

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 28 September 2010 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Mark Wingate opened the meeting at 9:30 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. Mark Wingate (sitting in for 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. Wingate introduced the members of the Technical Committee and reviewed the agenda.

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

Mr. Clark stated that Agenda Item 10, listed as a decision item, will be presented today, but due to requests for additional information, will not be voted on. He added that after the additional information is disseminated, an email vote can be taken.

DECISION: Mr. Rhinehart moved to approve the change to Agenda Item Number 10. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Rhinehart asked to include the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point Project to Agenda Item 4.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to approve the agenda with the change to Agenda Item Number 4, as presented. Mr. Paul 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 explained that right now available funds in the Planning Program are \$540,804, with \$100,000 expected to be returned into the budget from completed FY09 work. FY10 funds will be available until March 31 and then can be closed out. If recommended as presented, the FY11 Planning Program budget will be approximately \$5 million. The Construction Program

started with negative \$11.8 million of past approved funding and, with the FY11 Federal appropriation, pending funding re-authorization, will be \$79.6 million with approximately \$22 million from project cleanup. The Construction Program is going into today with a \$90 million budget available (\$68 million anticipated for FY11 and the \$22 million estimated project cleanup). Depending on today's budget recommendations of \$13.7 million, the Construction Program budget will be approximately \$76.3 million going into January.

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

Mr. Clark asked for clarification on the balance going into January 2011. Ms. Browning answered that accounting for new funding, expected return funds, and approvals for today, there will be a balance of approximately \$75 million going into January 2011. Mr. Clark then clarified that the numbers represent \$89 million less the \$14 million being voted on today and Ms. Browning agreed that was an approximate estimate. Ms. Browning pointed out that there will be two potential projects coming up for Phase 2 funding in January.

Mr. Hartman asked where the Planning Program budget numbers were. Ms. Browning answered that they are located under Tab 6 in the Committee's binders.

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

4. Agenda Item 2. Report: Final Report of the Monitoring Work Group Review of the Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) and the overall CWPPRA Monitoring Program (Dr. John Foret, NMFS). Dr. Foret provided a status update on the programmatic review of CRMS and the overall CWPPRA Monitoring Program. Dr. Foret gave a presentation on the status of the CWPPRA Monitoring Program and added that the draft report was submitted two weeks ago. The Work Group hopes to receive all comments in time for the final report to be presented at the October Task Force meeting. The Work Group was presented with four action items for this effort:

- 1) Determine if there is potential for programmatic cost savings by reducing the frequency of some monitoring efforts, reducing the number of stations, etc. The Work Group found that statistically, monitoring efforts and stations should not be reduced. He noted that while hydrologic data is the most expensive data to acquire, it is also the most called upon for use. He explained that the State is looking into cost saving measures, such as using in house technicians to collect elevation data versus contracting those efforts out. He gave an overview of the per unit per year cost to gather the five major criteria of data, in addition to overall costs spent on CRMS and total monitoring programs, including project specific monitoring. He explained that CRMS is only funded until 2013, but that by extrapolating to 2019, cost estimates to continue project specific monitoring were determined. As of April, the current expenditures for monitoring are at 5.87% of project costs, which is below the estimated 8.8%, but in the future, it is expected to approach the 8.8%.
- 2) Evaluate alternatives to improve monitoring input into decision-making. By CWPPRA project, determine if current data collection is adequate to determine if the project has met, or is on a trajectory toward meeting, its goals so that the decision making process

can be an informed one. Where data collection is inadequate for that purpose, identify and evaluate alternatives to remedy that shortcoming. Dr. Foret presented a summary table of the agency review of the adequacy of project monitoring. Based on this summary, the Technical Committee and Task Force will need to determine if more money should be added for monitoring to meet the shortcomings or if the monitoring budget should remain at the current level.

- 3) Identify potential partners and level of support for sharing of CRMS funding responsibility. OCPR and the Louisiana Applied Coastal Engineering and Science (LACES) Program has pledged \$7 million for FY09 to FY13. Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) has also been identified as a potential cost sharing partner, as well as the LCA Science and Technology Program (S&T).
- 4) Evaluate existing level of use by various agencies. The Work Group found a wide margin in how the data is being used and in the audience of users, which range from landowners to academics and consultants. He added that landowners represent less than one tenth of a percent of all users.

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

Mr. Hartman thanked Dr. Foret for the Work Group's effort on this report. He clarified that the reason for this effort was to evaluate increased monitoring costs and ensure that no cost savings were overlooked. He then asked if CRMS sites could not be overlapped with LCA project monitoring sites because the random spacing would be lost. Dr. Jenneke Visser agreed and added that such overlap would also result in a loss of the past three years of data from the CRMS sites already established. She stated that the Work Group will discuss future cost sharing with LCA.

Mr. Clark also thanked Dr. Foret for his efforts and said that USFWS would get draft report comments back as soon as possible. Mr. Clark then pointed out that the agency narratives in action item four were not included in the draft report and requested that they be included in the final report, at least as an appendix. Dr. Foret agreed to include the agency narratives in the final report.

Dr. Foret stated that the intention is to have all comments received and the report finalized by the October Task Force meeting.

Mr. Clark pointed out that USFWS has seven projects that need additional monitoring and land-water analysis. He stated that initial cost estimates have been received from OCPR and he wanted to submit some of these costs today, but was asked to wait until after this discussion.

Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Clark for clarification as to why seven projects need more monitoring when the presentation only showed four USFWS projects with inadequate monitoring. Dr. Foret clarified that if monitoring changes were required, but those changes were within the current project budget, then the project was classified as adequate. Mr. Hartman stated that the State and sponsor need to discuss increased project monitoring needs and then provide a cost estimate for discussion and voting to the Technical Committee.

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

5. Agenda Item 3. Report: Status of the Priority Project List (PPL) 1 – West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) (Travis Creel, USACE). Mr. Creel provided a status on the West Bay Work Plan and Closure Plan.

Mr. Creel gave a project summary and status update on the West Bay Project Closure Plan. There are currently three closure options: 1) semi-circle rock dike closure, 2) pumped in earthen ring closure, and 3) pumped in earthen plug closure. Options two and three are currently under review to determine if dredged material from the existing anchorage area would be suitable for use. The biggest delay is additional real estate requirements. A channel easement and disposal easement currently exist, but the earthen or rock closures would require tying into the banks and therefore additional real estate to the north and south would be needed. The earthen plug would require modification to the channel easement to include a disposal easement. The initial six-month effort has been stretched to nine months due to delays related to the Gulf oil spill. The final report will be given to the Technical Committee and Task Force in June 2011. Two data collection trips were conducted instead of the intended three trips because the final data effort would not have happened before that project moved forward.

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

Mr. Hartman asked about the real estate delay with the landowners. Mr. Creel responded that the matter is with the real estate division now and he is not sure of the status. Mr. Hartman asked if CWPPRA will have the cost of a future dredging event in the anchorage area. Mr. Creel answered that if the dredged material is not suitable for the closure, there would be another dredging cycle.

Mr. Paul asked if the dredged material is currently being used for berm work. Mr. Creel stated that the dredged material has been used at Cupid's Gap. Mr. Paul added that if the material is already in use, there is hope that this material will be suitable.

Mr. Rhinehart asked about coordinating the three closure alternatives with the Mississippi River Commission (MRC). Mr. Creel answered that they are waiting to finalize a recommended alternative before coordinating with the MRC. Mr. Rhinehart stated that at the last Task Force meeting, the concensus was to coordinate with the MRC before making a recommendation so that all parties were on board with the chosen design. Mr. Wingate agreed that MRC support is needed before choosing a recommended closure alternative.

Mr. Hartman clarified that the three closure alternatives are still under evaluation and that coordination with the MRC would need to wait on this evaluation. Mr. Creel added that geotechnical data is still being gathered and that evaluation of the alternatives can not be conducted until the data is received. Mr. Wingate agreed that coordinating with the MRC should begin soon.

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

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Director for Coastal Southern Management, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in support of the West Bay Project and presented photos of grasses and birds nesting on the islands and sediment accretion around the berms as evidence that the project is working. He spoke against closure of the diversion and asked the Technical Committee to think outside of the box for a way to make the project work without closing the diversion. He then invited the Technical Committee to visit the site and help find a solution. He added that diversion projects should be tweaked to work instead of being shut down.

Mr. Hartman responded that while a report done on the project's performance showed that it was not performing well, the main reason for the closure is that CWPPRA can not afford the dredging requirements at the anchorage area. He encouraged Mr. Hahn to find a way to have the anchorage area dredging be included in the USACE dredging program so that the diversion could remain open.

Ms. Goodman suggested that monitoring be conducted in the receiving area based on Mr. Hahn's comments indicating that there is accretion in the receiving area. She pointed out that the Task Force did not approve any further monitoring in the receiving area, but that it may be helpful to obtain data as to how the islands are affecting the receiving area. Mr. Clark agreed and suggested that it be added to the October Task Force meeting agenda. Mr. Hartman said that costs for such monitoring would need to be presented, but that even if the project was performing, CWPPRA could still not afford to continue dredging the anchorage area. Ms. Goodman responded that despite the closure, such data results on the shred would be good to have for future diversion projects and for the CWPPRA Program in general.

Mr. Paul stated that as long as CWPPRA must dredge the anchorage area, monitoring results will not change the closure decision. Mr. Hartman asked if the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) was conducting monitoring in the receiving area. Ms. Goodman suggested that it would still be helpful to have the State conduct at least one more set of bathymetric surveys to compare the pre- and post-shred conditions. Mr. Hartman suggested putting together a cost estimate and timeline to present at the next Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Rhinehart agreed with Mr. Hartman and Mr. Paul about the anchorage dredging and stated that a full high water cycle would be needed before evaluating any accretion results. Ms. Goodman responded that the project has been open for one year.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish Government, agreed with Mr. Hahn that it is heartbreaking to close this diversion. She asked if the dredged sediment could be beneficially used to keep the project open. Mr. Clark responded that the material is already being used beneficially. He also requested that the receiving area monitoring effort be placed on the agenda for the December Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Hartman added that the scientists should be consulted to determine the most appropriate time to conduct such surveying.

Mr. Hahn pointed out that Plaquemines Parish is currently working with the State to engineer and design dredging projects such that the projects can be bid in one continuous row so as to lower unit costs. Mr. Hartman responded that CWPPRA can not lobby Congress to include the

anchorage area under the USACE dredging program, and that the dredging costs are causing the diversion closure.

6. Agenda Item 4. Report: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Melanie Goodman, USACE). *Ms. Goodman reported on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects that have been experiencing project delays and milestones established for several projects.*

a. ME-21a Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point Project

Ms. Goodman reported that the State and USACE have been directly involved in contract negotiations and that the State has submitted a whereas clause with conditional statement regarding indemnification until such time as Congress relieves that requirement. This language is currently under review at USACE Headquarters and the Army General Council.

