

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 20 April 2010 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Mr. Thomas Holden, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman
Ms. Karen McCormick, 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. Holden introduced the members of the Technical Committee and welcomed Karen McCormick as the new EPA representative to the Technical Committee. Mr. Holden then presented Brad Crawford with a certificate of commendation for his service on the Technical Committee from June 2009 to April 2010. The Technical Committee then stood for photos.

Ms. Goodman explained that the Technical Committee meeting was being videotaped for Colonel Lee's incoming replacement. She also stated that more photos will be taken over the next several meetings.

Mr. Holden stated that this evening there will be a Dan Rather Reports on television in which dredge material related information would be featured. The title of the program is "Mississippi Mud".

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

Mr. Clark asked for a highlight of updates made since the draft agenda was sent to the Technical Committee members. Ms. Goodman answered that Agenda Item 13 was updated to include the preliminary report on the Monitoring Work Group CWPPRA Monitoring Program Evaluation.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that the Technical Committee was tasked at the last Task Force meeting to meet with the Outreach Committee to discuss its budget and strategic plan and that this item is not on the agenda for discussion. Ms. Goodman responded that this could be covered under Agenda Item 8.

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

3. Agenda Item 1. Report: Status of Breaux Act Program Funds and Projects (Gay Browning, USACE). Ms. Browning provided 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 of the construction budget and stated that there are no funding requests on today's agenda.

Including the fiscal year (FY) 10 Federal work allowance, there is a deficit of \$12.9 million Federal funding. With clean up of de-authorized and completed construction projects, approximately \$22.1 million will be returned. There will then be a \$5.9 million Federal surplus. The State match is already included. Thus far, in FY10 CWPPRA has obligated \$84 million for construction and is planning for another \$22 million for three upcoming construction projects. At the end of the year, there should be approximately \$65 million in unobligated funds. With the current approved estimates funded, there is currently a deficit of \$22.4 million through the life of the Program. She added that in December there was cut in the future Federal funding, but new funding forecasts are released in June.

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

Mr. Clark clarified that the budget shows if all projects in engineering and design are fully funded for the 20 year funding, then \$22.4 million is left, but that in reality some of the projects will be de-authorized or transferred to other programs. Ms. Browning clarified that the numbers do not include the future forecast for the West Bay Project, but do include the current Maurepas Project estimate. She added that the FY10 Federal work allowance funds have not yet been received.

Mr. Holden stated that while this is a bookkeeping exercise now, future forecast numbers become more important each year. He then asked about forecast amounts from agency return of unused construction funds. Ms. Browning answered that about \$20 million is to be returned, but that it takes time to coordinate the return of funds.

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

4. Agenda Item 2. Report: Task Force Fax Vote Approving a Scope Change for the CWPPRA Bio-Engineered Oyster Reef Demo Project (Melanie Goodman, USACE). Ms. Goodman reported on a recent Task Force fax vote to approve a change in project scope to increase the CWPPRA Priority Project List (PPL) 17 Bio-Engineered Oyster Reef Demonstration Project (LA-08) budget as requested by the NMFS and the LAOCPR.

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

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

5. Agenda Item 3. Report: Task Force Fax Vote Approving Construction of the CWPPRA Enhancement of Barrier Island Vegetation Demonstration Project (Melanie Goodman, USACE). Ms. Goodman reported on a recent Task Force fax vote to approve construction of the CWPPRA

by the EPA and the LAOPCR.

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

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

6. Agenda Item 4. Report: Status of Lake Portage Evaluation (Britt Paul, NRCS). Mr. Paul provided a status update on the Lake Portage Land Bridge (TV-17) Project. Mr. Paul reported that the project was brought before the Technical Committee and remanded to the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups for further evaluation. A field trip was scheduled and cancelled several times due to weather. Mr. Paul reported that a mud wave has filled the land bridge cuts and suggested the project update be put on hold until conditions allow for field trip evaluation.

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

Mr. Clark asked if current conditions indicate that the original focus of the field trip (to evaluate filling the cuts) is no longer a concern. Mr. Paul responded that the cuts are currently filled, but there is no way to know how long the mud will stay in place. The area was eroding and there were some connections, but these are now closed. Mr. Paul suggested the project be put on hold until there is a need for reevaluation. He added that the project would not be closed and that there is no money left to be returned to the Program since the purpose of the field trip was to consider whether or not to proceed with the next phase.

The Technical Committee agreed to no further action on the project until conditions change and the NRCS determines it necessary to initiate continued evaluation.

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

7. Agenda Item 5. Report: Project Update for PPL 11 – River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp Project (PO-29) (Brad Crawford, EPA, Kirk Rhinehart, OCPR, and Tom Holden, USACE). The EPA, in coordination with the State of Louisiana, provided a status update on the River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp Project design and gap analysis efforts. Mr. Crawford reported that the EPA was tasked with conducting a gap analysis and addressing the 30% design comments. He added that after some delay with the agency agreements, the project is ready to proceed from an EPA standpoint, that the USACE proposal is acceptable, and that after money is transferred to the USACE, they will be ready to proceed with the gap analysis

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

Mr. Rhinehart reported that the State has a contract with URS to continue with the design work. Mr. Holden asked when the 95% plans and specifications are expected to be ready. Mr. Rhinehart answered that a 12 to 18 month timeframe is anticipated.

Mr. Holden explained that as money is received from the Department of the Interior and is distributed by the USACE, it becomes designated for a certain purpose and the USACE can not get a return of the funds. Thus, the money for this project is now considered EPA money based on how the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) was set up. There was a delay, but an agreement has now been reached such that the funds can be returned to the USACE. Once the USACE receives the funds, it will complete the gap analysis. The intention is that the project will be transferred to the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Program after 95% design and that LCA will then build the Hope Canal.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that the State would like to keep the project in the CWPPRA program through the 95% design, which should be ready as early as FY11 or as late as the following year.

Mr. Holden remarked that as the chair of the Task Force, Colonel Lee has a responsibility to inform Congress that this project will be transferred from the CWPPRA authority to the LCA authority. The Technical Committee will advise the Task Force that the gap analysis and design will be conducted and that the transfer is anticipated to be on October 1, 2011, which is the start of Federal FY12.

Mr. Hartman asked if additional CWPPRA money would be needed to move forward. Mr. Holden and Mr. Rhinehart responded, no.

Mr. Hartman asked if this effort was in addition to the Blind River Project. Mr. Holden answered, yes.

Mr. Holden stated that this matter would be presented to the Task Force at the June meeting and that if the Task Force agreed, the Task Force chair would then inform Congress.

