Clark asked how the CWPPRA White Ditch Project relates to the Monsecour Project. Mr. Jurgensen answered that they anticipate the two projects to work synergistically. Mr. Teague agreed.

Mr. Hartman asked if there was any concern regarding the high salinities of Gulf water being used for the Freshwater Bayou Project. Mr. W. P. Edwards, III answered that after Hurricanes Rita and Ike, he had less concerns and the long-term impact should be softened.

Mr. Hartman asked about public opposition to using Calcasieu Lake as a borrow site for the Cameron-Creole Project since Calcasieu Lake is a specially designated spotted sea trout fishery. Mr. Clark answered that the project would return eroded material from the Cameron-Creole watershed that has been lost into the Lake and that while the public's reaction is unknown, USFWS, the Federal sponsor for the project, will work with agencies to determine a suitable borrow site within the Lake.

Mr. Rhinehart asked how the Monsecour Project interacts with the Bertrandville Project and expressed concern over duplication of effort and cost inefficiencies. Mr. Teague answered that there may be some overlap, but it is believed the area can handle both siphons. Mr. Teague added that the driver for the Monsecour Project is the opportunity to use the River resources for a sustainable ecosystem restoration in an easy and inexpensive manner which is not always available.

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

Mr. Phil Prect, manager of Louisiana Land Exploration Properties in southeast Louisiana, stated that his organization owns a large area of land in southeast Louisiana and is fully committed to supporting coastal restoration and hurricane levee protection projects. He spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont, Cheniere Ronquille, and Lost Lake Projects.

Mr. Hartman asked if Mr. Prect was supportive of the replacement of the water control structures on Lost Lake. Mr. Prect answered yes.

Mr. P. J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in favor of the following projects in order of least to most importance to Plaquemines Parish: Monsecour Siphon, Breton Marsh Restoration, Dedicated Sediment Delivery System, and the Cheniere Ronquille Project. The Cheniere Ronquille project encompasses not only a restoration feature, but also storm surge feature which is important to Plaquemines Parish.

Mr. Brian Fortson, environmental specialist for St. Tammany Parish, spoke in favor of the Fritsche Marsh Terracing Project. The project is important to the entire Ponchartrain Basin as to surge protection, habitat, and water quality. This area was also identified by CWPPRA early on as an important area to protect.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, spoke in support of the Lost Lake Marsh Creation Project and pointed out that the project has support from landowners, Terrebonne Parish, and other coastal advocacy groups. The project is one of the final links in a chain that will provide a strong buffer against storm activity and freshwater intrusion, is a cost effective project, and is the only project nominated within Terrebonne Parish which has one of the higher annual land loss rates.

Mr. W. P. Edwards III, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, spoke in support of the Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project.

Mr. Gerald Butand, President of the Vermilion Parish Police Jury, spoke in support of the Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project to protect the Mermentau Basin.

Mr. Sherrill Sagrera, Vermilion Parish Coastal Advisory, spoke in support of the Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project.

Mr. Allan Ensminger spoke in favor of the LaBranche East Marsh Creation Project and stated that he represents the Monteleone family, the landowner at that Project, and that they have supported CWPPRA from the beginning. He added that past projects in that area have been a success. He also stated that he serves on the Crescent Soil and Water Conservation District Board and as an officer of the Louisiana Landowners Association and supports building as many of the projects as possible because the nominee projects are all good projects.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont Project. The project would restore some of the Barataria Ridge function that was cut to make the Barataria Waterway, as well as restore marshes in the area, reduce tidal exchange, and help hold in sediments from the Naomi Siphon. The project is supported by landowners, Lafitte, Barataria, and Crown Point. She also stated that Jefferson Parish supports the LaBranche East Marsh Creation Project. The project would protect I-10 (a major evacuation route) and St. Charles and Jefferson Parishes from storm surge out of Lake Ponchartrain. The project is also highly visible to the public.