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

Mr. Paul asked for a timeline on the review. Mr. Rhinehart added that Mr. Chad Courville made a request via email asking for the cost share agreement status for this project. Ms. Goodman responded that they are trying to resolve the indemnification issues for this project as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. Chad Courville, the Miami Corporation, asked for clarification as to whether this request went through with a package of other information or as an individual item for review. He asked if this project would be held up by other issues. Mr. Rhinehart agreed that this project is unique. Ms. Goodman responded that she was not sure how the request went to Headquarters, but that to the best of her knowledge, other issues are still part of the negotiation. Mr. Rhinehart clarified that this language is not an effort to renegotiate the template, but is special for this project and should be going to Headquarters individually for review. Mr. Courville asked to remain updated on this matter and Mr. Wingate agreed.

b. BA-38 Barataria Barrier Shoreline, Pelican Island to Chaland Pass (CU2) Status Update (Rachel Sweeney, NOAA).

Ms. Sweeny gave a brief status report of the project. The project was a complex project intended to evaluate the shoreline from eastern Grand Isle to the Upper Mississippi River Delta in order to break the system down into CWPPRA-sized projects and identify which segments were most susceptible to breaching and had the highest local priority. The highest priority segments were the Chaland Headland and Pelican Island, which were combined into a single project authorized for Phase 2 construction in 2005 for a total funding of \$63 million. The Chaland Headland was completed in 2007 within budget and target benefits. Pelican Island experienced delays over land rights, oyster lease clearance, ocean dumping, sand mining, threatened and endangered species, and storms issues which required template redesign. Because of the delays, there has been ongoing dramatic erosion since 2002. The shoreline has changed and there are now cost increases to build the original dune template, which was designed to prevent breaching over the

project's 20-year life. A \$10 million cost increase was approved last year and the project was close to contract before the Gulf oil spill, which caused another setback. Based on recent storms, it has been observed that back barrier support is important as a foundation to creating a robust and successful marsh restoration platform. A new footprint, 500 feet wider and with an estimated 175 acres of additional marsh creation, was proposed to the Technical Committee via email. This revised footprint can be built within the current budget. The State is working on the oyster and land right clearances (estimated at 60 to 90 days) and contamination testing is being conducted. The current schedule to advertise for bidding is spring 2011.

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

Mr. Clark asked about the status of the State berm in this area. Ms. Sweeney responded that the State berm is being constructed in front of the island and is placing a quarter of the required island dune fill. She added that by leveraging the State work, the CWPPRA project can expand its template to the north, providing a more robust marsh platform.

Ms. Goodman asked if construction of the State berm is included in the benefits to the CWPPRA project. Ms. Sweeney responded, yes, to some extent, but that she has not run those numbers.

Mr. Hartman added that a new cost analysis was not conducted because, based on the numbers shown, the project is as good as previous in terms of cost benefit. Mr. Rhinehart pointed out that there is lot of equipment currently mobilized at the project and that if it could be moved to another project, cost savings could be had. He added that more work needs to be done to expedite the process of queuing projects to leverage work already underway to reduce mobilization costs.

Ms. Goodman stated that since a Technical Committee email vote was taken on the project cost changes, the decision needed to be reported to the public.

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

c. TV-19 Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection/Commercial Canal Freshwater Redirection Status Update. (Michael Somme, CSRS, Inc.)

Mr. Somme gave a brief status report of the project. He stated that the Iberia Parish grant was received in March and that the Vermilion Parish grant has been deemed adequate and they are waiting to hear back. Currently, the recon phase has just been completed and the geotechnical data was received last Friday. The preliminary study phase is expected to be completed in November. The end product will be a feasibility study and recommendation based on the most cost effective method to accomplish the project goals.

Mr. Hartman asked what the project goals are. Mr. Somme answered, to create shoreline protection along Weeks Bay. Mr. Creel added that the original goal was a hydrologic conveyance, but that the scope was changed to convert back to shoreline protection for that stretch. Mr. Hartman did not recall an official scope change. Mr. Creel responded that he thought

an official scope change was made and that he will check. Mr. Clark stated that another status report will be on the agenda at the December Technical Committee meeting.

Ms. Goodman gave a notice that the Beneficial Use of Dredging Material (BUDMAT) Program is not picking up Cycles 4 and 5 for the Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, therefore, they are now coordinating with the State to request construction approval in December and are working on a cost share agreement and cost estimate. Mr. Wingate added that the Calcasieu River dredged material management plan is almost completed and that approximately 40% of the dredged material will be used beneficially, whereas the previous plan had no beneficial use. This plan will include the same areas as Sabine Refuge Cycles 4 and 5. He added that this is good news since the dredged material management plan is a new tool with 100% Federal funding and beneficial use.

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

7. Agenda Item 5. Report/Decision: 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. Notice of the pending de-authorization was sent on August 23, 2010, to the U.S. Congress, the State House and Senate Natural Resources Committee chairs, and to adjacent landowners. The notice was also disseminated via the Breaux Act News Flash. The Technical Committee will vote on a recommendation to the Task Force for final de-authorization of the Brown Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project as requested by NRCS and OCPR.*

Ms. Goodman gave a brief status report of the project. The de-authorization letter was sent out and there were no objections to de-authorization. Today's request is that the Technical Committee recommend final de-authorization to the Task Force.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend final de-authorization of the Brown Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project, as requested by NRCS and OCPR, to the Task Force. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 6. Decision: FY11 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 21 Process, and Presentation of FY11 Outreach Budget (Melanie Goodman, USACE/Scott Wilson, USGS).