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

8. Agenda Item 6. Report: Status of the PPL 1 – West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) (Travis Creel, USACE). *The USACE provided a status report on the West Bay Project, including development of project closure plans and the on-going modeling work plan effort.* Mr. Creel reported that the USACE is moving forward with the second phase of the Task Force approved Work Plan for the West Bay Project. He added that the State has requested additional areas outside of the original scope of work be added at South Pass and Pass A Loutre and that if the State agrees to cost share this additional portion, it could be included. The State's Science and Technology (S&T) Program will pay for the additional scope.

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

Mr. Rhinehart stated that when the results of the West Bay study were presented, some holes were present in the areas of South Pass and Pass A Loutre. He suggested the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force maximization of the West Bay study effort by including these additional items. Mr. Clark responded that if money is available from the State then this is a great idea.

Mr. Holden suggested the Technical Committee inform the Task Force at the June meeting of the current status and highlight the advantages of adding this work to the ongoing study effort.

Ms. Goodman clarified that this additional work is not anticipated to slow down the work plan effort previously approved by the Task Force.

Mr. Creel reported that the Task Force approved closure of the West Bay Diversion during the 2010 low water season. Currently, the USACE is working on a closure plan, looking at alternatives for engineering and design, and collecting data. The USACE will also have to do a supplemental environmental assessment (EA). There was previously a contingency closure plan with an EA for emergency closure, but that EA can not be used since it only covers specific emergency conditions. The current schedule is to prepare the EA and plans and specifications from April to June, ask for Task Force funding at the end of June, and then bid the project in August. There also may be additional land rights requirements before the diversion can be closed. The best case time line is six months and the worst case is nine months.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification on the land rights delay. Mr. Creel answered that a dredge disposal easement and perpetual channel easement were acquired, but the two do not overlap. There are no conditions to fill the diversion within the channel easement.

Mr. Holden responded that the USACE is fairly confident that they can work through the EA and are looking at methods of closure. There may be impacts to project footprint, but no alternatives have been finalized. He also stated that the Mississippi (MS) River Commissioners will need to be briefed and that there is a possibility that the land rights issue could delay closure until next year's low water season unless a low water winter makes closure possible sooner. He added that closing the Diversion for the present reasons was never envisioned and therefore, the emergency closure plan does not account for this.

Mr. Clark asked for an overview of the preferred closure alternatives. Mr. Creel answered that there are currently three conceptual alternatives, including: rock closure in the receiving area, earthen closure in the receiving area, or filling the channel and restoring the natural levee with an earthen closure or rock dam; however, no geotechnical or survey data has been collected. The engineering department is going to have to look at the data and then evaluate the alternatives.

Mr. Hartman cautioned that a year delay will mean dredging the anchorage area again and warned that this extra cost must be taken into account when evaluating alternatives. He asked that the USACE be as cost effective as possible when evaluating closure alternatives.

Mr. Rhinehart asked about the operation and maintenance (O&M) costs and liability associated with the alternatives. Mr. Creel responded that such information is not yet available. Mr. Rhinehart asked if there is a possibility that the O&M costs and liability for a closure structure would reside with CWPPRA. Ms. Goodman responded that the cost responsibilities will depend on how closely the closure alignment is to the preexisting condition and that once alternative designs are developed, costs and responsibilities will be evaluated.

Mr. Rhinehart asked that closure alternatives be evaluated to avoid CWPPRA O&M costs and liability. He added that the design should be something that could revert back to the Mississippi River and Tributary (MR&T) authority for O&M and that this should be a focus of the closure efforts.

Mr. Hartman stated that when the USACE certifies the closure design, he hopes it would become a USACE project, no longer held by CWPPRA. Mr. Holden agreed that it is the intent to remove the project from CWPPRA and back under MR&T responsibility after closure. He added that there is no desire for CWPPRA to cover post-closure O&M, but that the details regarding O&M are not yet available.

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

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, pointed out that the West Bay Diversion took eleven years to study, but is being considered for closure after only seven years. He inquired about the fate of other diversions along the MS River if this diversion cannot be successful. He added that Colonel Lee attended a field trip at the diversion and that during the trip, alternatives to closure were discussed.

Earl Armstrong, Plaquemines Parish, stated that when the diversion was first cut, it was very large and since nothing was ever done to help the diversion work properly, the diversion created its own path. If this diversion is closed, there is nothing to help West Bay or the west side of the MS River which is gradually depleting and losing trees. He stated that the diversion was cut, but not controlled. He encouraged the Technical Committee to find solutions that would allow the diversion to remain open. He advised that the diversion should have been cut smaller and then evaluated and widened over time. He added that the island constructed last year from dredged material has helped, but that cuts added to the island have widened significantly already. If the island was not cut, he believes there would have been a chance for sediment buildup behind the island. He reiterated that an alternative should be sought to narrow the diversion and keep it open. He added that something needs to be done for Plaquemines Parish to hold the River together, such as with ridges and trees, because it takes the brunt of every storm.

Mr. Clark stated that though there are many reasons to close the diversion, the largest reason is the cost of dredging the anchorage and the rapid growth of the receiving area. He agreed that islands should have been constructed in year one of the project and last year was too late.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, encouraged the Technical Committee to come to Plaquemines Parish to investigate alternatives to closure.

Mr. Sean Duffy, Gulf States Maritime Association (GSMA), pointed out that the navigation industry has never requested closure of the diversion, but only that the dredging agreement be honored. He agreed that islands and shreds should have been constructed sooner. He stated that this is an experimental diversion on the River and the navigation industry will remain skeptical until they see a sediment diversion that works as designed. He added that he sent a letter to Congress asking them to allow the USACE to dredge the anchorage. He stated that the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Act of 2010 covers beneficial use of dredged material and that if more

money is added to the trust fund, more money may be available to dredge the anchorage which is the driving reason behind the closure. The navigation industry wants to see the diversion work.

John Hebert, resident of Algiers Parish and Jefferson Parish landowner, stated that he fishes and hunts in the area and believes conditions will worsen if the diversion is closed. He added that if the diversion is closed, sediment that could be getting to the west side will be lost and open gulf will develop in Bay Adams. He reiterated that closing the diversion is cutting the west side's throat and that salt water intrusion will kill all oysters in the areas.

There were no further public comments.

Mr. Holden summarized that the Task Force voted to close the diversion for a variety of reasons. The diversion study has taught more lessons about the River than any other study. This data is the good news from the West Bay Diversion Project, but unfortunately the diversion was not controlled. Lessons learned are that future diversions need to be controlled, need O&M plans, and need money to conduct such activities. He added that the commissioners have gotten the message and are not against diversions. They do understand that the diversion did have some indications of performance before Hurricane Katrina, but now the water flow is five times what was intended. He added that the CWPPRA Program has some special challenges and may not be the most appropriate forum for diversion projects.

Mr. Hartman stated that the CWPPRA Program has limited funds and that it can no longer afford to invest the money necessary to sustain the West Bay dredging requirements. He added that if there were certainty of funds from other sources, perhaps the story would be different. He also pointed out that the substantial funds required for the diversion limits the funds available to other CWPPRA projects.

