

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 08 December 2010 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Tom 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 asked the members of the Technical Committee to introduce themselves.

Mr. Clark expressed his condolences to Mr. Holden and his family for the recent loss of his father. Mr. Holden thanked Mr. Clark and expressed condolences for the recent passing of Mr. Clark's father.

Mr. Holden expressed excitement that this meeting will include voting to move forward on new projects. He added that from the USACE perspective there are no contentious issues, but that due diligence and consideration would be given to all topics on the agenda.

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to move the Black Bayou Culverts Project to after Agenda Item 11. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to add a discussion on the Tebo Point Project under Agenda Item 15. Mr. Clark 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. Browning provided an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding in the Planning and Construction Programs.

Ms. Browning explained that the planning funding is as the Task Force approved in October and has approximately \$568,000 in available funding. The construction funding is starting with \$82.8 million available for approvals. There is a total of \$136 million coming up for approval. With the

current funding and approved estimate, there would still be \$4.3 million available. She is waiting on the December forecast and should receive that information next week.

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

Mr. Holden asked if a slide could be displayed for the public. Ms. Browning answered no. Mr. Holden explained that in the graph in the handouts the red bar is the funding of the Program and the purple bar represents total Program cost to date. Currently, the red bar is slightly above the purple bar, indicating a \$4.3 million buffer.

Ms. Browning stated that monies are expected to be returned to the Program from cleaning up projects as well.

Mr. Hartman asked when these funds are expected to be received and how many projects would be returning funds. Ms. Browning answered that it varies. Mr. Clark added that approved projects may not be constructed as soon as approved and suggested that Ms. Browning disseminate the list of returnable funds to all of the agencies to show which projects have extra money.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Task Force Email Vote Approving Change in Scope and Construction Funding the PPL 6 – North Lake Boudreaux Freshwater Introduction and Hydrologic Management Project (TE-32a) (Darryl Clark, USFWS). During the October 13, 2010 Task Force meeting, the USFWS and the OCPR requested approval for a change in scope and Phase II construction funding for the project. The Task Force approved holding additional construction funds in reserve, including three years of operation and maintenance (O&M), but deferred making a decision until a recommendation was provided by the Technical Committee. The Technical Committee voted via email to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the requested change in scope and construction funding. The Task Force subsequently voted to approve the change in scope and Phase II construction funding by email.

Mr. Clark stated that the USACE raised some Federal fiscal law issues regarding the receipt of contributions by Federal agencies. The Department of Interior (DOI) and USACE attorneys are currently working through these issues. The DOI attorney has found a statute in the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act that allows the DOI to receive voluntary contributions and will discuss this further with the USACE attorneys.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if this project is included in the totals given for the budget status update. Ms. Browning answered yes, because it has already been approved.

Mr. Holden clarified that the Task Force voted to approve this project, that progress is being made, and that hopefully a better status report can be made at the January Task Force meeting.

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

Al Levron, Terrebonne Parish Manager, asked if a Task Force decision will be required if the financial relationship changes. Mr. Holden answered that the financial status is unknown until the issue is resolved. Mr. Hartman answered that any change in budgets must be approved by the Task Force.

5. Agenda Item 4. Report: Task Force Fax Vote to Approve the CWPPRA Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Survey (USGS) Construction Program Technical Support Services Fund (Melanie Goodman, USACE). During the September 28, 2010 Technical Committee meeting, USGS and the Planning & Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee requested approval for the CWPPRA FY11 USGS Construction Program Technical Support Services Fund for project information database maintenance, CWPPRA website maintenance, and Core GIS tasks in the amount of \$186,018. The Technical Committee voted via email to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the requested funding. The Task Force subsequently voted to approve the funding by fax vote on December 7, 2010.

Ms. Goodman summarized that these services were removed from the Planning Program budget and a fax vote was taken to approve moving those services, and the corresponding funding, into the Construction Program.

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

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

6. Agenda Item 5. Report: Status of the PPL 1 – West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) and Request for Approval to Continue Monitoring the West Bay Receiving Area (Travis Creel, USACE). Mr. Creel provided a status on the West Bay Work Plan and Closure Plan and presented an update on whether to expend existing project funds to monitor the West Bay receiving area as was discussed at the September 28, 2010 Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Creel explained that after discussions with the State, it has been determined that no final survey data should be collected because to determine if the island is inducing settlement or is being washed away into other areas of the bay, further data would be required. The final geotechnical results should be available in February and a final engineering recommendation for closure is expected in March, at which time, funds for final closure will be requested. Construction bidding is then expected to occur during the low water season of 2011. After the closure has been constructed, two to three years of high water season analysis will be required to verify that the closure is working as designed. Additional land easements are still being worked out and if there are any substantial comments on the closure Environmental Assessment (EA) then those comments must be addressed. The current estimated cost for closure is \$10 to \$20 million, depending on the alternative. Currently, about 75% of the Pilottown Anchorage Area (PAA) is cleared out based on the September and December surveys. Flow through the diversion is currently at about 1,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) due to the low water season.

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

Mr. Clark asked what additional data and analysis would be required beyond a final survey. Mr. Creel answered that information about the type of material coming through the diversion and placed for the berm would be required in addition to detailed surveys of the receiving areas. Mr. Clark expressed disappointment that no further surveying would be conducted and suggested that taking a cross section of the berm may not be as complicated as anticipated.

Mr. Clark asked if the \$10 million cost estimate includes dredging the PAA. Mr. Creel answered that the \$10 million dollar rock closure alternative would not include any dredging, but that the \$20 million earthen closure alternative would include dredging the PAA for borrow material to be used for the earthen closure.

Mr. Hartman asked if money should be set aside now as a placeholder for the \$10 to \$20 million closure cost estimate and suggested that if so, a discussion should be held before voting to fund the other projects on the agenda.

Mr. Rhinehart asked what type of analysis would be required for the post-closure evaluation. Mr. Creel answered that no detailed discussion has occurred, but the evaluation would need to be conducted over two to three high water seasons to ensure that no wash-out or settlement was occurring.