Mr. Kerry St. Pe', Director of the Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program (BTNEP), spoke in favor of the Bayou Dupont, Cheniere Ronquille, and the Lost Lake Projects. The best place to get sediments for marsh creation is the Mississippi River so it would be judicious to look into building infrastructure on both sides of the River that could take advantage of using these sediments to create marshes in the future.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish, spoke in support of several projects in order of importance: the Cheniere Ronquille Project because barrier islands are the first line of defense; the Dedicated Delivery Near the Big Mar because of Hurricane Katrina damage; the Breton Sound Marsh Creation Project because it is important to build marsh and duck habitat; and the Monsecour Siphon Project because there is no river water flushing this area out so the area is stagnant and mosquito infested.

Mr. Hartman suggested that the Technical Committee table recommending funding for a demonstration project this year because there is a NRCS shoreline protection demonstration project going to Request for Proposal (RFP) soon that will include designs identified on the currently nominated demonstration projects. Mr. Clark and Mr. Teague agreed.

Mr. Rhinehart asked about the NRCS project. Mr. Paul responded that the project will soon release an RFP for shoreline protection, non-rock alternative, which could include any type of shoreline protection product.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to not recommend a demonstration project to the Task Force for funding this year. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Ms. Goodman explained that each agency will rank projects from highest (6) to lowest (1). Projects will be chosen based first on the number of agencies that voted for that project and in the event of a tie, the project with the highest summary of points will be chosen. The top four nominee projects will be selected for recommendation at the January 2010 Task Force meeting as the selected projects to move forward for PPL 19 Phase I Engineering and Design.

Voting Results

Ms. Melanie Goodman, USACE, presented the agency voting results. The top projects are listed below in order by the number of agency votes with the summary of points shown in parentheses.

The top four candidate projects were:

1. Lost Lake Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration Project - 6 agency votes (20)
2. Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project - 5 agency votes (20)
3. Labranche East Marsh Creation Project - 5 agency votes (16)
4. Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration Project - 4 agency votes (16)

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend the top four projects to the Task Force as the selected PPL 19 projects for Phase I Engineering and Design (Lost Lake Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration Project, Freshwater Bayou Marsh Creation Project, Labranche East Marsh Creation Habitat Enhancement Project, and Chenier Ronquille Barrier Shoreline Restoration and Marsh Creation Project). Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. The results of the Technical Committee decision will be reported to the Task Force.

12. Agenda Item 11. Discussion/Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Tom Holden, USACE). 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.

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Construct Start Date	Total Fully Funded Cost Est.	Net Benefit Acres	Total Cost per Acre
NRCS	BA-27c(4)	9	Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 - CU 8	Aug-10	\$20,498,664	107	\$191,576
NRCS	CS-49 (1)	18	Cameron-Creole Fresh Water Intro, Vegetative Plantings - CU 1	Aug-10	\$1,147,096	40	\$28,677
COE	TV-11b	9	Freshwater Bayou Canal, Freshwater Bayou Lock and Belle Isle Canal	Sep-10	\$38,065,335	241	\$157,947
NRCS	TE-43	10	GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne	Oct-10	\$13,022,246	65	\$200,342
EPA	TE-47	11	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration	Jan-11	\$61,750,785	195	\$316,671
FWS	ME-20	11	South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration	Aug-10	\$29,046,128	352	\$82,517
NMFS	TE-52	16	West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration	Jun-10	\$42,250,417	305	\$138,5268

Each sponsoring agency presented an overview of the seven candidate projects.

Mr. Paul Kasbar, EPA, gave an overview of the Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration Project. The project is located in Region 3. This area is considered to be one of the most rapidly deteriorating areas with a rate of land loss of approximately 31 acres per year. The project will demonstrate the feasibility of using the Ship Shoal sediment as a viable source for restoration. Project features include restoring barrier island to create a continuous protective barrier, reduce wave energies, enhance longshore sediment transport, restore roughly 500 acres of barrier island and provide sustainable barrier island habitat. The project would benefit 703 acres of barrier island and shallow water habitat. The project should be constructed now because barrier islands are the first line of defense and the design plans in place are still current, but additional deterioration may make the design outdated.

Mr. Teague added that a number of Louisiana coastal restoration panels have strongly recommended the use of Ship Shoal sand for barrier island restoration and that there are a number of peer reviews and scientific publications in support of this. To date, neither CWPPRA nor anyone else has used this material.

