

MRCEMVN-PM-C

08 April 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 08 April 2011 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Mr. 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. Holden expressed appreciation for Ms. Melanie Goodman's seven years of service to the CWPPRA Program. Ms. Goodman thanked everyone who worked with the Program, especially the Planning and Engineering (P&E) Subcommittee and the grassroots and public interest groups, and expressed hopefulness at working with these groups in the future on the West Bank and Vicinity Project.

Mr. Holden introduced Mr. Brad Inman, USACE, who has replaced Ms. Goodman as the new CWPPRA Program Manager.

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

Mr. Clark asked if any agenda items had been revised per the updated agenda in the binders and was answered that only the cost number in Agenda Item No. 10 had been changed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. 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 highlighted that the current Program budget estimate is \$2.49 billion and that the projected funding, through the end of the Program, is \$2.303 billion, leaving a shortage of \$186 million. She explained that the forecast is updated twice a year, in June and December, and that

the Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11) funds in the amount of \$82 million (including \$5 million for planning) have been received. She clarified that the funding could increase or decrease based on the upcoming June forecast.

Mr. Holden asked if any projects are anticipated to come out, leaving more funds available. Ms. Browning answered that Maurepas Swamp at \$152 million and Rockefeller Refuge at \$95 million are placeholders in the current estimate and have not been approved for Phase II funding. Removing these two projects would reduce the current budget estimate by over \$200 million.

Mr. Holden asked if there is enough funding to complete the West Bay closure activities. Ms. Browning answered that there is currently approval for the \$50 million closure estimate.

Mr. Clark clarified that while Maurepas Swamp and Rockefeller Refuge are the two largest, there are other projects that may also drop out. Ms. Browning agreed and suggested that the Technical Committee consider how many more priority lists be funded based on the current budget numbers.

Mr. Holden pointed out that with returned funds from projects falling out, there shows a slight surplus in the budget and emphasized that the Program is not in a debt circumstance. He then asked how today's cost approvals would affect the budget. Ms. Browning responded that only the Lake Borgne Project is requesting an estimate and funding increase today of approximately \$3.3 million. She added that the other requests today are for current estimate increases, which are only Phase II placeholders; however, she highlighted that approval of these estimate increases would increase the new projected budget from \$2.49 billion to \$2.544 billion.

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

Mr. Clark pointed out that the Program is on a cash flow system and that there is no guarantee that all projects in engineering and design will move into construction. He also explained that a letter was submitted by USFWS on March 15, 2011, giving the USACE the CWPPRA work allowance from the Sports Fish Restoration and Boating Safety Trust Fund. He added that the Trust Fund is currently under continuing resolution to the end of this year, but will need to be re-authorized by Congress after that point.

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

4. 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 Project and Closure Plan.

Mr. Creel reviewed the project's history and then gave a current status report. The project team is working with the State to develop a plan and schedule to conduct a final survey of the receiving area, as directed at the last Technical Committee and Task Force meetings. Geotechnical borings from the river and receiving area have been collected and engineering analysis still needs to be conducted. Three alternatives (rock dike closure, earthen closure, and earthen plug) are still under consideration. Survey data has been collected in the open water area bottoms, but

additional survey data is needed on the existing banks to the north and south of the diversion. Right-of-entry has been refused by the property owner to the north. Plaquemines Parish has also sent a letter supporting the property owner's position denying right-of-entry. The shoaling investigation results are scheduled to be presented to the Technical Committee in June via a webinar meeting. A site visit is scheduled for June 30, 2011, but is being rescheduled at the request of Plaquemines Parish to coincide with the low water season.

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

Mr. Clark asked about the survey of the receiving area. Mr. Creel answered that the State is coordinating the survey crew.

Mr. Hartman asked about closure scheduling delays and land rights procedures to gain right-of-entry. Mr. Holden replied that a condemnation proceeding is likely to be used and that a two-step process will be required to gain entry for investigation purposes to conduct the survey and then to acquire land in fee based on the final design requirements. He added that the schedule would likely be pushed to the fall of 2012 or beginning of 2013.