Mr. Rhinehart asked for a status of discussions with the Mississippi River Commission (MRC) regarding post-closure maintenance. Ms. Goodman responded that a preliminary engineering design is needed before detailed discussion can happen, but that the MRC is aware of this project coming down the pipeline. She explained that before responsibility can be determined, there must be a period of post-construction analysis to verify that the closure is functioning as designed and the bank line is back to its pre-project condition. She added that at this time, the Operations Division Manager is recommending a three-year period for this post-construction evaluation.

Mr. Hartman asked if this means that the closure is a CWPPRA structure until the evaluation proves the closure is performing as designed. Mr. Creel answered, yes.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if this three year period of analysis is included in the current cost estimates and if there would be any other associated costs. Ms. Goodman answered that it is not currently included since the closure design is needed before costs can be determined. Mr. Creel added that there has been some discussion of overbuilding to account for settlement and to eliminate O&M costs.

Mr. Holden clarified that the MRC has responsibility for this area of the Mississippi River (River) and that when O&M becomes a USACE responsibility, it will fall within the O&M Program. He added that the USACE has decided to treat the River like other projects and conduct its dredging within the O&M budget. Since the average cost to dredge the River to full dimensions has exceeded the budget in the past few years, there will be reduced widths and depths in areas of the River which has been publically explained to the State and industry. He

stated that for the West Bay closure, a reasonable performance period will need to be defined and he agreed with Mr. Hartman that further discussions are needed to identify required future funding for closure.

Mr. Paul asked if the funding level is contingent on MRC approval. Mr. Holden clarified that based on past experience, the MRC will want assurances that the actions taken will in fact close the diversion and keep it closed which can be demonstrated through the post-closure evaluation period.

Mr. Paul asked for a design timeline. Mr. Creel answered that the engineering recommended design should be ready in March. Mr. Clark asked about the construction schedule. Mr. Creel said construction would take place during the low water season, but that funds would be needed before then. Mr. Clark suggested using 2012 funds if construction takes place at the end of 2011, but Ms. Browning clarified that funding approval is needed to bid the project for construction.

Mr. Holden added that money is needed from current funds because the high and low water seasons can not be accurately forecasted.

Mr. Hartman recommended setting aside a \$15 million placeholder and using returned funds from project clean up if the cost exceeds that amount.

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

P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, introduced Albertine Kimble and Earl Armstrong. Mr. Hahn stated that since the berm was built, the project is working. Mr. Hahn warned that no one has looked at the project to see why it is working and that this is the first time in three years that he has seen a project actually work. He stated that money is being spent on other projects that are washing away and asked why money is being spent this way when the diversion presents an opportunity to build on a project that is working. Mr. Hahn offered to take the Technical Committee to the project site to show them how the project is working. He expressed disappointment that if this project is shut down, he will give up on coastal restoration and that the Technical Committee should find a way to make the diversion work.

Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Coastal Manager, stated that a site visit was conducted on December 2nd and showed photos of land building up in the receiving area. She added that she is happy to see the project is working and that it was nice to walk on land in that area.

Earl Armstrong, Plaquemines Parish resident, stated that he grew up in Pilottown and that this is one of the best projects he has ever seen. He commended CWPPRA and the USACE for building the project. He explained that sand bars began to accumulate 1.5 miles behind the island eleven months after constructing the island and that he thought the cuts were a bad idea since one of them scoured through and the other never performed as intended. He added that the diversion was built in 2003, but no dredging was done until 2009. He believes that West Bay will fill in if more islands are constructed. He stated that as sediment is trapped in this area, it will reduce the amount of dredging required downstream and would be a huge mistake to close the diversion. He emphasized that the project needs more time and that if further dredging of the PAA is required,

that material should be used to construct more islands. He added that more money should be spent to help this area, rather than to close the diversion. He asked how long it had been since CWPPRA evaluated how the diversion was working.

Mr. Rhinehart responded that surveys were carried out prior to closure discussions and post-construction site visits were conducted.

Mr. Armstrong asked if any grid surveys were taken before the island was built. Mr. Clark responded that the results showed that the receiving area was getting deeper, with a greater volume than in previous years. He added that the issue is the cost of dredging the PAA in relation to the survey results showing a deepening receiving area. He added that USFWS would like to see more surveys done, but that it seems that is not the direction the project sponsors are recommending.

Mr. Hahn requested that more information be gathered. Mr. Hartman responded that the issue has never been project performance, but CWPPRA's legal obligation to pay for the PAA dredging. He explained that the CWPPRA Program can not afford to spend \$20 million dollars every three years for this dredging; that CWPPRA is becoming an O&M program and that in a few years there will be no money left to build new projects. He added that if the congressional delegation would add the PAA to USACE dredging responsibilities, CWPPRA could afford to keep the diversion open.

Mr. Armstrong stated that if this diversion is closed, no other diversion will be constructed in this area again. He added that the lower end is almost gone and while work is being done on the upper end, the lower end is helping to save the upper end. He stated that eleven months after the levee and island were constructed, he could stand on land 1.5 miles in front of the island. He offered to take the Technical Committee to the site in airboats free of charge.

Mr. Hahn stated that Plaquemines Parish is willing to spend money to keep this diversion open and asked that at the least, more meetings be held to discuss alternatives to closure. He added that he will have to give up on coastal restoration if they want to shut down a project that is working.

Paul Kemp, National Audubon Society, stated that while we know most of the PAA build up is not a result of the diversion, more information should be gathered to determine where the sediment is coming from. He added that a survey is not very expensive and that perhaps parish and private funds could be used to conduct survey work. He emphasized that before the diversion is permanently closed, the source of the PAA sediment accumulation be further investigated.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the PAA is hardly used and that the Technical Committee should investigate this and ask more questions of the people claiming that the diversion is ruining the PAA. He added that the well being of the people of Plaquemines Parish should be considered and pointed out that this area took a lot of storm surge which helped the upper end and that this diversion is helping the lower end.

Mr. Rhinehart explained that much research and study has been conducted on the PAA and diversion, in addition to the work conducted at the Myrtle Grove location to understand how to maximize diversion locations to capture settlement. He added that the studies revealed West Bay is not ideally situated to build land and that research shows the receiving bay is deepening. He explained that a lot of material was pumped into this area and has redistributed and settled out, accounting for the sand build-up now being seen. He stated that this was expected and that to determine the true source of the sediment material would require a large investment of time and money. He believes that the best position is to wait through the next high water season to see how the area performs.