- a. *The Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee recommended that the PPL 21 Planning Process Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) include selecting three nominees in the Barataria, Terrebonne, and Pontchartrain Basins, and two nominees in all other basins, except Atchafalaya where only one nominee would be selected. If only one project is presented at the Regional Planning Team meeting for the*

Mississippi River Delta Basin, then an additional nominee would be selected for the Breton Sound Basin. The P&E Subcommittee also recommended that the public be notified of the results of the PPL 21 candidate project evaluations via the Breaux Act News Flash in lieu of holding the traditional Fall PPL meetings. The Technical Committee will vote on making the P&E Subcommittee's recommendations to the Task Force.

Ms. Goodman reported that the process for PPL 21 is the same as PPL 20 except for the following changes: 1) in the event of multi-basin projects, the project will either be placed in the basin where the majority of the benefits incur or broken up into the multiple basins, 2) last year there was a coast-wide project presented, so for PPL 21, a legitimate coast-wide project will be allowed as the 21st project to compete with the other projects, and 3) the P&E Subcommittee recommends dropping the fall public meetings to announce the candidate projects and instead presenting the results through email and via the *Breaux Act News Flash* prior to the December Technical Committee meeting.

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

Mr. Clark supported the change to drop the public meetings.

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

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish Government, spoke in support of keeping the public meetings, since the meetings help get stakeholders invested in the CWPPRA process, let the public know how projects are evaluated in CWPPRA, and maintain transparency within the process.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Terrebonne Parish Government, agreed with Ms. Winter and stated that the public, local government, and citizens groups should be allowed to attend the meetings and make comments, since there are limited opportunities for these individuals to engage the agencies otherwise.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Director for Coastal Southern Management, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in support of keeping the public meetings.

Mr. Nic Mathern, LaFourche Parish Government, supported keeping the public meetings since not everyone has time to attend the daytime CWPPRA meetings. The evening meetings provide another opportunity for the public to engage in CWPPRA.

Mr. Hartman clarified that the public meetings are only intended to present the results of the votes and that the same presentations are made at the December Technical Committee meeting. Ms. Goodman added that in the past, the two public meetings are sparsely attended, usually consisting of agency representatives. Mr. Hartman suggested a compromise to have only one public meeting.

Mr. Paul stated that in light of today's comments, he supports keeping the public meetings. Mr. Clark agreed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval of the Planning and Evaluation Subcommittee's recommendation for the PPL 21 Planning Process, with the exception of keeping the two fall public candidate project evaluation meetings, to the Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

b. The CWPPRA Outreach Committee presented the draft FY11 Outreach Committee budget in the amount of \$445,800 to the Technical Committee.

Ms. Susan Bergeron presented an overview of the Outreach Committee budget. The Outreach Committee attempted to make the budget as transparent as possible. Two new tasks were added this year, one task for legislative education and one for video production. The budget has already been presented to the P&E Subcommittee, to the Technical Committee, and to the Task Force. It was recommended by the P&E Subcommittee to move the day-to-day website operations into the Construction Program budget.

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

Mr. Clark commented that this is the most detailed Outreach Committee budget he has ever seen. Mr. Hartman commended Ms. Bergeron on her good work.

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

c. The P&E Subcommittee recommended the FY11 Planning budget in the amount of \$4,992,073, which includes the Outreach Committee budget. The Technical Committee will vote on making a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY11 Planning budget, including the Outreach Program budget.

Ms. Goodman presented an overview of the FY11 Planning budget. The P&E Subcommittee was asked to reduce the budget to under \$5 million. The Planning budget is currently carrying over \$541,000 into FY11 from previous years and anticipates approximately another \$100,000 to be returned. The annual CWPPRA Program allocation for planning activities is \$5 million. The total recommended budget by the P&E Subcommittee includes \$4,546,273 for planning activities and \$445,800 for outreach activities for a total of \$4,992,073. To reduce the budget, helicopter flyovers were eliminated and maintenance of the website fact sheets and project reports was moved into the construction project budgets, since they are related to construction program activities. Certain Core GIS support activities and some costs of the LA Coast website were also moved from planning into construction. The actual cost share for those items needs to be created, but the P&E Subcommittee is coordinating with the State and USGS and a fax vote may be held at a later date. The Governor's Office of Coastal Activities (GOCA) budget has remaining FY09 funds which are recommended to be carried over and used for FY11. The P&E Subcommittee recommends that no GOCA budget be allocated for FY11 and that the carried over funds be used. If more funds are needed, more money could be allocated later. The Outreach Committee budget was increased by \$10,000 for video support. Additionally, the 2012 report to Congress

may start in FY11, but the cost estimate is still in development and may be requested later. The two public meetings would fall under FY12, and would not affect the FY11 budget.

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

Mr. Rhinehart stated that GOCA has approximately \$30,000 remaining in the FY09 and \$30,000 remaining in the FY10 budget which could be carried over for use in FY11. The past years' invoices will take approximately three months to clear off the books.

Mr. Hartman suggested GOCA be granted an extension to keep charging against previous years. Mr. Rhinehart suggested that GOCA clear out the past years' books and then roll the remaining funds back into the Program and receive a new FY11 budget of \$60,000. Mr. Hartman and Ms. Goodman agreed that this seemed more appropriate and that coordination will take place in time for the October Task Force meeting. Ms. Goodman clarified that no additional funds will be given to GOCA, but that just the remaining FY09 and FY10 funds would be reallocated.