Mr. Rhinehart asked how the closure plan would absolve CWPPRA of maintenance responsibilities. Mr. Holden responded that the intention is for the design to have a performance element so as to structure the closure such that, for the performance period under the cost share agreement, there can be certainty that the closure would provide its function and sustain its form, thus requiring no further obligation from CWPPRA.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the closure will be constructed to not need maintenance or if CWPPRA will not have the obligation to maintain it. Mr. Holden answered, both, for the period of the 20 years that the project is under the cost share agreement. Mr. Rhinehart expressed a preference for CWPPRA divesting itself of any obligations once the closure is complete, rather than having a potential 20-year maintenance period. Mr. Holden clarified that the intent is to have an engineered solution such that, under the terms of the cost share agreement, there is a high degree of confidence that a closure will be put in place that will not require further actions through CWPPRA.

Mr. Rhinehart asked who will be reviewing the engineering for the closure. Mr. Holden responded, the USACE and Mississippi River Commission (MRC). Mr. Holden added that the USACE intends to present an engineering solution that the MRC will endorse, recommend implementing, and then direct the USACE to pick up in its Operations and Maintenance (O&M) program.

Mr. Paul asked if the project is on hold until the land rights issue is resolved and if the survey and actual construction are two separate land right processes. Mr. Creel answered that the design is continuing, using historical data, but that the survey data for the north and south tie-ins will be necessary. Mr. Holden clarified that there is a two-step process to condemn land for the survey under a right-of-access for investigations and then to condemn land once the actual construction footprint is known. He added that until the final footprint is known, the condemnation cannot proceed.

Mr. Hartman commented that Plaquemines Parish has threatened action which would further slow the project down.

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

Mr. Sean Duffy, Mississippi River Maritime Association, commented that the West Bay diversion took ten years to build and requested that as other diversions are proposed and discussed, the lessons learned from this failure be used to create success in the future. He pointed out that while the navigation industry wishes to see diversions work, this project shows that diversions remain experimental.

Mr. Clark responded that the main reason the diversion is being closed is the \$12 million cost burden every two to three years to dredge the Pilottown Anchorage Area (PAA). Mr. Duffy agreed that that is one of the responsibilities according to the agreement.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, emphasized that the diversion is working and encouraged the Technical Committee to visit the site. He added that it is very discouraging to see this project closed after twelve years of studies and \$20 million dollars to get it built. He expressed frustration that \$50 to \$80 million will be spent to close the diversion when that money could be spent to build new projects. He also asked if projects could be better coordinated to reduce mobilization costs, for example the Lake Hermitage and Point a la Hache projects. Mr. Hartman asked if Mr. Hahn has talked to his congressional delegate regarding putting the PAA into the USACE O&M program. Mr. Hahn responded, yes. Mr. Clark pointed out that the Lake Hermitage Project has funding, while the W. Point a Hache Marsh Creation project has not yet received construction funding, but that the USFWS, as the sponsor of the Lake Hermitage Project, is willing to find ways to save money in the future.

Ms. Cynthia Duet, National Audubon Society, asked if the condemnation process would extend the closure timeline such that another dredge cycle would be required under CWPPRA. Mr. Holden responded that the berm constructed by the State for the oil spill response has had some positive effects at the PAA and that there may be a problem of not enough sediment material to build the closure. He added that the closure timeline also depends on the river stages.

Mr. Rhinehart suggested moving Agenda Item No. 4 to before Agenda Item No. 8 for time considerations.

DECISION: Mr. Rhinehart moved to delay discussion of Agenda Item No. 4 until before Agenda Item No. 8. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

5. Agenda Item 5. Report: Status of the PPL 6 – North Lake Boudreaux Freshwater Introduction and Hydrologic Management Project (TE-32a) Federal Fiscal Law Issue (Darryl Clark, USFWS).

Mr. Holden reported that the USACE was able to determine that the funds could be released and that the USFWS and the State can proceed as the original concept was proposed. Ms. Browning and Ms. Mary Kinsey confirmed that a draft cost share agreement is in progress.

Mr. Clark thanked the USACE for a favorable response. He added that the Department of the Interior indicated in December that there were three statutes, including the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and Fish and Wildlife Act, which will allow this cost sharing.

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 6. Report: Review of Navigation Channel Agreements (Kirk Rhinehart, OCPR).
Mr. Rhinehart reported on the State's position of sponsoring coastal restoration projects located along Federally authorized navigation channels.