A representative from NRCS gave an overview of the Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 – CU 8. The project is located in Region 2. The CU 8 portion of this project represents the last area to be funded for construction and the goal is to reduce or eliminate shoreline erosion. The project features 14,800 feet of rock dike and revetment along the west bank of Bayou Perot and the north shore of Little Lake and four site-specific organism drainage openings. Beneficial use of dredge material may result in the creation of an additional 38 acres of marsh. The project should be constructed now because of the high erosion rate in this area, and the delay in funding has already caused construction costs to increase by 120 percent. The project is an example of CWPPRA using multiple years of funding to accomplish a goal greater than just the footprint of a single project. The fully funded Phase II cost is \$20.5 million, and the fully funded Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$16.6 million.

Mr. Troy Mallach, NRCS, gave an overview of the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Intro, Vegetative Plantings CU1 located in Region 4. Since flooding from Hurricanes Rita and Ike, much of the proposed planting area has yet to re-vegetate. The project will re-vegetate approximately 200 acres of suitable marsh substrate by expediting vegetative plantings to accelerate re-establishment of plant cover and prevent continued soil and elevation loss. The project features two applications of targeted plantings. The project is a part of the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction Project, but is being requested separately due to concern over jeopardizing the potential to restore this area while waiting on the engineering and design aspects of the larger project. The project should be constructed now because these organic soils are vulnerable and without planting, it is believed this area will permanently become open water. The fully funded Phase II cost is \$1.1 million, and the fully funded Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$990,199.

Mr. Travis Creel, USACE, gave an overview of the Freshwater Bayou Canal, Freshwater Bayou Lock and Belle Isle Canal Project. The project features approximately 40,000 linear feet of rock dike to stop shoreline erosion along the east bank of the Freshwater Bayou Canal from Belle Isle Bayou to the Lock structure at the Gulf. The original project included hydrologic restoration features which were dropped after initial design review. Breaches in the bank allow boat wakes to push turbid, high salinity waters into the interior wetlands causing marsh loss and decreasing submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) coverage. The project will complement other existing and planned projects in the area. The fully funded cost estimate is \$38 million, and the total cost per acre is \$157,947.

Mr. Ron Boustany, NRCS, gave an overview of the GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne Project. The project is located in Region 3. Deterioration of the southern bankline of the GIWW threatens floatant marshes of the Penchant Basin and short-circuits freshwater conveyance from the Atchafalaya River to the east. The project features installation of 8,833 linear feet of shoreline protection along the southern bank of the GIWW. Approximately 14,500 feet of the original project have been incorporated into CIAP and some areas were removed from the project to cut costs since those areas are lined with cypress trees and were determined to be in fairly good condition. The project should be constructed now because it is a unique opportunity to partner with CIAP and CWPPRA will only be responsible for construction of approximately 38 percent of the original project. The fully funded Phase II cost is \$11.2 million, and the fully funded Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$9.5 million.

Mr. Darryl Clark, USFWS, gave an overview of the South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration Project. The project goal is to restore marsh, reduce marsh loss, and to improve marsh productivity by introducing freshwater, nutrients, and sediment from the Mermentau River at Upper Mud Lake. The project will also protect marsh and reduce salinities, increase productivity in SAV and restore marsh by dredge material from the Gulf. One freshwater introduction area has been removed from the project because modeling showed that it would not be effective and the culverts under Highway 82 were changed from two 48 inch to four 42 inch to increase flow. The fully funded cost is \$29 million, and the Phase II Increment 1 cost is \$27.3 million.

Ms. Cheryl Brodnax, NMFS, gave an overview of the West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration Project. The project goals are to rebuild the barrier headland west of Belle Pass, remedy the current land loss rate, re-establish lost back barrier marsh, reduce shoreline erosion along the adjacent interior marshes, buffer adjacent infrastructure and navigation channel, and repair several tidal inlets and breaches that have occurred in the headland. The project is located in an area that will remain unrestored by other programs if it is not addressed through CWPPRA. The project should be constructed now while there is still an existing platform to build on and this barrier headland directly protects infrastructure and communities.