Mr. Hartman commended the P&E Subcommittee on getting the FY11 Planning budget under \$5 million.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval of the Planning Program budget in the amount of \$4,992,073, including the Outreach Committee budget, as recommended by the P&E Subcommittee, with the exception of NOT excluding the GOCA FY11, for which an email vote will later be sent, to the Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

d. The P&E Subcommittee recommended Technical Committee approval of the following change to the CWPPRA SOP:

Section 6a. (1) (c):

The responsibilities of the Technical Committee include the annual review of the outreach budget and the Public Outreach Committee's strategic plan. These efforts should be undertaken in the spring and summer Technical Committee and Task Force meetings, respectively.

Ms. Goodman presented the recommended SOP change. This change is recommended because there is currently a time delay in receiving funds, since budgets are not approved until the FY in which they are needed. The SOP change would move budget decisions up so that funds for a FY are in place to execute when the FY begins.

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

Mr. Clark asked for clarification on the SOP change. Ms. Goodman explained that not all of the SOP text is shown in the agenda and that the change applies to the entire Planning Program budget and not just the Outreach Committee budget.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval of the P&E Subcommittee's recommendation to modify the SOP as presented to the Task Force. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 7. Decision: Annual Request for Incremental Funding for FY13 Administrative Costs for Cash Flow Projects (Gay Browning, USACE). *The USACE will request funding approval in the amount of \$37,190 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. The Technical Committee will vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request for funds.*

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval of the annual request for incremental funding for FY13 administrative costs for cash flow projects in the amount of \$37,190 to the Task Force. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

10. Agenda Item 8. Decision: Request for FY13 Project Specific Monitoring Funds for Cash Flow Projects, and FY13 Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) – Wetland Monitoring Funds (Greg Steyer, USGS). *Following a presentation by the USGS on the status/progress of CRMS over the past year, the Technical Committee will vote on the following requests:*

- a. PPL 9+ Project specific FY13 monitoring funding totaling \$156,685:*
 - Coast-wide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding in the amount of \$117,442*
 - Grand-White Lakes Landbridge Protection (ME-19), PPL-10, USFWS
Incremental funding in the amount of \$20,808*
 - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection, Phase 3 (BA-27c), PPL-9, NCRS
Incremental funding in the amount of \$18,435*

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval of the requested project specific FY13 monitoring incremental funding in the amount of \$156,685 and the Coast-Wide Nutria Control Program incremental funding in the amount of \$117,442 to the Task Force.

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

b. CRMS FY13 monitoring funds in the amount of \$10,504,462.

Mr. Steyer gave an overview of CRMS, which is co-chaired by OCPR and USGS. He explained that CRMS is a component of the existing CWPPRA Monitoring Program and is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of CWPPRA restoration projects and the cumulative effect of those projects on the landscape. He added that the information gathered is important for project planning, engineering and design, model validation, operational decisions, and assessment of hurricane impacts. The annual report is to give a project overview, funds update and summary of new developments.

Mr. Steyer reviewed the CRMS program to date and explained that it is a cash flow project and that this year's funding request is \$10.504 million with a running balance of approximately \$14 million. He explained that annual authorization requests for the subsequent year are based on the expenditures in the previous FY and that the FY10 expenditures were \$11 million with \$1.5 million of carry over from the previous years. Last year, the full budget amount was not requested because the authorizations moved from a three to a two year cash flow. Costs for the project average approximately \$9 million each year. OCPR contributed \$500,000 this year, and over the next three FYs will increase that contribution to \$750,000, \$1 million, and \$1.25 million, respectively. LCA is contributing about \$475,000 each year and the LCA S&T contributed \$750,000 in the last funding cycle.

CRMS consists of a network of 390 stations which measure several items within a complex ecosystem. Every year there is a CRMS road show to provide training and determine additional data which could be provided to partners. Currently, on the CRMS website, data can be downloaded on a site and project scale, and CRMS is currently working on incorporating project tabs and project level details. Last year, several data sets were produced which are now available online. Based on feedback from partners, CRMS is developing additional tools and data, focusing on development of a report carding process and using the CRMS data to determine if previously assumed ecosystem relationships still hold true. This data is being used by the modeling community for CWPPRA and other agencies to improve data models and therefore improve the planning process. CRMS will also continue soliciting funds from other programs to help support monitoring efforts.

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

Mr. Clark stated that CRMS is a part of the CWPPRA Program and that 99% of CRMS funding comes from CWPPRA. He added that he appreciates the recent State funding contributions, but recommends that for the next presentation to the Task Force, the CWPPRA logo be added to the slides. Mr. Steyer responded that the logo is on the first and last slides, but that he will put the logo on all of the slides. Mr. Hartman asked if the CWPPRA logo is on the CRMS website. Mr. Steyer answered yes.

Ms. Browning asked for clarification on the remaining \$16 million. Mr. Steyer responded that there is currently discussion regarding whether the way CRMS funding was initially set up should remain in place for the future.

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval of the requested CRMS FY13 monitoring funds in the amount of \$10,504,642 to the Task Force. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

- c. Non-cash flow project monitoring budget increase and incremental funding:
- East Mud Lake Marsh Management (CS-20), PPL-2, NRCS, budget increase in the amount of \$405,938 and FY13 incremental funding in the amount of \$275,866, which includes \$89,211 to cover previously expended funds.*

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

Mr. Hartman asked how \$90,000 has been expended without approval. Ms. Dona Weifenbach, OCP, responded that there were price overages and that they were not aware of the previous year's expenditures. She added that the continuous recorders were pulled when they realized that they were over budget.