Mr. Hahn reminded everyone that 12 years of studies and \$22 million was spent to create the diversion and now another \$15 to \$20 million will be spent to close it. He pointed out that people who live in the project area must live with these mistakes. He asked that the Technical Committee solicit local input to find a solution and offered to meet with the Technical Committee at their convenience.

Mr. Armstrong stated that the sand bars developing within the last eleven months have nothing to do with the material placed redistributing because the sand bars are 1.5 miles away from the island and the water currents are coming away from the sand bars and toward the island.

Mr. Holden complimented the public for their passion and stated that he is open to a site visit and not opposed to further surveying; however, the Task Force has voted to close the diversion and CWPPRA must address its fiscal positioning and work within constrained funding. He suggested that perhaps the Technical Committee visit the project site to better inform the Task Force as to any critical information before the closure is finalized. He added that the science shows the diversion is not performing well and the finances can not handle leaving the diversion open; therefore, CWPPRA is in a very tough position. He stated that the Technical Committee could follow up with a site visit and further discussion, but that today, the Technical Committee needed to discuss cost estimates for closure to recommend to the Task Force.

Mr. Hartman moved to set aside \$15 million from this year's construction budget for closure of the West Bay Diversion during next year's low water period. Mr. Clark stated that he felt further data would be helpful, but understands the expense involved. He asked Mr. Creel for a cost estimate to obtain full survey data.

Mr. Hartman stated that the USGS conducted the original surveys and that this work could be repeated. Mr. Clark recommended that, at a minimum, the USGS work be repeated and that the State survey along transect lines so as to compare volumes and berm sizes now to the previous data. He added that even if the receiving area is trapping sediments, there is still an issue with dredging the PAA. A plan would be necessary to address these dredging requirements since CWPPRA can not afford to continue that dredging.

Ms. Goodman clarified that the State did a monitoring survey prior to construction and took as-builts of the islands and that they know the volume of material that was used to construct the islands. Mr. Clark responded that the surveys should be re-conducted, but that grain size analysis not be done. Mr. Creel estimated that a new survey would cost approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Clark moved to amend the motion to include a survey of the receiving area to be conducted this year at the estimated \$100,000 cost. Ms. McCormick added that she is new to CWPPRA, but that it sounds as if more information should be gathered about this project. She offered to attend a site visit as well, added that \$100,000 is worth the cost of gathering more data when closure is estimated at \$15 to \$20 million, and expressed support to amend the motion. Mr. Hartman responded that the survey should be conducted as soon as possible. Ms. McCormick added that if the Audubon Society can give financial assistance as offered, such help would be welcomed.

Mr. Rhinehart encouraged proponents of this project to also look at the policy issue of the restoration program maintaining the PAA and to investigate alternatives to CWPPRA paying for the PAA dredging. Mr. Clark agreed that the PAA is a part of this equation that must be resolved.

Mr. Hahn stated that the navigation industry agrees that while the PAA is still needed, they are willing to work with CWPPRA to find a solution to keep the diversion open.

Mr. Hartman stated that the navigation industry has expressed strong opposition to closing the PAA and suggested that Mr. Hahn invite navigation industry representatives to the site visit and discussions.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend setting aside \$15 million from construction funds for closure of the West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03), the performance of a survey of the receiving area at a cost of up to, but not to exceed \$100,000 to be conducted as soon as possible, and acceptance of support from non-governmental organizations in this effort, to the Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 6. Report: Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection/Commercial Canal Freshwater Redirection (TV-19) Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) Feasibility Study Efforts (Michael Somme, CSRS, Inc.). *Mr. Somme provided a status on the Vermilion and Iberia Parishes' draft feasibility study being conducted under the Louisiana CIAP.*

Mr. Somme gave a status overview of the project. The project objectives are to protect the land remaining, build more land to prevent saltwater intrusion, and try to restore the original land mass. Iberia and Vermilion Parish have each given \$100,000 to conduct a preliminary study to evaluate alternatives. A timeline has been submitted. The survey work was delayed to capitalize on cost savings. The preliminary study will be completed in January and the final study will be completed in March/April.

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

Mr. Clark asked what direction the report was headed in. Ben Malbrouf, with the Shaw Group, answered that they are currently in the preliminary stage and that the preliminary report is expected to be finished in January. Based on the current analysis, it seems the rock structure is the best option.

Ms. Goodman asked if the final report will include a wetland benefits and fully funded cost estimate. Mr. Malbrouf responded that they plan to have an estimate of the fully funded cost and amount of marsh to be built in conjunction with the structure. Mr. Hartman added that the P&E Subcommittee will develop the full cost and benefits analysis.

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

8. Agenda Item 7. Report: Status of Request for O&M Incremental Funding and Budget Increase for the PPL 10 – Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection (PO-30) (Paul Kaspar, EPA). During the September 28, 2010 Technical Committee meeting, EPA requested approval for an O&M budget increase, in the amount of \$3,349,711, and Increment 1 funding increase, in the amount of \$3,356,181. The Technical Committee deferred making a decision until the project’s alternatives have been analyzed. The Project Team continues to evaluate options for the scheduled maintenance lift. The Technical Committee was provided with the status of the analysis performed to date along with the intended path forward as future consideration for an incremental funding increase may still be required.

Mr. Kaspar gave an update on the status of the project, which is meant to halt shoreline retreat at Shell Beach and Bayou Dupre. Bayou Dupre has two reaches totaling approximately 12,000 feet of onshore rock dike with a sheet pile structure that ties into the existing core Corps rock. Shell Beach has an additional two reaches totaling 17,000 feet of rock dike.