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

Mr. M. O. Miller, II, M. O. Miller Estate Family Property, spoke in support of the South Grand Chenier Project and stated that millions of private dollars have been spent over the years for terracing, levee repairs, culverts, etc. and that the Miller Estate has had an active management plan in place for the past eight to ten years.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, spoke in support of the Ship Shoal Whiskey Island Project. The project is time sensitive and becoming more expensive to build as time goes on. The LCA project in the Whiskey Island area will not be ready to ask for funding until at least FY 2011 and approval of the CWPPRA Project would allow a more comprehensive approach in conjunction with the LCA project. Though this project is expensive for CWPPRA, there have been precedents for these amounts on past projects in the Barataria area.

Mr. W. P. Edwards III, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, spoke in favor of the Freshwater Bayou Canal Project. The project has been on the list the longest and if chosen, Vermilion Parish will do whatever it can to make the project successful.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of the Barataria Basin Landbridge. This is the last piece of the landbridge and the rest of the project has been successful thus far.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, land manager for Continental Land and Fur, spoke in favor of the GIWW Bank Restoration Project. The thin mat floating marshes in this area can not survive in the high velocity waters generated by boat traffic on the GIWW and the real component of this project is to stop water movement into the adjacent floating marsh. The project also meets the State's Master Plan objective of protecting and maintaining the banks along navigation channels. Compared to other CWPPRA projects, this project will have immediate benefits and will actually benefit more acres of floating marsh than shown so that the true cost effectiveness is higher.

Mr. Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, spoke in support of the Cameron-Creole Freshwater Project. The project is cost effective and presents a unique opportunity to colonize the mud flat with *Spartina alterniflora* at this time.

Mr. Kerry St. Pe', Director of BTNEP, spoke in favor of three projects in order of importance: West Belle Pass Project because once the barrier shoreline is gone, it is gone forever and will open the Timbalier Bay (he also supported this project on behalf of the LaFourche Parish Coastal

Zone), GIWW Project which would protect floating marshes from washing away and have benefits beyond protecting shoreline, and the Barataria Basin Landbridge project which is the completion of a project that has been recognized as being critical.

Ms. Goodman explained that each agency will rank projects from highest (6) to lowest (1). Projects will be chosen based first on the number of agencies that voted for that project and in the event of a tie, the project with the highest summary of points will be chosen. The top four nominee projects will be selected for recommendation at the January 2010 Task Force meeting as the selected projects to move forward for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding. She explained that the starting budget today is \$94 million and that moving down the presented spreadsheet, after the fifth project there is \$3 million left.

Voting Results

Ms. Melanie Goodman, USACE, presented the agency voting results. The top projects are listed below in order by the number of agency votes with the summary of points shown in parentheses.

The top five candidate projects were:

1. Cameron-Creole Freshwater Intro, Vegetative Plantings (CU-1) - 6 agency votes (14)
2. Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3 (CU-8) - 5 agency votes (10)
3. West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration - 4 agency votes (12)
4. South Grand Cheniere Hydrologic Restoration - 4 agency votes (8)
5. GIWW Bank Restoration of Critical Areas in Terrebonne – 2 agency votes (7)

Mr. Paul recommended that the top five projects be sent to the Task Force for approval so that more projects can be constructed. Mr. Hartman disagreed and stated that more than \$3 million should be left in the budget for future cost overruns to avoid borrowing against future projects and recommended only selecting the top four projects so that \$12 million is left.

Mr. Clark asked what the total amount of cost overruns in 2009 were. Ms. Browning answered that she was not sure. Mr. Clark added that CWPPRA can borrow against future funds because in the past there has been up to \$100 million in obligated, but unencumbered funds and that he thinks it is great that there are four or five projects that can be constructed.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that the fifth project was only voted for by two agencies.

Mr. Teague stated that EPA does not support funding the fifth project.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that the most important part of CWPPRA is building projects and that there is enough flexibility in the program to borrow from future funds. He added that all of the nominee projects are good projects to have gotten to a Phase II level and he supports recommending the fifth project for funding.

Mr. Holden pointed out that the fourth project is heavily dependent on dredging and that cost estimates for dredging have gone up lately and are difficult to plan for. He agreed that all of the projects are good projects, but the USACE does not support the risk of approving the fifth project at this time.

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

Mr. Greg Linscombe, land manager for Continental Land and Fur, supported building the fifth project since the goal of CWPPRA is to build projects.

Ms. Browning reminded the Technical Committee that last December CWPPRA took a \$32 million cut over the life of the program in forecast funding and that the new forecasts will be released in December.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, supported recommending the fifth project because the GIWW Project would allow more freshwater into Terrebonne Parish which is isolated from most freshwater sources.