Mr. Clark asked who is responsible for watching the budget. Ms. Weifenbach responded that responsibilities are divided and the duties in the reorganization require that CWPPRA expenditures be sent to the field office, but that the Gulf oil spill has caused some reorganization of responsibilities. Mr. Clark asked why there was first an increase of \$186,000 and now it is an increase of \$275,000. Ms. Weifenbach answered that they had looked at using the monitoring contingency funds for the overage, but decided to continue monitoring and so combined the amounts. She added that the project is working very well and that the managed portions of the project have lost little land due to storms.

Mr. Hartman expressed support for the granting of additional funds, but asked if the vertical accretion stations were being reduced to 20. Ms. Weifenbach answered yes.

Mr. Clark asked what year the project life ends. Ms. Weifenbach answered, 2016.

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend approval of the requested monitoring budget increase in the amount of \$405,938 and FY13 incremental funding in the amount of \$275,866, which includes \$89,211 to cover previously expended funds, for the East Mud Lake Marsh Management Project (CS-20), PPL-2, to the Task Force. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (David Burkholder, OCP). *The Technical Committee will*

consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY13 incremental funding in the amount of \$5,885,332 and O&M budget increases totaling \$3,349,711.

a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY13 incremental funding in the total amount of \$2,650,974, for the following projects:

- Four Mile Canal Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL-9, NMFS, incremental funding amount (Federal S&A only): \$1,000.

- Pass Chaland to Grand Bayou Pass Barrier Shoreline Restoration (BA-35), PPL-11, NMFS, incremental funding amount (FY11 – FY13)(Federal S&A only): \$6,665

- Coast-wide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS, incremental funding amount: \$2,643,309

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval of the requested FY13 incremental funding in the total amount of \$2,650,974 to the Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

b. PPL 1-8 Projects requesting approval for FY13 incremental funding in the total amount of \$10,524, for the following projects:

- Point au Fer Canal Plugs (TE-22), PPL-2, NMFS, incremental funding amount (Federal S&A only): \$2,205.

- Lake Chapeau Sediment Input & Hydrologic Restoration (TE-26), PPL-3, NMFS, incremental funding amount (Federal S&A only): \$2,319

- Black Bayou Hydrologic Restoration (CS-27), PPL-6, NMFS, incremental funding amount (FY11 – FY13)(Federal S&A only): \$6,000

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend approval of the requested FY13 incremental funding in the total amount of \$10,524 to the Task Force. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

c. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for an O&M budget increase and increment 1 funding increase:

- Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection (PO-30), PPI-10, EPA, O&M budget increase amount: \$3,349,711; increment 1 funding increase amount: \$3,356,181.

David Burkholder, OCPR, gave an overview of the status of the project. Construction was done in June 2009 and there is approximately \$1.3 million from Phase 1 engineering and design and Phase 2 construction to be returned into the CWPPRA Program. There was concern that the rock falling below the mud line after Hurricanes Gustav and Ike should have resulted in a FEMA claim. He stated that excessive settlement was observed prior to the storms and that while there was some increased shoreline erosion and alignment changes after the storms, it was not believed to be eligible for FEMA assistance.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if any engineering analysis has been completed on the soils in this area to evaluate whether the rock sinking issue will arise in the future. Peter Hopkins, OCPR, responded that they have geotechnical data on the actual rock placed in the field and will conduct a new geotechnical analysis and surveying, to start this week, to document current conditions.

Mr. Rhinehart asked what level of confidence he has that the sinking will not repeat itself. Mr. Hopkins responded that they will look at other alternatives, possibly using fiberglass or aggregate. Mr. Paul added that there are other construction methods and asked if the cost presented is based on the use of rock. Mr. Hopkins answered, yes, because it was felt to be the worst case scenario. A 25% contingency is built into the construction cost estimate and they will evaluate less costly alternatives. Ms. McCormick added that they did not wish to ask for more money in the future and so are requesting the cost estimate for the worst case scenario and will then evaluate cheaper alternatives. Mr. Paul added that he has numbers and data from the Baratavia Waterway Project and that this project needs to be analyzed before it is funded.

Mr. Clark suggested the project alternatives be analyzed and then the funding request be made at the December Technical Committee meeting or via fax vote. Mr. Hopkins responded that the rock alternative is buildable and is based on preliminary geotechnical data. Ms. McCormick expressed concern that if funding is not approved now, the project will be pushed back another year and may cause construction costs to rise. Mr. Hopkins stated that the ideal time for construction is in the summer.

Mr. Rhinehart asked how an alternatives analysis would affect the project schedule. Mr. Hopkins responded that once they know funds are available, they can evaluate alternatives and determine which avenue to pursue. Mr. Rhinehart replied that they should be finding a solution and then asking for money to support the best long-term effective solution.

Ms. McCormick suggested coordination with Mr. Paul regarding rock alternatives and using the engineering and design money to evaluate these alternatives. Mr. Burkholder responded that there are some remaining Phase 1 funds, but that this project is in Phase 2 and there is still money in Phase 2. While Phase 1 is closed out, the available Phase 2 funds could be used to conduct the alternatives analysis. While they do not wish to wait until next October to ask for

additional funds, if the funds can be approved in January, the project schedule should still be on track.