Alex Gonzales stated that at the last Technical Committee meeting, the project sponsors were instructed to investigate problems that had occurred at the project site. Since that time, further analysis and surveying has been performed and some issues have been identified. Reaches 2 and 4 are located in decent soil conditions and the rock breakwater was able to be constructed in a single lift. The existing marsh elevation pre-construction was at 0.5 feet and rock was placed to 4.0 feet. The rock is now performing as designed and there are no further issues within those reaches. Reaches 1 and 3 are located in poor soil conditions and the plan was to create the rock breakwater in multiple lifts (two construction lifts and one maintenance lift). The maintenance lift has not yet occurred, but these reaches have areas that are failing and over-settling. Reach 3 has a five to seven foot/year erosion rate and Reach 1 has a seven to nine foot/year erosion rate. Approximately 50% of these areas will need further analysis to find an alternative design since erosion is continuing to occur in open water areas at the typical erosion rates. Hurricanes Ike and Gustav reduced the factor of safety in several sections of Reaches 1 and 3. A post-hurricane as-built survey was conducted of the lake. The lake bottom has been redefined, causing the overburden used for the slope stability analysis to be eroded, which is yielding a lower factor of safety and slope failures in some areas. They have looked at three alternatives for the failed sections including, re-aligning the breakwater with the same stone and design, a lightweight core breakwater with rock armor cover, and a fiberglass composite sheet pile structure with timber pile support. The sheet pile option currently has the highest construction cost, but is a one time installation and has no multiple lifts. This alternative would also give additional protection from scouring from the failed breakwaters in front of the sheet piles and would be easy to construct; therefore, at this time, the sheet pile alternative seems to be the most attractive option.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if there was a cost estimate for the O&M on the sheet pile alternative. Mr. Gonzalez answered that they do not have any numbers yet, but that some analysis has been conducted and this alternative works based on the calculations.

Mr. Clark stated that he was pleased that they have evaluated additional alternatives.

Shannon Haynes, with the Shaw Group, stated that they do have costs for this, the wave study was conducted and the numbers look okay. There is also the added benefit of the failed rock breakwaters in front of the sheet piles for extra scour protection. He added that the per linear foot cost comparison is higher for the sheet pile alternative, but that the cost comparison for the rock alternative does not include additional lifts and the costs are more comparable when the additional lifts are accounted for.

Mr. Kaspar gave an overview of the project's funding history. In September, an O&M funding request of \$3.4 million was made, but at the time the cost estimate was based on best available data. Since then, additional survey and geotechnical data has been gathered and more data is expected. After the final geotechnical analysis is conducted, the cost estimate will be finalized and additional funding requirements can be identified. The intention is to solicit a fax or email vote from the Technical Committee before the next Task Force meeting for additional funding. A final set of plans is scheduled to be ready for bid this summer.

Mr. Clark agreed that this sounds like a good plan forward.

Ms. McCormick thanked the project team for their hard work and thanked the Technical Committee for its cooperation and direction to evaluate additional alternatives on this project.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if a placeholder is needed for this anticipated funding request. Mr. Haynes responded that the cost estimate is now in the range of, or lower than, the \$3.4 million previously requested and that using the \$3.4 million as a placeholder would be conservative. He clarified that the request was for \$3.4 million, but that the project has \$1.3 million expected to be returned to the Program, yielding a net need of approximately \$2 million. Ms. McCormick added that a more accurate cost estimate should be ready in time for the email vote.

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

DECISION: Ms. McCormick moved to recommend setting aside \$3 million for a future request of O&M Incremental funding and budget increase for the PPL 10 – Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project (PO-30) to the Task Force. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report/Decision: Request for Approval to Change the CWPPRA List Server Name from “Breux Act Newsflash” to “CWPPRA Newsflash” (Paul Kaspar, EPA). During the October 13, 2010 Task Force meeting, Colonel Fleming requested feedback from the Outreach Committee about changing the CWPPRA list server name from “Breux Act Newsflash” to “CWPPRA Newsflash.” The change has been requested to stay consistent with the Outreach

Committee's current branding efforts. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to change the list server name. The change will begin at the beginning of the year.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval to change the CWPPRA list server name from "Breaux Act Newsflash" to "CWPPRA Newsflash" to the Task Force. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

10. Agenda Item 9. Report/Decision: Status of the PPL 15 – Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project (BA-42) and Request for a One-Year Extension of the Phase II Funding (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project was approved for Phase II funding on January 21, 2009. Construction award will not occur within two years of Phase II approval. The USFWS and OCPR requested that the Phase II funds not be placed on a revocation list and that a one-year extension be granted to continue with project implementation. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the request for a one-year extension of Phase II funding for the project.

Mr. Roy gave an overview of the project funding history and explained that this request is for an extension of the Phase II funding previously approved. The project features are unchanged since the Phase II funding was approved and the extension is to avoid the project ending up on the revocation list. The delay is due to land rights issues on 28 to 29 bottom acres of the Jefferson Canal which is needed for the project dredge pipeline corridor. Alternative routes would be more expensive and time consuming to install. After several attempts to negotiate with the landowners, the last buyout package was submitted in October and the landowners have either refused the package or failed to respond. Therefore, Plaquemines Parish is going to use its quick-take authority to purchase the land with State only funds, thus making the land Parish property. A motion for this action will be made at next month's Plaquemines Parish council meeting. The plan is to bid the project in May, with construction next fall.

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

Mr. Roy reminded the Technical Committee that the Phase II cost estimate is two years old and that although an update has not been vetted through the CWPPRA process, he expects a cost increase of \$5 to \$8 million.

Mr. Clark asked if the expected funds to cover the cost increase should be set aside now or addressed later. Ms. Goodman asked when the funds would be needed. Mr. Roy responded that they hope to advertise the project in March. Mr. Holden stated that funds could be set aside now or when bids are received, either the scope be adjusted to fit the budget, or additional funds be requested to account for bid amounts. Mr. Hartman suggested that if construction bids are high, project sponsors request additional funding at that time.

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

Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Coastal Manager, stated that this area could also be used for other pipelines and that she hopes the Technical Committee votes in favor of the extension.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval for the request for a one year extension of the Phase II funding for the PPL 15 – Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project (BA-42) to the Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 10. Report/Decision: Request for Approval to Initiate De-authorization for the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock (TV-11b) (Kirk Rhinehart, OCPR). *The OCPR requested that formal de-authorization of the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock Project (TV-11b) due to the project features, which are not in the boundaries of restoration, but instead are based on the maintenance of a Federally authorized navigation channel, not be initiated at this time.*

Mr. Rhinehart gave an overview of the project status. Concerns have been raised regarding the number of times this project has been presented for Phase II construction funding. The State feels that rock lining the shoreline should be handled through the channel O&M by the USACE and not by the State. The State would like to have further discussion with the USACE, stakeholders in the area, and OCPR to determine how to handle this project. At this time, the State requests the project not be formally moved into the de-authorization process, but that more discussions be had as to how to proceed.