Mr. Clark reiterated that the USFWS supports sediment and freshwater diversions, but that the cost for West Bay has been skyrocketing and that the CWPPRA Program can no longer sustain such a large project that is not providing measurable benefits.

9. Agenda Item 7. Report: Status on USACE and State of Louisiana Cost Sharing Agreement (CSA) Negotiations (Tom Holden, USACE). Mr. Holden provided a status update on negotiations between the USACE and the State of Louisiana to resolve issues that have delayed completion of model CSA's for USACE sponsored CWPPRA Cash Flow Projects. Mr. Holden stated that the USACE and State have continued to work through issues regarding CSA negotiations and the hold harmless and indemnification clauses. In general, they have established a verbal agreement as to how to proceed forward. The State is to reduce this agreement to writing and provide to the USACE.

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

Mr. Clark asked if negotiations were one sided or had give and take on both sides. Mr. Holden stated that both sides are giving and that the USACE is currently waiting on the written agreement from the State.

Mr. Rhinehart clarified that the agreement under consideration is a path for moving forward in elevating negotiations to D.C. level resolution and not the actual CSA. He added that the indemnification issue is unique to USACE contracts and unique post-Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. Holden summarized that progress is being made. He added that the USACE presents to Capital Hill twice per year and that this year is the first time all delegation members were briefed on the CWPPRA projects, funding status, and future funding challenges.

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

10. Agenda Item 8. Discussion: Initial Discussion of FY11 Planning Budget Development (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Melanie Goodman, USACE). *The FY11 Planning Program Budget development, including the PPL 21 Process, will be initiated.* Ms. Goodman pointed out that planning for the FY12 budget report to Congress should begin in FY11 since the FY11 budget report was grossly delayed and recommended that the FY12 budget report be partially funded in FY11 to get a head start. The Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee is going to look to trim the planning budget as best they can and will try to keep the budget within the \$5 million annual limit.

There is an anticipated FY10 carryover of \$540,000 into FY11, with a possible extra \$1.8 million in agency budgets that have not been expended, suggesting that planning is not spending as much money as previously thought. The P&E Subcommittee would like feedback from the Technical Committee before presenting the planning budget to the Task Force. After this meeting, the P&E Subcommittee will develop a FY11 budget approach to present to the Technical Committee prior to submission to the Task Force. She added that the Task Force also directed the Technical Committee and P&E Subcommittee to vet the outreach budget before presentation to the Task Force.

Ms. Goodman presented the following list of P&E Subcommittee brainstorm ideas to reduce the planning budget:

- Apply a 10% across-the-board budget cut for all agencies, allowing agencies to determine where to make cuts.
- Apply a flat line budget to all agencies on certain planning tasks, where each agency would receive the same flat amount of funds for those tasks. There is concern that this may reduce agency participation in planning efforts.
- Evaluate current USACE Geographic Information System (GIS) support efforts to determine if CWPPRA needs are being met; alternatively, move GIS from the planning budget to the construction budget since many GIS efforts support the construction phase of projects. The GIS program currently supports 2.5 full time employees.
- Evaluate the Outreach Program to streamline the budget.
- Evaluate other support services for the CWPPRA program for cost savings.
- Rearrange Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings to be held over two days versus three days.
- Eliminate the November PPL public meetings where the voting results are presented to the public and instead post the results on the internet and through public notice.

- Skip a PPL cycle or stretch a cycle to be longer than one year.
- Eliminate candidate demonstration projects in FY11.
- Integrate Technical Committee and Task Force meetings into one meeting.
- Convert paper meeting binders into an electronic version.
- Eliminate candidate project helicopter surveys.
- Minimize the number of agency representatives that attend field trips and work group meetings.

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

Mr. Clark stated that the best alternatives would be an across the board percentage cut or flat line budgets for certain planning tasks. He added that the GIS reductions could be studied, but that currently, the GIS staff has received increased requests. He also stated that there is not a large cost savings to condensing the public meetings into fewer days. He added that the project helicopter surveys could be eliminated if all agencies agreed.

Mr. Paul asked that the P&E Subcommittee research these options further and present more information before the Technical Committee weighs in. Particularly, he asked to see an estimate of the cost savings for each option and an overview of how much the entire budget needs to be reduced.

Mr. Hartman stated that some of the options do not have a lot of potential benefit. He suggested the P&E Subcommittee apply last year's budget to this year and then evaluate additional budget reductions.

Mr. Paul agreed that not all supporting functions are still necessary.

Mr. Hartman, Mr. Paul, and Mr. Clark agreed that they disliked the option to extend the PPL process beyond one year. Mr. Clark added that the P&E Subcommittee should evaluate supplemental support functions and that new support functions may not be sustainable. Mr. Hartman suggested starting with a plan to have one full time equivalent (FTE) for GIS and then if additional GIS work is needed, an explanation would be required as to why an additional FTE is needed.

Mr. Holden suggested the P&E Subcommittee recognize that they must meet the \$5 million budget, establish a priority list of items, starting with essential functions, and then evaluate the items that fall below the \$5 million budget line. He reiterated that it may be an easier analysis to remove everything and then add items back in based on priority, thus, the non-essential items under the \$5 million budget line could change from year to year as needed.

Ms. Goodman stated that money is returned to the program every year from the planning budgets and that the areas where money is returned need to be evaluated for potential budget reductions.

Ms. Rachel Sweeny, NMFS, advised that the P&E Subcommittee is looking for specific guidance from the Technical Committee in this matter.

Ms. Michelle Fisher, with United States Geographic Survey (USGS), stated that the GIS group also provides support to CWPPRA beyond the PPL process. She added that before this year, the GIS group had 2.5 employees, but is already looking to reduce staff to cut costs.

Mr. Holden stated that the USACE has a billable account for GIS where work is assessed to specific projects. He added that there is a risk of having to add money to projects if not enough GIS is budgeted for. Mr. Hartman suggested that additional GIS could come out of project construction budgets.

Mr. Holden suggested that one option would be to make GIS a separate project outside of the planning budget. He added that support functions need to be evaluated and eliminated if no longer needed for the Program.

Mr. Hartman reiterated that the P&E Subcommittee should start with last year's budget because it represents a cost reduction when inflation is considered and then look at supplemental functions and cost cutting opportunities.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that it would be beneficial to first look at inefficiencies and redundancies in the CWPPRA Program and then focus on necessary functions to start at the \$5 million baseline. He suggested looking for redundancies in areas such as GIS where multiple agencies have the same data. He added that he would like the P&E Subcommittee to evaluate how data is being communicated and any overlap between agencies.

Mr. Holden summarized that the P&E Subcommittee will make cost saving recommendations to the Technical Committee and then the Technical Committee will evaluate and make a recommendation to the Task Force.