Mr. Hartman stated that while he appreciates returning unused funds into the program, it is better to use that money to find an effective solution to the problem. Mr. Burkholder clarified that some design work has been done and that they are not asking for money with no design. He added that they can work within the recommendation for further alternative analysis as long as there is still a summer build timeframe. Ms. McCormick clarified that they will look at some alternatives to give a better assurance that the rock sinking issue will not arise again in the future.

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

No action was taken by the Technical Committee since the EPA volunteered to look at new alternatives for the project design and present again at the December Technical Committee meeting.

12. Agenda Item 10. Discussion: Request for Change in Scope and Construction Funding for the PPL 6 – North Lake Boudreaux Freshwater Introduction and Hydrologic Management Project (TE-32a) (Ronny Paille and Darryl Clark, USFWS). *The USFWS and the State Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority, through the OCPR, request Technical Committee recommendation for Task Force approval for a change in scope, and to request Phase 2 construction funding for the North Lake Boudreaux Project, to change the project features from benefitting 416 acres to TBA acres, and to increase the estimated fully funded project cost by TBA% from \$12,289,133 to \$TBA.*

Mr. Clark stated that this is a non-cash flow project and that, though not required, the 30% and 95% meetings have been conducted. He added that there are some outstanding questions to be answered and that the project sponsors would like to get those questions answered within the next six days and then ask for a Technical Committee email vote in time for the October Task Force meeting. Otherwise, the request will be presented at the December Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Paille gave an overview of the project. The project was authorized in 2003 and is located in Terrebonne Parish. They do not have a fully funded cost estimate yet, but are close. The Parish wants to build the levee to parish standards, but the CWPPRA project does not require such a high levee. The plan is for CWPPRA to help pay for the project, with the Parish conducting design and construction to parish standards and using the existing levee to reduce impacts. The parish standard is an eight-foot elevation and the CWPPRA project only needs a four-foot elevation. However, more information is being gathered, including quantifying the CWPPRA share of forced drainage costs and impacts, pursuing conservation easements for the south forced drainage system's enclosed wetlands, correcting impact discrepancies, and developing the fully funded cost estimate, using the existing offset water level rise impacts.

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

Mr. Hartman asked about liability and who the permittee would be for the levee. He added that he hopes the Parish would be the permittee and liability would be kept with the Parish since the levee is being constructed to the parish standard and not by CWPPRA.

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

Mr. Al Levron, Terrebonne Parish Manager, commented that indemnification could be extended to the necessary agencies. He added that the standards have changed and that it would be ridiculous to make a smaller levee feature now and then increase the levee height at a later time. Rather, it makes more sense to construct the levee to parish standards at this time. He stated that the Parish will be the permittee, will construct the levee, will accept the monitoring responsibilities, and will handle any conservation easements needed. CWPPRA will pay its proportionate cost. He explained that the Barataria-Terrebonne National Estuary Program (BTNEP) and the Apache Corporation have already given money towards the project. He is in favor of avoiding CWPPRA policies and requirements by making it a parish project. He added that the Parish is willing and able to overcome the obstacles presented in the past few days.

Mr. Clark clarified that CWPPRA will estimate the appropriate amount of money that falls under the CWPPRA responsible portions of the project. Mr. Hartman agreed that the correct CWPPRA funding should be identified.

Mr. Levron stated that the Parish has additional sources of funds and guidelines that they must comply with. Ms. McCormick asked that the CWPPRA requirements not be viewed as obstacles, but rather that CWPPRA wants the best information available to make the best decisions regarding the project. She added that they are just asking for some clarifications and that CWPPRA and the Parish should be joined as the project moves forward so as not to contradict one another to the detriment of the project.

Mr. Levron responded that the Parish is committed to the project and that many of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and permit requirements have already been completed. The Parish needs to know how much partner funding is available before they can get the rest of the financing together and begin the project. Mr. Hartman stated that once the remaining information was presented, the Technical Committee could take a vote.

Mr. Paille stated that they wish to get all of the required information as soon as possible and have a Technical Committee fax vote in time for presentation at the October Task Force meeting.

Mr. Clark clarified that the Parish needs to put in writing that it will seek the necessary conservation easements. Mr. Hartman stated that a guarantee that the Parish has the needed conservation servitudes allows the regulatory issues within CWPPRA to be alleviated.

Mr. Clark expressed doubt that the required information would be available within the next six days. Mr. Levron replied that the Parish is ready to move forward. Mr. Hartman asked if the Parish has a process to obtain easements if there is an unwilling landowner. Mr. Levron answered, yes. Mr. Hartman responded that this should be clarified in writing and requested an email from the Parish stating that the Parish would use its quick-take authority to obtain the

required conservation easements. He added that it is a huge regulatory issue to allow wetlands to be enclosed.

Mr. Levron stated that after the recent hurricanes, Terrebonne Parish has been very proactive in obtaining all necessary permitting requirements for projects.