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

Mr. Holden stated that this is an acceptable approach since circumstances have changed over time.

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

Sherrill Sagrera, Vermilion Parish landowner, thanked the State for the opportunity to at least discuss this project further. He added that the only solution to restore broken land is rock armoring, but that if there is another avenue, he is open to suggestions.

12. Agenda Item 11. Report/Discussion: Request for Approval for Final De-authorization of the South Pecan Island Freshwater Introduction Project (ME-23) (Rick Hartman, NMFS). *OCPR and NMFS requested approval for final de-authorization of the South Pecan Island Freshwater Introduction Project (ME-23) based on a significant decrease in the project's cost effectiveness. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the final de-authorization of the project.*

Mr. Hartman explained that the project sponsors feel the project is not sufficiently cost effective to move forward and that the de-authorization is not about landowners. The project sponsors propose to complete the de-authorization process.

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

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

Sherrill Sagrera, Vermilion Parish landowner, stated that, on behalf of the Parish, he would like to see this project not de-authorized, but understands that it is probably not feasible to move forward.

W.P. Edwards, Chairman of the Vermilion Parish Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and land manager of Vermilion Corporation, echoed that he would also like to see this project not be de-authorized. He commended the USFWS for requesting another year on the Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation Project to resolve the land rights issue. He added that to his knowledge, Vermilion Parish has not been asked to help obtain land rights for this project. He stated that the landowner is not a Vermilion Parish resident and has perhaps not considered the possibility of losing his land. He suggested delaying and revisiting this project after looking into the power of the Parish regarding land rights.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval for final de-authorization of the South Pecan Island Freshwater Introduction Project (ME-23) to the Task Force. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

13. Additional Agenda Item. Discussion/Decision: Request for O&M Incremental Funding for the Black Bayou Culverts Project (CS-29). The Black Bayou Culverts structure is experiencing leakage under the structure. To address the problem, NRCS and OCPR propose to: a) install a cofferdam on the eastern side of the structure to provide short-term remedy and maintain freshwater conditions in the Mermentau Basin to avoid adverse impacts to irrigation; and b) install a cofferdam on the western side of the structure, dewater the site, perform an inspection, and formulate a design to permanently repair the structure. To perform these tasks, NRCS and OCPR requested the Technical Committee make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve use of the remaining Increment 1 and "out-year" O&M and monitoring funding in the amount of \$805,986. Once a repair design and cost estimate is complete, NRCS and OCPR will return to the Technical Committee and Task Force to request a project budget increase to fund the permanent repair and perform O&M for the remainder of the project life.

Mr. Paul gave an update on the project status. The project structure started experiencing leaks in the box culverts under Highway 384. Water is seeping under the structure, which has been slowed with sand bags, but not stopped. The project sponsors need to install cofferdams, dewater the structure, and design a fix for the problem. There are existing out year O&M funds, but the request is to move up these funds to pay for the immediate work to prevent saltwater intrusion and design a permanent fix.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if additional funds are being requested. Mr. Paul answered that future funds need to be moved into the current budget for the cofferdams, inspection, and design to fix this problem. After a solution has been identified and designed, the project sponsors will request money to construct the permanent repair.

Mr. Clark clarified that this request is to move future funding into the current budget.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval to move out year budget funding in the requested amount into the current budget for the Black Bayou Culverts Project (CS-29) for dewatering, inspection, and design of a solution to fix the structure leak to the Task Force. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

14. Agenda Item 12. Report/Decision: 20th Priority Project List (PPL) (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The Environmental Workgroup Chairman presented an overview of the eleven PPL 20 candidate projects. The Technical Committee voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force for selecting PPL 20 projects for Phase I engineering and design.

The P&E Subcommittee recommended that no demonstration project be funded this year since the proposed demonstration projects are basically elements that have been contained in previous demonstration projects that have been implemented.

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

Mr. Clark pointed out that no demonstration project was chosen last year either. He suggested that one of the demonstration projects could be funded this year and the other two could compete in the NRCS non-rock demonstration project approved three years ago. He expressed concern that the NRCS project will only evaluate three to four alternatives and said that he was open to considering a demonstration project this year. Mr. Paul agreed that he would consider a demonstration project this year.

Mr. Hartman stated that the P&E Subcommittee had discussed approving an additional \$1 million for the NRCS project to increase the number of alternatives evaluated. The P&E Subcommittee was to coordinate with the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) to ensure that there was enough money to prove something when evaluating the non-rock alternatives and was to request more funding from the Technical Committee if needed. He suggested setting aside the \$1 million as a placeholder so that adequate evaluation of the non-rock alternative submissions could take place.

Mr. Clark responded that he was amenable to that, but giving the NRCS more money was not mutually exclusive with not having a demonstration project this year. Mr. Hartman responded that he would rather leave it to the NRCS to evaluate and chose the best non-rock alternatives.

Mr. Paul stated that the floating islands could be used for projects other than shoreline protection and that he would not want to eliminate investigating this possibility.

Mr. Clark stated that he had hoped that the NRCS would be reviewing non-rock alternatives at this time, and that he does not support a second year with no demonstration project.

Mr. Rhinehart pointed out that no demonstration project selection last year is not a reason to require one this year and that he supports the P&E Subcommittee's recommendation.

Ms. McCormick stated that the EPA did not want a demonstration project, but that the floating island would be their choice if one was to be selected.

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

Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, expressed interest in using the floating island alternative in areas of Terrebonne Parish and added that the Parish has encouraged the manufacturer to submit this option for the NRCS non-rock evaluation. The floating islands may have other applications and have been accepted by the Coast Guard to be used for spill response efforts.

Nic Matherne, LaFourche Parish Director of Coastal Restoration, agreed with Ms. Suazo and added that his levee district has used some of these floating islands on a mini demo basis. He recommended a full demonstration since it would be a great way for everyone to see how the floating islands work for incorporation into future projects. Mr. Hartman asked how the mini demo is performing. Mr. Matherne responded that they were easy to install and grass is now growing into the system.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend to the Task Force that no demonstration project be chosen for PPL 20. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. Mr. Hartman, Ms. McCormick, and Mr. Rhinehart voted in favor of the motion and Mr. Clark and Mr. Paul voted against the motion. The motion passed.