Mr. W. P. Edwards III, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, spoke in favor of recommending the fifth project because the delay in building projects always increases the cost and if the money is available now, then the project should be built now.

Mr. Kerry St. Pe', Director of BTNEP, spoke in favor of approving the fifth project since the GIWW Project would bring in freshwater from the Atchafalya River which is the only source of freshwater to Terrebonne Parish.

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend the top five projects to the Task Force as the selected projects for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. Mr. Paul, Mr. Rhinehart, and Mr. Clark voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Holden, Mr. Teague, and Mr. Hartman opposed. The motion failed to pass.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend the top four projects to the Task Force as the selected projects for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Cameron-Creole Freshwater Intro, Vegetative Plantings, Barataria Basin Landbridge, Phase 3, West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration, South Grand Cheniere Hydrologic Restoration). Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. The results of the Technical Committee decision will be reported to the Task Force.

Mr. Greg Linscombe, land manager for Continental Land and Fur, asked about Robert's Rules of Order where normally the chair only votes in a tie. Mr. Holden agreed, but stated that in this case he wanted the USACE vote registered.

13. Agenda Item 12. Additional Agenda Items (Tom Holden, USACE).

a. Report/Discussion: Update on a Potential Change in Project Scope for the Bio-Engineered Oyster Reef Demonstration Project (LA-08) Due to an Estimated Budget Increase (Richard Hartman, NMFS). Since the September Technical Committee meeting, the NMFS and

OCPR have been working to modify the design for the Bio-Engineered Oyster Reef Demonstration Project. The current design is going through engineering work group review so final costs are not yet available. Dr. John Foret will make a presentation on the current status of the engineering and design and the estimated increase in project construction cost. The Technical Committee will have the opportunity to discuss and ask questions at this time. An increase in project costs and construction approval would be requested at a later date.

Mr. Hartman explained that at the last Task Force meeting, the Task Force directed the project sponsors to reevaluate the project and look for cost savings.

Dr. John Foret, with NMFS, gave an overview of this reevaluation and explained that by reducing the width of the units from a 65 to 35 foot footprint, cost savings can be realized. He explained that the design height, location and method would remain the same, but that reducing the width any further would hurt the structural integrity of the units. He also stated that the wave reduction design criteria was reduced from 50 to 45 percent. The budget is currently under review and will be presented at a later date for a cost increase request.

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

Mr. Teague asked if any monitoring was included in the project budget. Dr. Foret answered that the monitoring budget is \$328,000 for this project.

Mr. Clark thanked the project sponsors for conducting the redesign.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to comments from the public. There were no public comments.

14. Agenda Item 13. Request for Public Comments (Thomas Holden, USACE). There were no public comments.

15. Agenda Item 14. Priority Project List 20 Regional Planning Team Meetings (Melanie Goodman, USACE). Ms. Goodman reviewed the dates and times for upcoming Regional Planning Team Meetings and pointed out that the Region III meeting is usually held in Morgan City, but will be held in Houma this year.

January 26, 2010	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Rockefeller Refuge
January 27, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Houma
January 28, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 28, 2010	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 24, 2010	10:00 a.m.	RPT Voting Meeting	Baton Rouge

16. Agenda Item 15. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Melanie Goodman, USACE). *The Task Force meeting will be held January 20, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. at the USACE, 7400 Leake Ave., New Orleans, Louisiana in the District Assembly Room (DARM).*

17. Agenda Item 16. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Melanie Goodman, USACE). Ms. Goodman announced that the times and dates of upcoming CWPPRA Program meetings are as listed below and in the agenda.

January 20, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
January 26, 2010	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Rockefeller Refuge
January 27, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Houma
January 28, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 28, 2010	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 24, 2010	10:00 a.m.	RPT Voting Meeting	Baton Rouge
April 24, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
June 2, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 22, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 27, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
November 16, 2010	7:00 p.m.	PPL 20 Public Meeting	Abbeville
November 17, 2010	7:00 p.m.	PPL 20 Public Meeting	New Orleans
December 1, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge

18. Agenda Item 17. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Holden adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:25 p.m.