Mr. Hartman expressed concern that the Technical Committee had not met with the Outreach Committee to evaluate specifics of the outreach budget and potential SOP changes as directed by Task Force.

Mr. Clark asked if the Technical Committee has been provided with the Outreach Committee's strategic vision. Ms. Goodman replied that she will send the strategic vision to the Technical Committee.

Scott Wilson, with the Outreach Committee, stated that last year the Outreach Committee reduced their budget by 8 to 10 % and will continue to look for ways to reduce costs.

Ms. Goodman and Mr. Wilson will arrange a meeting between the Outreach Committee and the Technical Committee between now and June to discuss the outreach budget, plan, strategic vision, and potential SOP changes.

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

Mr. Mark Schleifstein, with the Times-Picayune, expressed concern and encouraged the Technical Committee not to cut the outreach budget because the public needs to understand what

is happening with CWPPRA projects. He added that outreach is especially important due to cutbacks in the mainstream media (such as newspapers) and that CWPPRA outreach informs the public of projects in other programs, such as LCA.

11. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 20 (Melanie Goodman, USACE, and Angela Trahan, USFWS). The Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits of the PPL 20 Project Nominees and Demonstration Project Nominees listed below. The Technical Committee will select 10 projects and up to 3 demonstration projects as PPL 20 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects that will be approved for Phase I (Planning and Engineering and Design). Ms. Trahan gave a brief overview of the PPL 20 nominee and demonstration projects.

Mr. Holden opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee and the public for each project.

Region	Basin	PPL 20 Nominees
1	Pontchartrain	Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project
1	Pontchartrain	Unknown Pass to Rigolets Shoreline Protection
1	Pontchartrain	New Orleans Land Bridge Shoreline Stabilization and Marsh Creation Project
2	Mississippi River Delta	Coastwide Planting Project
2	Mississippi River Delta	Beneficial Use of MS River Dredge Material via Hopper Dredge Pumpout Stations
2	Breton Sound	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation
2	Breton Sound	Monsecour Siphon
2	Barataria	Bayou L'Ours Ridge Restoration and Terracing
2	Barataria	Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 3
2	Barataria	Home Place Marsh Creation
3	Terrebonne	Lake Barre Marsh Creation
3	Terrebonne	Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation-Nourishment Project
3	Terrebonne	Bayou Terrebonne Diversion Project
3	Atchafalaya	West Wax Lake Wetlands Diversion
3	Teche-Vermilion	Cole's Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration
3	Teche-Vermilion	Cote Blanche Freshwater and Sediment Introduction and Shoreline Protection Project
4	Mermentau	Lower Mud Lake Terracing and Bankline Stabilization
4	Mermentau	Rockefeller Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization, Joseph's Harbor East
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration

PPL 20 Demonstration Project Nominees		
Coastwide	DEMO	Floating Island Environmental Solutions Biohaven©
Coastwide	DEMO	Ecosystems Wave Attenuator
Coastwide	DEMO	The Wave Robber Wave Suppressor Sediment Collection System
Coastwide	DEMO	Use of Sand Derived from Pulverized Glass As Beach Nourishment on Barrier Island Restoration Projects

Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project (Region 1) –This project would consist of placing hydraulically dredged sediment from Lake Pontchartrain into open water sites to create approximately 418 acres of emergent marsh and nourish an additional 42 acres. Several larger historic marsh ponds have been identified and containment dikes would be proposed to re-create these historic ponds. Tidal creeks are also proposed to connect these ponds to facilitate water and fisheries exchange. Containment dikes would be sufficiently gapped or degraded to allow for fisheries access no later than three years post construction. The project will benefit 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$30 to \$35 million.

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish Government environmental specialist, supports this project and stated that this project has been made more imperative by a recent breach in the Lake Pontchartrain shoreline. He cautioned that if the breach grows larger in the future, there will be further reduction of interior marshes.

Unknown Pass to Rigolets Shoreline Protection (Region 1) – The project features will consist of construction of a foreshore rock dike (21,085 feet) along the shoreline of Lake Borgne. Material dredged for access to the shoreline will be beneficially used to create approximately 65 acres of marsh, planted with vegetation appropriate for a brackish marsh. The project will benefit 100 to 150 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$25 to \$30 million.

Wynecta Fisher, City of New Orleans, stated that the City prefers this project over the Land Bridge Shoreline Stabilization and Marsh Creation Project, adding that the Rigolets Project complements two other projects in the area.

New Orleans Land Bridge Shoreline Stabilization and Marsh Creation Project (Region 1) – The project will include installation of approximately 7,183 linear feet of rock along the northwestern shoreline of the New Orleans Land Bridge and placement of fill to create/restore/nourish approximately 65 acres of wetlands. The project will benefit 50 to 100 net acres over the 20-year project life, and the fully funded project cost is \$10 to \$15 million.

There were no comments.

Coast-wide Planting Project – The project will provide a consistent annual mechanism for vegetative planting projects through the CWPPRA Program designed to implement targeted restoration planting efforts. The project would set up an advisory panel consisting of representatives from various State and Federal agencies to assist in selection of projects for funding. The project would also set up a mechanism by which project nominations would be submitted for consideration. The panel would provide an annual report on project activities. The project will benefit 500 to 550 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$15 to \$20 million.

There were no comments.

Beneficial Use of Mississippi River Dredge Material via Hopper Dredge Pumpout Stations (Region 2) - The project would create four mooring/pumpout sites along either side of the MS River and Main Pass in the vicinity of Head of Passes, West Bay and East Bay. These pumpout stations would be a mooring anchor with a pipe floating in the water that would be hoisted up to the ship for pumpout. CWPPRA would pay for the incremental portion of the pumpout cost for a set amount of sediment. The project will benefit 750 to 800 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$25 to \$30 million.

Mr. Holden stated that the USACE has looked at this project because, as of today, the USACE is already working in the vicinity of this project.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, stated that this project is in a great location and that work is already being conducted in the area so Plaquemines Parish is very much in favor of this project.

Mr. Sean Duffy, GSMA, stated that the navigation industry has discussed this project and have notes and input from the subgroup to offer. They think it is a good project, would like to see it move forward, and see communication and cooperation with the pilots to ensure they are comfortable with this step. He added that South Pass is not currently being dredged even though it is one of the passes qualified under the trust fund.

Mr. Roy Frischhertz, resident of Jefferson Parish, supports this project in conjunction with the Coast-wide Planting Project. He added that if material is dredged and placed, it also needs to be planted or it will be washed away. Mr. Clark responded that this is the initial stage and those issues will be fleshed out in later phases.

Mr. Holden noted that hopper dredge pumping is always on the table for the USACE and the State for O&M activities and that it is something both the navigation industry and the USACE support. He added that hopper dredge pumping can be performed outside of the CWPPRA Program with a CSA between the USACE and the State.

Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation (Region 2) - The project would create/nourish 493 acres of marsh along the western shore of Lake Lery, using material dredged from Lake Lery, and vegetative plantings. Temporary containment dikes will be constructed *in situ* around the marsh creation/nourishment areas and will be gapped within three years of construction to allow greater tidal exchange and estuarine organism access. The project will benefit 350 to 400 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$20 to \$25 million.

Mr. William McCartney, St. Bernard Parish Government, stated that this is a smart project because it plays off of other projects already in progress in the area.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, supports this project.

Monsecour Siphon (Region 2) - The project features a 2,000 cubic foot per second (cfs) maximum capacity siphon from the MS River that empties into the marsh. A conveyance channel will be constructed at the siphon outflow to aid in delivery of MS River water. Additional features may be required to aid the delivery and management of siphon discharge throughout the outfall area. This project is estimated to introduce, on average, 1,145 cfs of water per day from the MS River, providing an estimated 68% reduction in land loss rate. The project will benefit 950 to 1,000 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$10 to \$15 million.

Mr. David Haspel, Haspel & Davis Milling & Planting, supports this project because it is needed to correct saltwater intrusion and hurricane flooding in the area. There is no levee in this area so floodwater surges through, killing trees and animals.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, supports this project because the siphon mimics the MS River which this area needs. He added that this is the number one supported project for Plaquemines Parish and that this siphon is something that can be controlled versus a large diversion like West Bay.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish, stated that this is her number one supported project and added that the area is infested with mosquitoes and needs the siphon.

Mr. William McCartney, St. Bernard Parish Government, spoke in support of this project.

Mr. Roy Frischhertz, resident of Jefferson Parish, stated that this area suffered serious damage after Hurricane Katrina and that the siphon could do much to restore the area. He added that he whole-heartedly supports restoring this area and creating flood protection. He expressed concern that the impact of the siphon may be to back water up in the area and suggested adding levees to the marsh side of this area.

Mr. John Hebert, resident of Algiers Parish and Jefferson Parish landowner, stated that this project would be money extremely well spent since the siphon impacts go for miles, encouraging vegetation and growing coontail grass that helps prevent damage from wave action.

Bayou L'Ours Ridge Restoration and Terracing (Region 2) – The purpose of this project is to permanently close off three gaps. Two additional gaps will be decreased in size and armored to prevent any further scouring. A 462-acre terracing field, consisting of approximately 42,500 linear feet of terraces will be constructed south of the ridge to provide additional protection. The bankline of the canal south of closure four will be restored to prevent salt water intrusion into the terracing field. The project will benefit 0 to 50 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$10 to \$15 million.

Mr. Nicholas Matherne, Lafourche Parish Government, supports this project because it would restore the natural function and hydrology of the area and close the gaps. He added that marsh habitat could thrive north of here and that it is Lafourche Parish's number one supported project.

Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 3 (Region 2) - The project will create and/or nourish approximately 501 acres of marsh, 10 acres of tidal ponds, and 10,000 linear feet of tidal creeks by hydraulically pumping sediment from the MS River into the shallow water marsh creation area. The project will utilize the existing pipeline crossing that was constructed for an adjacent project. Containment dikes will be constructed around the marsh creation area to keep material on site during pumping and tidal creeks and ponds will be constructed. Once pumping has been completed, containment dikes will be degraded to the current platform elevation and gaps will be made in the containment dike, hydraulically connecting the constructed tidal creeks to the adjacent water. Additionally, newly constructed marsh will be assessed to determine if vegetative plantings are needed. Funds are budgeted to plant 50% of the created marsh. The project will benefit 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$40 to \$50 million.

Mr. Tom Halko, citizen of Jefferson Parish, supports this project and generally supports anything that would effect the Barataria Bay and Estuary. He added that this project has multiple benefits, including flood protection, coastal and wetland protection, restoring the natural ridge, and giving more support to the levee system. He stated that what acts as one community's flood protection can increase another community's risk of flood. The activities north of Barataria to protect those communities are creating backwater systems which are draining rainwater into the southern communities so that anything south of this area will add protection and mitigate some of the results of the activities to the north.

Mr. Mike Jeansonne, landowner in the area, stated that in conjunction with the Naomi Siphon, marshes north of this area are being restored astoundingly well. He added that current efforts have shut off a lot of tidal flow and that this project would be another link in the chain to help with the protection already underway.

Mr. John Hebert, resident of Algiers Parish and Jefferson Parish landowner, stated that the bridge will provide hurricane protection to the people and residences, and not just the marshes, of Algiers and Jefferson Parishes.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, asked why the pipeline was picked up and inquired as to whether it would be possible to coordinate with parishes to keep pipe in place and better coordinate moving it from project to project.

Mr. Henry "Skip" Haller, Madison Land Company, found the pipeline removal disheartening. He added that it would be better to put river sediment into marshes and hopes that some of this sediment comes to Jefferson Parish.

Mr. Rhinehart responded that for the Dupont Project, a small amount of infrastructure was left in place which is a step in the right direction. He added that the State is looking at other methods of efficiency to avoid mobilization and demobilization costs. He stated that in this case, there was no new project nearby to move the pipeline to, but that the State is looking to better sequence projects and do long term leases of dredging equipment to reduce costs. He expressed appreciation for the public's comments.

Mr. Woody Crews, Jefferson Parish Marine Fisheries Advisory Board, was delighted to hear this project was at a conceptual stage. He commended the comments regarding more efficient use of the pipelines. He added that pipelines used to fill areas of the land bridge are inevitable and while there are many band-aid solutions, sediment delivery is the only new tool available. He would like to see some permanency in the pipeline infrastructure in areas where there will be much effort over a long period of time.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that this is the Parish's number one supported project. She added that the project would use the existing pipeline crossing and that there is a Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) project that is investigating technology to put a permanent pipeline in place for pumping. She added that this project would provide a second line of defense to Plaquemines, Orleans, and Jefferson Parishes and would build expand on the previous BA 39 project.

Jason Smith, Board Coordinator for the Jefferson Parish Marine and Fisheries Advisory Board, stated there are many other projects that would work in conjunction with this project to create a line of defense, such as South of the Pen Shoreline and the other Bayou Dupont Project. This project will create protection for areas on the west bank of Jefferson and Orleans Parishes. He stated support for this project on behalf of the Mayor of Jean Lafitte.

Home Place Marsh Creation (Region 2) – Material for marsh creation and nourishment will be excavated from the MS River to create 215 acres of marsh and 35 acres of marsh nourishment. The project will benefit 200 to 250 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$30 to \$35 million.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, stated that this is Plaquemines Parish’s number two supported project.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish, supports this project because this area needs attention and will become open water if nothing is done.