Mr. Hartman made a motion to put aside an additional \$1 million for the NRCS non-rock alternative demonstration project. Mr. Clark suggested waiting until the alternatives are received. Mr. Hartman pointed out that if the money is not used, it can be returned to the CWPPRA Program. Mr. Clark responded that more than \$1 million dollars may be required after analysis is conducted.

Mr. Roy went through the candidate projects and gave a brief overview of each. There were 20 nominee projects which have been trimmed down to eleven candidate projects as listed in the table below.

Region	Project
1	Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project
1	Unknown Pass to Rigolets Shoreline Protection Project
2	Coast-wide Planting Project
2	Home Place Marsh Creation Project
2	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation Project
2	Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 3
2	Monsecour Siphon
3	Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation-Nourishment Project
3	Cote Blanche Freshwater and Sediment Introduction and Shoreline Protection Project
4	Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation Project
4	Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration Project

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

Mr. Hartman asked if the Calcasieu DMMP included using material from mining to create marsh adjacent to the ship channel or if it could be added since the area is next to the ship channel. Mr. Holden answered, yes, but that it has not been identified as a disposal site as yet.

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

Phil Precht, Louisiana Land and Exploration and ConocoPhillips Companies, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont Project on behalf of the ConocoPhillips Alliance Refinery. The Refinery intends to fully cooperate as the pipeline is constructed on its property since these projects help protect the Refinery from storm surge. He also spoke in support of the Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation Project which is mostly on their land and will synergize well with previous projects to help bolster the hurricane protection levee being built.

Mr. Hartman thanked ConocoPhillips for being so helpful in installing the pipeline.

Paul Naquin, St. Mary Parish President, spoke in support of the Cote Blanche Project. He stated that there were four storms during the time of constructing this project and small lakes have grown in the area. There are already two CWPPRA projects in this area, which used to be a fresh marsh, but has become saltier after all of the hurricane damage which stopped the flow into the marsh areas there. This project will create 10,000 acres of marsh land, 763 of which will be beneficial, and this area is a black bear habitat and contains Indian burial grounds. The Chitimacha Indian Tribe fully supports this project, as well as the Miami Corporation.

Tina Horn, Cameron Parish Police Jury, stated that if they had to wait on the USACE to rock ship channels, they would not be able to stop the saltwater intrusion happening. Many projects have been constructed to stop saltwater intrusion and CWPPRA should not avoid shoreline protection along the ship channels because it falls within USACE jurisdiction. While the USACE has assumption of maintenance for some ship channels and needs disposal areas, it will need help from CWPPRA to create marsh and protect marshes and shorelines unless the USACE receives a windfall in funding. The Kelso Bayou Project is their number one preferred project, but they also stated support the Cameron-Creole Watershed Project.

Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, spoke in support of the Terrebonne Bay and Marsh Creation Project. This is the third time this project has been under consideration for selection and would provide natural future protection to the Morganza interior and the community of Montegut which has experienced levee failure. The project would also provide great habitat benefits and is the only candidate project in the Terrebonne Basin, which is the most rapidly eroding area in the State and located in a demonstrated area of need.

James Harris, USFWS Southeast Louisiana Refuges, spoke in support of the Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project. This project will help areas beginning to breach, which were hit by Hurricane Katrina. Experience with similar projects in the area have shown good results in that secondary benefits can be increased by capturing lots of fines and materials normally lost. He also spoke in support of the Cameron-Creole Grand Bayou Project. He expressed excitement at the number of marsh creation projects in this PPL cycle because these types of projects have many immediate and long term benefits. He stated that CWPPRA needs to look at cumulative effects of projects when voting.

Nic Matherne, LaFourche Parish Government, supported Terrebonne Parish and the Terrebonne Bay and Marsh Creation Project which would be a first step in providing protection to both Parishes and the Morganza to Gulf Levee System. Both Parishes have a direct vested interest in the project.

Laurie Cormier, Calcasieu Parish Police Jury, spoke in support of the Cameron-Creole and Kelso Bayou Projects.

Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont Project since it is located in an area with historic and current high rates of erosion. Bayou Dupont has become open water in many areas and this project would restore shoreline and continue the landbridge. The project would restore habitat to an area that has deteriorated and would be part of multiple lines of defense to protect the Plaquemines levee. The Jefferson Parish President and Council, Marine Fisheries Advisory Board, Lafitte Mayor, coastal stakeholders and residents of Jefferson and Plaquemines Parish, and project site landowners support the project. The project builds on the success of the popular BA-39 and stimulus projects already in place that restored a large area of previously eroded land. She also spoke in support of the Monsecour Siphon since the project is a relatively inexpensive way to bring sediment and freshwater into that area.

Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Coastal Manager, stated that the Monsecour Siphon is their number one supported project because this area is dying and the project would help the levee and highway and would save the remaining life in the area by bringing river water in. She added that CWPPRA has landowner permission and the project is cost effective. She stated that the Bayou Dupont Project is their number two supported project because it would provide instant wetland protection. She also spoke in support of the Home Place Project because this area is fading away fast since there is no river water to sustain it and there is much worry about Highway 23 and the levee. She also stated support for the Coast-wide Planting Project and, on behalf of St Bernard Parish, the Lake Lery Project.

Henry “Skip” Haller Jr., Madison Land and Jefferson Parish landowner, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont Project since it would be a continuation and stepping stone to building the landbridge and a beneficial use of River spoils.

Ms. McCormick stated that the intent of CWPPRA is to restore Louisiana coast which can not be accomplished without public involvement. She thanked the public for participating.

Mr. Holden asked how the Technical Committee wanted to address a tie vote. Mr. Hartman suggested casting the votes to determine if there was a clear consensus for the top four projects. The Technical Committee agreed.