13. Agenda Item 11. Decision: Request for a Change in Project Scope for the Bayou Dupont Ridge Creation and Marsh Restoration Project (BA-48) due to an Estimated Budget Increase (Richard Hartman, NMFS). *The NMFS and OCPR are requesting a change in the project scope due to an estimated budget increase over 89%. The Bayou Dupont Ridge Creation and Marsh Restoration Project was approved on PPL-17. The original approved total project cost is \$21,626,767. While the project area and features are largely the same, increases in the estimated unit dredge and mobilization costs have resulted in a Phase 2 estimate that is significantly higher than the Phase 1 fully funded cost estimate. While the estimated fully funded cost and updated wetland value assessment (WVA) are pending Engineering and Environmental Work Group review, NMFS and OCPR wish to proceed to 95% design in late October 2010 and proceed to a Phase 2 funding request for January 2011. The Technical Committee will consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request for a scope change to increase the estimated total project budget to \$41,085,171.*

Cecelia Linder, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), gave a presentation on the project. As the project progressed, there has been an increase in construction costs. This request is being made in advance of the Phase 2 request in January 2011, when there will be a better estimate of construction costs. They do not expect the project's fully funded cost estimate to exceed \$42.5 million. The new estimate is almost double the originally estimated cost. There is also an expected change in net benefitted acres pending review by the Environmental Work Group.

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

Mr. Clark asked if there will be a revised fully funded cost estimate before the next Task Force meeting. Ms. Linder replied that there is no guarantee because the Economic Work Group is extremely busy. Mr. Hartman responded that it is the responsibility of the project sponsors to request a scope change when the costs and benefits of a project are expected to change or reduce by 25% or more. He added that a completed cost estimate is not needed at this time, but that the sponsors are just requesting approval to continue to 95% design even though the costs are estimated to be almost double that originally estimated.

Mr. Paul asked what the settled height on the ridge feature would be. Ms. Linder responded that the height will be 4.5 post-construction and is expected to be 2.0 at year twenty. Mr. Paul expressed concern about whether planting woody species will be effective. Ms. Linder answered that the plan is not to plant a lot of trees, but to introduce more woody species as the project is monitored over time.

Mr. Clark pointed out that the high cost is due to using sediment on this project from "outside the system."

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

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish Government, spoke in support of allowing this project to go through the design phase.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Director for Coastal Southern Management, Plaquemines Parish Government, also spoke in support of this project.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval of the requested change in project scope to increase the estimated total project budget to \$41,085,171 to the Task Force. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

14. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Request for Approval to Initiate Deauthorization of the South Pecan Island Freshwater Introduction Project (ME-23) (Dr. John Foret, NMFS). The OCPR, the local sponsor, and NMFS, the Federal sponsor, request approval to initiate the 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 will vote on a recommendation to the Task Force to initiate de-authorization of the South Pecan Island Freshwater Introduction Project (ME-23).

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

Mr. Clark expressed sorrow at the de-authorization of this project because it is a good project. Mr. Hartman asked if agencies can initiate de-authorization based on anything other than changes in the project's cost effectiveness. Ms. Goodman responded that the chairman of the Task Force signs all de-authorization requests and that everything he signs goes through legal review. She added that USACE Office of Counsel (OC) has determined that de-authorization based on an unwilling landowner may be arbitrary and capricious since the USACE does sometimes take land for priority projects.

Mr. Hartman asked that the record show the reason for de-authorization is a decrease in the cost effectiveness of the project and not an unwilling landowner. Mr. Rhinehart stated that OCPR sent a letter requesting de-authorization and that they were asked for additional information. He stated that he does not feel the entire project history must be presented for a de-authorization request.

Mr. Wingate asked if this project is not similar to the Brown Lake Project. Ms. Goodman responded that it is, but that the Brown Lake Project gave justification for de-authorization on the technical merit and supplied technical information showing the project was not cost effective in addition to stating that there was an unwilling landowner. Mr. Paul expressed aggravation that USACE OC is delaying the de-authorization process for a project that can not be built.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that the USACE is just one member of CWPPRA and that USACE OC approval may not be necessary for project de-authorization. Mr. Rhinehart expressed further frustration at having to explain de-authorization reasons to USACE OC satisfaction when the Technical Committee and Task Force have determined a project unfeasible. He added that he

feels USACE OC is dictating the technical merits of a project through this process which is not their role and the situation is becoming acrimonious.

Mr. Wingate agreed that the USACE OC should not be dictating project technical merits.

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

Mr. Randy Moertle, Miller Estates, asked under what authority CWPPRA would be allowed to take a landowner's land. Ms. Goodman responded that she could have the Office of Council send him an email regarding the condemnation process.

Mr. Hartman stated that even if CWPPRA were a USACE program, there would be no condemnation process. He clarified that the NMFS would never consider a quick-take process for restoration purposes. Mr. Paul and Mr. Clark agreed that NRCS and USFWS would also not take private land for restoration projects.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend approval to initiate the requested 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.

15. Agenda Item 13. Additional Agenda Items (Mark Wingate, USACE). There were no additional agenda items.

16. Agenda Item 14. Request for Public Comments (Mark Wingate, 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 October 13, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. at the Lake Charles Civic Center, 900 Lake Shore Drive, Lake Charles, Louisiana. The CWPPRA 20th Anniversary Fall Dedication Ceremony will be held October 14, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the Cameron Parish National Wildlife Refuge Complex, 1428 Highway 27, Bell City, Louisiana.*

Mr. Clark added that the Outreach Committee would like an RSVP from those who plan to attend the Dedication Ceremony.

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. The December 1st Technical Committee meeting has been changed to December 8th. Mr. Paul asked for some optional dates. Ms. Goodman responded that based on the schedules of the Technical Committee chair, only one alternative date was presented.

October 13, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lake Charles
October 14, 2010	10:00 a.m.	Dedication Ceremony	Bell City
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 8, 2010	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
January 18, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
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

19. Agenda Item 17. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. Mr. Wingate adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:30 p.m.