Lake Barre Marsh Creation (Region 3) - The project will use dedicated dredging from either Lake Barre or Madison Bay to create 364 acres and nourish 252 acres saline marsh in three subareas. Fill areas were selected to maintain a continuous landform between Madison and Terrebonne Bays, create marsh in open water areas, and nourish fragmenting marsh. Cell configuration is also based on historic conditions. The project will benefit 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$30 to \$35 million.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that this is Terrebonne Parish’s number one supported project. This area sustains the highest average annual rate of land loss in the State. She also spoke in support of the Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation Project since it is not the first time Terrebonne Bay has been on the nominee project list.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the Lake Barre Project is subsumed by the Terrebonne Bay Project. Mr. Clark responded that there is some overlap. Mr. Rhinehart expressed concern that this is an area with critical needs and two similar projects. He added that the Technical Committee needs to be cognizant of overlaps in the PPL process and combine projects when needed so that votes do not get split, thus losing both projects.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that in the past, the Terrebonne Bay project features had some issues, but that there is now a different approach.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that he would support a larger project now that is a combination of the two smaller projects which could then be reduced as needed in later phases of evaluation.

Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation – Nourishment Project (Region 3) – The project would create a higher marsh along approximately 35,000 feet of shoreline along the northern bank of Terrebonne Bay. North of the shoreline, 235 acres of emergent marsh would be created in shallow open water and 550 acres of emergent marsh would be nourished by hydraulic dredge.

All constructed containment dikes would be sufficiently gapped or degraded not later than three years post-construction to allow for fisheries access. This could be part one of a phased comprehensive plan to protect the northern shoreline of Terrebonne Bay from further erosion. The project would also work synergistically with the previously constructed CWPPRA Terrebonne Bay Demo Project (TE-45) which is adjacent to this proposed project allowing that project to be expanded. If the TE-45 project was expanded without this project first being built, there is a reasonable chance that the marshes could be separated from the shoreline protection component and become isolated. The project will benefit 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$25 to \$30 million.

There were no comments.

Bayou Terrebonne Diversion Project (Region 3) – The project will construct a freshwater diversion to move freshwater, nutrients and sediments originating largely from the Atchafalaya River via the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) and Bayou Terrebonne into the Montegut Unit marshes in Central Terrebonne. The project will include construction of a diversion structure to manage an average of 250 cfs of freshwater flow through an underground conduit a distance of approximately 1,200 feet from the bayou to the northern extent of the marsh. The project will benefit 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$10 to \$15 million.

There were no comments.

West Wax Lake Wetlands Diversion Project (Region 3) - The purpose of this project is to restore and maintain hydrologic connection between Wax Lake Outlet (Atchafalaya River water) and distributary channels to sustain hydrologic processes and wetlands. The project will benefit 100 to 150 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$10 to \$15 million.

Karen Wicker, Vice-President of Coastal Environments, Inc., stated that when the USACE dredged this area in 1941, it initiated diversion which has subsequently filled almost all of Wax Lake. As the Wax Lake Outlet is filled, the three channels bringing freshwater, nutrients, and sediment to this area are being cut off. While not technically a diversion project, this project will enhance other projects, is consistent with State and Federal plans for enhancement, and benefits 24,000 acres of land. She supports the project which is also consistent with three other projects in the area. This project would help preserve the interior marsh while these other three projects are helping to restore the shoreline.

Linda Ditsworth, St. Mary Land & Exploration Company, stated that the Company relies on freshwater, sediment, and nutrient introduction and that without this project moving forward, St. Mary land is exposed to further shoreline erosion.

Paul Naquin, St. Mary Parish President, stated that this project is very needed in St. Mary Parish. He added that St. Mary Parish took a hard hit from Hurricanes Katrina, Ike, Gustav, and Rita and that most of the freshwater marshes are not coming back as they did in the past after storms; fish species are down and more saltwater is getting into St. Mary Parish. He stated that this project

will work with the Wax Lake Outlet to create delta and is the number one supported project for St. Mary Parish.

Catherine Siracusa, St. Mary Parish Black Bear Conflict Program, stated that this project will help maintain habitat for the Louisiana black bear.

Cole's Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration (Region 3) – The project will create 335 acres of intermediate marsh in existing open water areas via dedicated dredging with borrow from Vermilion Bay. Approximately 30,000 feet of terraces are proposed in shallow open water areas to reduce pond enlargement, which is estimated to create about 30 acres of wetland. Project features would include a 10,600 foot rock dike along the eastern shore of Freshwater Bayou and flap-gated culverts installed at locations along Freshwater Bayou Canal and through spoil banks in the northwestern portion of the project area to provide conduits for freshwater and sediment introduction. The project will benefit 300 to 350 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$40 to \$50 million.

There were no comments.

Cote Blanche Freshwater and Sediment Introduction and Shoreline Protection Project (Region 3) – The project includes channel enlargement, spoil bank gapping, and/or structural measures where necessary to increase freshwater and sediment input from the GIWW into interior Cote Blanche marshes and optimize distribution through multiple avenues to further reduce emergent marsh loss and accelerate sediment accretion to promote land building in isolated areas. Project features include construction of approximately 26,400 linear feet of armored protection parallel to the northern shoreline of East Cote Blanche Bay. The project will benefit 600 to 650 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$20 to \$25 million.

Paul Naquin, St. Mary Parish President, stated that this project is similar to the Wax Lake Project by bringing freshwater and sediment from the GIWW into the area. He added that PPL 9 or 10 had a project that did some work around the base shore in this area and asked the Technical Committee to consider extending that effort with this project.

Catherine Siracusa, St. Mary Parish Black Bear Conflict Program, stated that this project will also help maintain critical habitat for the Louisiana black bear within St. Mary Parish.

Lower Mud Lake Terracing and Bankline Stabilization (Region 4) – This project includes dredging distributary channels and constructing 36,000 linear feet of 60 foot-wide terraces to establish approximately 50 acres of emergent marsh and maximize sedimentation within the project area. Approximately 5,500 linear feet of shoreline protection would also be constructed along the west bank of the Mermentau Ship Channel. The project will benefit 50 to 100 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$10 to \$15 million.

There were no comments.

Rockefeller Gulf of Mexico Shoreline Stabilization, Joseph's Harbor East (Region 4) – The project would entail construction of near shore breakwaters along the Gulf shoreline which would extend from the eastern bank of Joseph's Harbor Canal eastward for 10,000 feet. The proposed structure would be designed to attenuate shoreline retreat along this stretch of Gulf shoreline, as well as promote shallowing, settling out, and natural vegetative colonization of over-wash material landward of the proposed structure. The proposed design would consist of neutral buoyancy material encapsulated by stone and would include openings every 1,000 feet to facilitate material and organism linkages. Excavation material for construction access would be placed on the landward side of the structures. The project will benefit 100 to 150 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$40 to \$50 million.

There were no comments.

Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation (Region 4) - This project will place approximately three million cubic yards of material dredged from a Calcasieu Lake borrow site into two marsh creation areas north of Grand Bayou to restore 580 acres and nourish 13 acres of brackish marsh. Tidal creeks will be constructed prior to placement of dredge material and retention levees would be gapped for estuarine fisheries access and to achieve a functional marsh. The project will benefit 500 to 550 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$20 to \$25 million.

There were no comments.

Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration (Region 4) - Approximately 262 acres of marsh will be created/nourished and planted to reestablish the natural meandering banks of Kelso Bayou. Over 100 acres would be located between Calcasieu Ship Channel and State Highway 27. Approximately 3,200 linear feet of rock will be used to protect marsh creation areas and existing shoreline along the Calcasieu Ship Channel. A barge bay will be constructed at Alkali Ditch to reduce tidal erosion and rock armor will be placed at the mouth of Kelso Bayou. The project will benefit 250 to 300 net acres over the 20-year project life and the fully funded project cost is \$20 to \$25 million.

There were no comments.

Demonstration Projects:

Floating Island Environmental Solutions BioHaven – This demonstration project would evaluate the effectiveness of floating marsh islands to reduce wave fetch, trap sediment, establish floating marsh, and evaluate their effectiveness as an alternative to earthen terraces in areas of poor soils.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in favor of the floating island demo project and stated that this method works and was tried last year on a test site in Plaquemines Parish. He added that the marsh is growing at the test site and invited the Technical Committee to visit the site.

EcoSystems Wave Attenuator for Shoreline Protection Demo – This demonstration project would evaluate the effectiveness of the EcoSystems Wave Attenuator as an alternative method of shoreline protection in areas where site conditions limit or preclude traditional methods.

There were no comments.

The Wave Robber Wave Suppressor Sediment Collection System – This demonstration project would evaluate the effectiveness of the Wave Suppressor Sediment Collection System as an alternative method of shoreline protection equivalent to traditional methods which trap ambient sediments to facilitate expansion of emergent marsh.

There were no comments.

Use of Sand Derived from Pulverized Glass as Beach Nourishment on Barrier Island Restoration Projects – This demonstration project would evaluate the effectiveness of cullet compared to sand in erosion control and prevention, specifically focusing on using glass cullet to rebuild the shoreline of a barrier island.

There were no comments.

Voting Results

Each agency voted to select up to ten (10) of the twenty (20) nominee projects and up to three (3) of the four (4) demonstration nominee projects. Each agency ranked projects from highest to lowest. The projects were ranked first by the number of agency votes received and then by the weighted score. The top ten ranked nominee projects and top three demonstration projects will be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects for Phase I (Planning and Engineering and Design).

Mr. Travis Creel, USACE, presented the agency voting results. The top ten (10) projects are listed below in order by the number of agency votes with the summary of points shown in parentheses.

The top candidate projects were:

1. Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation-Nourishment Project – 6 agency votes (33)
2. Coastwide Planting Project – 5 agency votes (34)
3. Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation – 5 agency votes (33)
4. Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation – 5 agency votes (31)
5. Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project – 4 agency votes (31)
6. Home Place Marsh Creation – 4 agency votes (28)
7. Monsecour Siphon – 4 agency votes (24)
8. Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 3 – 4 agency votes (21)
9. Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration – 4 agency votes (21)
10. Cote Blanche Freshwater and Sediment Introduction and Shoreline Protection Project – 4 agency votes (13)

The demonstration candidate project votes were as follows:

1. Floating Island Environmental Solutions BioHaven – 6 agency votes (16)
2. EcoSystems Wave Attenuator for Shoreline Protection Demo – 6 agency votes (12)
3. The Wave Robber Wave Suppressor Sediment Collection System – 5 agency votes (7)
4. Use of Sand Derived from Pulverized Glass as Beach Nourishment on Barrier Island Restoration Projects – 1 agency vote (1)

The number 10 and number 11 projects had a tied vote. The tie was broken, but Mr. Holden suggested that 10 projects be approved and the Technical Committee recommend to the Task Force that they carry all 11 projects through to the next phase. Mr. Paul pointed out that this phase does not go to the Task Force for approval and recommended moving forward with all 11 projects.

Mr. Clark stated that he would be open to arguments for moving ahead with all 11 projects. Mr. Rhinehart supported moving forward with all 11 projects.

Mr. Hartman expressed concern that if the top 11 projects move forward, the number 12 and 13 projects were very close in the vote and there is no mandate to guide the next step; however, he agreed with moving forward on the top 11 projects. Mr. Rhinehart pointed out that this is the first time there has been a dead tie and therefore he is comfortable carrying the top 11 projects forward.

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to select the top 11 projects as PPL 20 candidate projects (Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation-Nourishment Project, Coastwide Planting Project, Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation, Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation, Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project, Home Place Marsh Creation, Monsecour Siphon, Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 3, Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration, Cote Blanche Freshwater and Sediment Introduction and Shoreline Protection Project, and Unknown Pass to Rigolets Shoreline Protection) and the top three demonstration projects as the PPL 20 candidate demonstration projects (Floating Island Environmental Solutions BioHaven, EcoSystems Wave Attenuator for Shoreline Protection Demo, and The Wave Robber Wave Suppressor Sediment Collection System) to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects that will be approved for Phase I (Planning, Engineering and Design). Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Holden stated that the Technical Committee will email the Task Force informing them that all 11 projects will move forward to the next phase absent any guidance from the Task Force to the contrary.

12. Agenda Item 10. Discussion/Decision: Request for Riverine Mining/Scofield Island Project Scope Change (Rachel Sweeny, NMFS). Ms. Sweeny discussed a request by the NMFS and LAOCPR for a Technical Committee recommendation for Task Force approval to change the scope of the Riverine Mining/Scofield Island Project (BA-40) due to project cost increases.

Ms. Sweeny reported that the Technical Committee had requested a briefing when this project reached the 30% design review stage. The project involves mining sand from the MS River and transporting that sand for barrier island restoration because sand resources are limited east of Grand Isle. The 30% design review has been completed and a revised cost estimate has been developed. When the project was funded for engineering and design, the construction costs were estimated at \$36 million and fully funded costs were estimated at \$44.5 million. The current estimated construction cost is \$52 million (150% higher than originally estimated due to ongoing barrier island erosion and increased construction costs) and the estimated fully funded cost is now at \$65 million. The acreages have increased approximately 120 to 130% from the original design, but the design still needs to be optimized. The project sponsors wish to continue through with the permit application, initiating the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, and begin preliminary land rights work and then reevaluate the project.

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

Mr. Clark asked how many acres of benefit are estimated. Ms. Sweeny answered that the current estimate is 537 as-built acres and 356 net acres. She added that they are still investigating ways to optimize the acreage benefits and reduce construction costs.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if additional funding would be needed for this request. Ms. Sweeny answered, no.