The voting results were as follows:

Region	Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
1	Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation Project	4	5	2	6	6	5	6	28
2	Coastwide Planting Project	6	1	4	5	3	3	6	22
4	Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation	5	4		4	5	1	5	19
4	Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration	1		1	3		6	4	11
3	Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation-Nourishment Project	3	3		2	1		4	9
2	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation		6		1	4		3	11
2	Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery - Marsh Creation 3		2	5		2		3	9
2	Monsecour Siphon			6			2	2	8
3	Cote Blanche Freshwater and Sediment Introduction and Shoreline Protection Project	2					4	2	6
2	Home Place Marsh Creation			3				1	3
1	Unknown Pass to Rigolets Shoreline Protection							0	0

Mr. Holden excused himself from the meeting and introduced Mark Wingate, USACE, as the substitute Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Clark stated that the Standard Operating Procedure calls for recommendation of up to four candidate projects to the Task Force, but that since the scores are close, he would support recommending the top five projects for engineering and design. Mr. Rhinehart agreed, because there could be four typical projects and the Coast-wide Planting Project. Mr. Paul agreed as well.

Ms. Goodman stated that with the top four projects, the total Phase I cost is \$7.461 million and with the top five projects, it is \$10,363,337.

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

Phil Precht, Louisiana Land and Exploration and ConocoPhillips Companies, expressed appreciation for the Technical Committee's support.

Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, supported recommending the top five projects.

Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, pointed out that the Bayou Dupont Project had the same number of points as the fifth project and that the Lake Lery Project has a higher point value than the fifth project. She suggested that the Technical Committee consider Phase I funding for more than five projects since there will be future money available from the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process. Then, the State would have projects ready for Phase II when funding becomes available.

Oneil Malbrough, with the Shaw Group, agreed with Ms. Winter and added that it seems significant areas of loss along the coast are being missed. He added that conducting Phase 0 planning would be significant in moving forward.

Mr. Rhinehart agreed with designing projects, but cautioned that this vote must be balanced with the Phase II construction funding approvals next on the agenda.

Mr. Hartman realized that there is a good potential for significant money coming in from the oil spill, but pointed out just because CWPPRA does not continue with a project, does not mean that another entity can not pick the project up for construction. He also stressed that CWPPRA is becoming an O&M program and that less and less projects will be constructed in the future.

Mr. Clark stated that he sees both sides of this argument and agreed with Mr. Hartman that projects could be worked into the oil spill restoration fairly quickly because the costs and benefits have already been evaluated during the PPL process. He suggested moving ahead with the top five projects.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval of the top five voted projects (Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation, Coast-wide Planting, Cameron-Creole Watershed Grand Bayou Marsh Creation, Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration, and Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation-Nourishment Projects) to the Task Force. Mr.

Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

15. Agenda Item 13. Report/Decision: Request for Scope Change to Combine PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycles 4 & 5 (CS-28-4&5), New Fully Funded Estimate Approval, and Construction Approval and Funding (Scott Wandell, USACE). The USACE requested an administrative scope change to combine the PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project Cycles 4 and 5 for financial accounting purposes, and approval of the combined current fully funded estimate for Cycles 4 and 5 in the amount of \$8,111,705. Also, the USACE, with concurrence from the State and USFWS, requested construction approval and Increment I funding in the amount of \$7,952,795 to construct both Cycles 4 and 5 during the Calcasieu Ship Channel FY 11 maintenance cycle in winter 2010/2011.

Mr. Wandell gave a brief history of the project and a status update since the January report. He asked that the last two construction cycles, Cycles 4 and 5, be combined into one project for accounting purposes and requested approval of the new fully funded cost estimate and construction approval and funding so that both cycles can be conducted during the next USACE dredging event. CWPPRA will pay for the incremental cost to pump the material to the project site.

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

Mr. Hartman stated that this area has been identified in the new Dredged Material Management Plan (DMMP) for the Calcasieu Ship Channel which has caused a lot of damage in Cameron Parish. He feels that coastal restoration dollars should not be spent to mitigate this damage when this area is already identified as part of the new DMMP. He asked if this is a dual funding issue.

Mr. Clark explained that this area is in the DMMP, but that the DMMP has not been approved and funding would not happen until FY 12. However, submitting this through CWPPRA would allow advertisement in 2011 for construction in early 2012, at least a year sooner than if the project was rolled under the DMMP.

Mr. Wingate added that the DMMP will be signed off on by December 15th, but that since the DMMP has not yet been budgeted for, money for this area would not be received until FY 13 at the earliest. This reach of the River will be dredged in FY 11 so either CWPPRA money can be used to create marsh at that time or the project can be put on hold for completion under the DMMP.

Ms. Goodman stated that in the mean time, the dredged material from that reach of the River would go to an upland disposal site and would not be beneficially used. Mr. Wingate added that beneficial use would increase the cost.

Mr. Paul cautioned that this would be spending CWPPRA money for a project that has been identified under another program.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that CWPPRA is in the business of building projects. He expressed concern that USACE will not receive funding in a timely fashion, thus losing the opportunity to create significant marsh in an area of great need at the current incremental price. He stated that he would like to hear more discussion on this matter. He asked what the cost of this project means to the bottom line. Ms. Browning answered that the construction budget has \$53 million left and that this project is a request for \$8 million.

Mr. Clark pointed out that there would be enough money left to fund this project and one of the Phase II construction projects, while leaving a little money left.

Mr. Paul asked if a cost share agreement is in place for this project or if the previous cycle cost share agreements could be utilized. Ms. Goodman responded that a new cost share agreement would have to be negotiated and that the previous agreements can not be used. She explained that the indemnification requirements would need to be added in as in the Tebo Point Project and that if an agreement is not reached, the funds for this project could be brought back into the CWPPRA Program. She added that funding authority is needed before a cost share agreement can be started.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that this vote does not preclude any other actions and that he hopes the State and USACE can reach an agreement.

Mr. Hartman asked if Council has been consulted regarding dual funding issues. Ms. Goodman replied that it would be dual appropriations, but that since CWPPRA is authorized to construct this project, it is a stand alone authority. However, if these were O&M funds, then there would be an issue.

Mr. Clark stated that he would like the motion to include a contingency that if a cost share agreement can not be in place in time for FY 11 construction, this project be left to the DMMP and be de-authorized from the CWPPRA Program.