Mr. Hartman clarified that this is just a request for scope change approval for projected construction costs and to continue to the 95% design. He added that the permitting and NEPA process is a good way to determine whether the planned concept is a good one. Also, once the project is permitted, the approved borrow site could be used in the future even if this particular project does not move forward.

Mr. Clark clarified that he does not object to moving forward, but asked if this scope change increase would increase the fully funded cost. Mr. Hartman responded, yes, an increase in the fully funded cost is requested in order to get the correct number on the books. Mr. Clark asked for more information on the cost estimate. Ms. Sweeny answered that the new fully funded cost estimates were given at the 30% design review meeting.

Ms. Sweeny stated that the project is not asking for more money, but even if the project was stopped today, there is little money left because they have used most of it. She reiterated that today's request is just to continue with the design process and does not mean that they will spend the \$65 million to construct the project.

Mr. Hartman says that approval is necessary under the SOP to get the correct numbers to the Technical Committee and Ms. Browning. Ms. Browning responded that the numbers act as a placeholder, and are not an approved estimate, but rather the latest estimate.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification and stated that the new cost estimate numbers should be presented in the agenda and binder for a scope change request. Ms. Goodman responded that at

the 30% design phase, the construction cost is updated, but not taken through a fully funded economic analysis.

Ms. Sweeny stated that she will send the current cost estimate to the agencies, but that the fully funded cost is just an estimate because it has not been reviewed by the Economic Work Group.

Mr. Clark stated that when requesting a scope change, a cost estimate needs to be developed by the Engineering and Economic Work Groups according to the SOP. Ms. Goodman responded that the Maurepas Swamp Project did not go through the Work Groups.

Ms. Sweeny clarified that a scope change is usually requested at the 95% design stage, but that this project is only at the 30% design phase. Mr. Clark asked for a SOP review to verify whether a cost estimate is needed to be developed by the Economic Work Group. It was determined that the SOP did not require a new cost estimate analysis at this time.

Mr. Clark pointed out that in the past, similar scope change requests were submitted to the Economic Work Group. Ms. Goodman responded that in the past, there has been no consistency, but that in this case, a new cost estimate will become outdated very quickly as the project moves forward. Mr. Hartman agreed that the numbers will change very quickly. Ms. Goodman added that the updated construction costs were presented at the 30% design review meeting.

Mr. Holden stated that the Technical Committee does not need to approve a total construction cost at this time and that it is on record that there will be cost changes if the project effort is continued. He added that there will be a better understanding as the analysis continues and that he does not see a need to vote on the dollar increase at this time since there is only a current working estimate that has not been validated. Mr. Hartman clarified that the intent of the cost estimate is to show that the project has potential to become expensive.

Mr. Clark stated that he was fine with continuing the engineering and design, but was not comfortable with a scope change request with no cost estimate numbers. Mr. Hartman replied that the updated numbers would be provided to Ms. Browning.

The Technical Committee determined no decision action was necessary and that the project should continue within the existing authorities. The project sponsor will devise a new cost estimate and then continue with the engineering and design.

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

13. Agenda Item 11. Report: Pending De-authorization of the Brown Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project (Melanie Goodman, USACE). The Task Force initiated procedures to de-authorize the Brown Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project on October 28, 2009. De-authorization procedures are pending Corps sufficiency review of justification for de-authorization. Ms. Goodman reported that procedures have already been initiated to begin de-authorization as reported at the last Task Force meeting. The letter notifying landowners has not yet been issued because the USACE is trying to get a clear understanding of the reasons for de-authorization. They hope to have the letter issued and have the 30 day comment period

completed before the June Task Force meeting. Once the letter is sent out and the 30 day comment period has passed, the Technical Committee can have an email vote to make a recommendation for final de-authorization to the Task Force.

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

Mr. Clark asked for clarification as to the delay. Ms. Goodman answered that the reason for de-authorization was unclear, but that further details could be discussed offline. She added that the State has recently clarified reasons for de-authorization so that de-authorization can proceed.

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

14. Agenda Item 12. Report: De-authorization of the Lake Borgne/MRGO Shoreline Protection Project (Melanie Goodman, USACE). The Task Force initiated procedures to de-authorize the Lake Borgne/MRGO Shoreline Protection Project on January 20, 2010. Notice of the pending de-authorization was sent to Congress and the State House and Senate Natural Resources Committee chairs of the intent to de-authorize. Ms. Goodman explained that the status of this project is similar to the Brown Lake Project and that after one more internal review, the letter is expected to be issued and it is expected that the 30 day comment period will be completed before the June Task Force meeting. She added that the Technical Committee can have an email vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force for final de-authorization after the comment period.

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. There were no public comments.

15. Agenda Item 13. Additional Agenda Items - Preliminary Report: Monitoring Work Group CWPPRA Monitoring Program Evaluation (Dr. John Foret and Dr. Jenneke Visser). Dr. Foret, NMFS, provided a preliminary report on the Monitoring Work Group findings concerning the CWPPRA monitoring program.

Dr. Foret reported that the Monitoring Work Group has met twice and will meet again next week. The Work Group was tasked with four action items regarding review of the Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS).

- 1) Determine potential programmatic cost savings by reducing the frequency of some monitoring efforts, reducing stations, etc. – The Work Group has found that the number of stations is at the bare minimum for most variables. Future action includes changing analysis to incorporate minimal differences that are biologically significant.
- 2) Evaluate alternatives to improve monitoring input into decision making – The Work Group has held meetings with several agencies and at this point, there are no significant changes within project specific monitoring and all changes should be within existing

- 3) Identify potential partners and level of support to share CRMS funding responsibility– LCA has six projects that, if approved for construction, could represent a ten-year supplement to the CRMS program and could add more CRMS style stations built by LCA. Future action is to pursue potential contributions from the CIAP program. Mr. Holden suggested calling Greg Miller.
- 4) Evaluate the existing level of monitoring use by various agencies – The level of monitoring use varies by agency, but most is used in planning and engineering and design for new projects. The Work Group has not heard from all agencies. Future action is to finish these interviews.

The Monitoring Work Group will prepare a report by the June deadline.

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

Mr. Clark stated that USFWS project monitoring needs will not be met with project specific monitoring only. Mr. Clark pointed out that originally monitoring was estimated at 8.0 to 8.5% of project costs, but is currently at 5.8 to 6.0% of the construction budget (\$1.1 billion) which indicates that previous concerns regarding the monitoring budget may not be accurate since the overall percentage is less than originally estimated. Ms. Browning clarified that these numbers only represent the approved funding numbers.

Mr. Clark cautioned the State not to contract for CRMS services until the funds are approved. Mr. Rhinehart agreed.

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

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

17. Agenda Item 15. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Melanie Goodman, USACE). *The Task Force meeting will be held June 23, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Fisheries and Habitat Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana. NOTE – This date has recently changed.*

18. 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.

June 23, 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

19. Agenda Item 17. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Holden seconded. Mr. Holden adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:15 p.m.