Ms. McCormick stated that she supports this project, but that if funding is approved, it would reduce funding available for the Phase II voting next on the agenda. She pointed out that if this project is funded, there would only be money left to fund one of the Phase II projects. She expressed concern about this, but agreed that if the Technical Committee was headed in this direction it was acceptable.

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval of the fully funded cost estimate and construction approval and funding in the requested amount for PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycles 4 & 5 (CS-28-4&5) to the Task Force. The recommendation would be contingent upon execution of a cost share agreement before the June Task Force meeting for project execution within the FY 11 and if a cost share agreement is not executed, then to allow the project to go through the DMMP Program and de-authorize the project within CWPPRA. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. Mr. Hartman and Ms.

McCormick opposed the motion and Mr. Clark, Mr. Paul, and Mr. Rhinehart voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval for a scope change to combine PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycles IV & V (CS-28-4&5) into one project for administrative purposes to the Task Force. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

16. Agenda Item 14. Report/Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Melanie Goodman, USACE). The Technical Committee considered 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 recommended a project for Task Force approval within available program construction funding limits.

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Construct Start Date	Total Fully Funded Cost Est.	Net Benefit Acres	Total Cost per Acre
EPA	TE-47	11	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration	Jan 2012	\$65,355,632	195	\$335,157
NMFS	BA-48	17	Bayou Dupont Ridge Creation & Marsh Restoration	Sep 2011	\$38,539,351	187	\$206,093

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

Mr. Rhinehart suggested this item be covered quickly since there is not enough budget left to fund the Ship Shoal Whiskey West Flank Restoration Project.

Ms. McCormick expressed disappointment that the Whiskey West Project could not be constructed and asked that it receive consideration during next year’s funding cycle.

Mr. Clark expressed optimism that the Bayou Dupont Project will be successful.

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

Phil Precht, ConocoPhillips, expressed support for the Bayou Dupont Project.

Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, expressed support for the Bayou Dupont Project.

Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Coastal Manager, also expressed support for the Bayou Dupont Project.

A landowner in the area expressed support for the Bayou Dupont Project and added that he feels it is the better of the two projects.

DECISION: Mr. Rhinehart moved to recommend Phase II authorization and approval of Phase II Increment 1 funding for the Bayou Dupont Ridge Creation and Marsh Restoration Project to the Task Force. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

17. Agenda Item 15. Additional Agenda Items (Mark Wingate, USACE)

Mr. Wingate opened the floor to discussion of the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point Project.

Mr. Paul stated that the Technical Committee received a letter from Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, asking for a status update on this project and the cost share agreement. Mr. Wingate responded that this issue is moving slower than anyone wishes it to, but that he remains hopeful that an agreement will be reached.

Ms. Goodman added that the USACE submitted cost share agreement language to the State a couple of weeks ago incorporating the State's indemnification clause required by the USACE. The USACE is waiting to hear back from the State.

Mr. Rhinehart expressed disappointment that this agreement and the indemnification issue have not been resolved. He added that the State gave up certain items and in return asked the USACE to cede on certain points to make up for those concessions. The State sent these requests on October 14th and received comments back last Friday. It does not appear that the USACE could provide the concessions requested by the State at the District level. He stated that at this point in time, it is uncertain whether the State can sign the latest agreement provided by the USACE since such an agreement would set a precedent for future agreements. Mr. Courville has requested the project be transferred to another agency. The State's position is to not instigate a transfer until the State has had time to fully analyze the latest cost share agreement language. He stated that by the next Task Force meeting, the State will have reviewed the current version of the agreement and will know if it is acceptable. He asked if the Technical Committee does elect to honor Mr. Courville's request, the transfer wait until after the next Task Force meeting so that the State can report on the current status at that time.

Mr. Paul stated that the next Task Force meeting should be soon enough for an answer. Mr. Clark asked if they would know anything sooner. Mr. Rhinehart responded that they should know more in a couple of weeks.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that they need to be responsive to a major landowner and can not let this cost share agreement issue continue unresolved. He suggested adding an item to the next Task Force agenda to transfer this project to another agency, with a request for discussions beforehand. Mr. Clark agreed that this issue be added to the next Task Force meeting agenda as a discussion/decision item.

Mr. Wingate pointed out that there may be more back and forth discussion on the agreement before the next Task Force meeting. Mr. Rhinehart stated that resolution must be made one way

or another. Mr. Wingate responded that resolution should be reached before the next Task Force meeting.

Mr. Clark pointed out that the Technical Committee should extend the time limit on the Phase II construction funds since the funds were originally approved in 2007.

Mr. Hartman stated that if the issue is not resolved by the January Task Force meeting, the Task Force can decide how to proceed. Mr. Rhinehart contradicted that the Task Force looks to the Technical Committee for recommendations and that they should be cautious so the issue does not circle back to the Technical Committee, causing delays.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend an extension until December 2011 for the Phase II construction funding for the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point Project (ME-21a) to the Task Force. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

18. Agenda Item 16. Request for Public Comments (Mark Wingate, USACE). There were no public comments.

19. Agenda Item 17. Announcement: PPL 21 Regional Planning Team (RPT) Meetings (Melanie Goodman, USACE). Ms. Goodman reviewed the upcoming CWPPRA meetings. Mr. Paul asked if a change in the RPT membership requires approval by the Technical Committee. Mr. Hartman responded that the Technical Committee does not decide this. Mr. Clark added that the P&E Subcommittee can handle deciding who runs the RPT meetings.

January 25, 2011	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Abbeville
January 26, 2011	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
January 27, 2011	9:00 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 27, 2011	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 22, 2011	10:00 a.m.	RPT Voting Meeting	Baton Rouge

20. Agenda Item 18. Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Melanie Goodman, USACE). *The Task Force meeting will be held January 18, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana in the District Assembly Room (DARM).* Ms. Goodman stated that this meeting may be moved to January 19, 2011.

21. Agenda Item 19. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Melanie Goodman, USACE).

January 18, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
January 25, 2011	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Abbeville
January 26, 2011	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
January 27, 2011	9:00 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans

January 27, 2011	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 22, 2011	10:00 a.m.	RPT Voting Meeting	Baton Rouge
April 19, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	New Orleans
June 1, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 20, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge

22. Agenda Item 20. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Rhinehart moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hartman seconded. Mr. Wingate adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:00 p.m.