Mr. Holden explained that at the Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority's (CPRA) meeting in January, the chairman explained a State policy that may impact, to an extent, cost share agreements containing a restoration component on a Federal navigation channel. He added that there are currently 21 projects within CWPPRA that would fall within this category: one is a nominee today, three are in Phase I, two are in Phase II, three are currently under construction, and the remaining 13 are in O&M. He then asked Mr. Rhinehart to give a brief outline of the State's position and the current status of this issue as it affects CWPPRA.

Mr. Rhinehart explained that in the past, though the State has voted to fund some CWPPRA projects with Federal navigation channel components, such as the GIWW critical areas of Terrebonne, the State has tried to limit the use of restoration dollars to supplement O&M features which are Federal responsibilities. Currently, the State is working on a formal policy brief that will be discussed at the CPRA and presented to the Task Force to clearly articulate the State's position on these types of projects.

Right now, the position is that there is no retroactivity, O&M will be continued on existing projects, and pre-cash flow projects will continue to move toward construction. However, the State will most likely not vote for, but will cost share if required, projects that are on the PPL and contain Federal navigation channel components. Therefore, the State will not move to de-authorize, but will not support those cash flow projects coming up for construction funding. The State will also not support new projects on the PPL whose primary function would be to reinforce banks of Federally authorized navigation channels with an existing Federal O&M requirement. The policy brief will help to clarify the definition of when this would apply to better help the restoration community understand the State's position moving forward.

Mr. Rhinehart continued that the concern is that if projects are not funded through CWPPRA, they will not be constructed. The State's argument is that the USACE policy is to not pay for local sponsor maintenance issues and that in reciprocation, the State policy would be to not pay for those maintenance issues of the Federal Government. However, there has to be a funding

venue for these projects. At this time, the State is working with the congressional delegation and have elevated this issue to the Gulf Coast Ecosystem Restoration Task Force level to identify where and how funds should originate to be appropriately used for dredging, coastal restoration, and channel O&M.

Mr. Holden stated that the Federal maintenance funding is not only an issue in Louisiana, but nation-wide; and unless there are navigation impacts, the USACE does not conduct O&M activities.

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

Mr. Hartman asked about the implications to the Cole's Bayou Project on the agenda today. Mr. Rhinehart responded that the State may not vote to bring construction funds to a project currently in Phase I, but will cost share if the Task Force approves such a project. He then clarified that the Cole's Bayou Project is supported by the State because it does not include direct rock lining maintenance of the navigation channel.

Mr. Hartman asked for clarification as to whether the State would support projects adjacent to channels that have a marsh creation or other features beyond just erosion of channel banks. Mr. Rhinehart reiterated that the line is tricky as to defining what loss or damage results from lack of maintenance; therefore, at this time, projects only placing structures on the bankline would not be supported. Mr. Rhinehart emphasized that this will be more clearly defined in the future and is only for purposes of today's voting.

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

Mr. Randy Moertle, E.A. McIlhenny Enterprises, pointed out that the Cole's Bayou Project was voted down last year due to this policy position, but that only 17 percent of the project cost was for the bankline stabilization component and that, though a good stand-alone project, the strength of the project was even greater with the bankline stabilization. He recommended that the State perhaps develop a percentage cost cutoff for bankline components so that projects focused on marsh creation and hydrologic restoration, such as Cole's Bayou, would not go unfunded. He encouraged the State to resolve this issue because Federal navigation channels affect most of the coastal restoration projects. He added that landowners, individuals, and even other agencies are not in favor of this position because while Federal navigation channels may be a USACE responsibility, there is no funding to conduct needed maintenance. He warned that unless resolution is reached soon on this issue, it will explode into a fire storm.

Mr. Sean Duffy, Mississippi River Maritime Association, asked if there has been any outreach to the navigation interest on this matter. He pointed out that the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund has money for both dredging and beneficial use of dredged material. He encouraged everyone to speak to their congressional delegates in support of HR104 and S412 because these bills allow money for navigation dredging and beneficial use which increases the material available for coastal restoration and the likelihood of beneficial use of dredged material. He added that while there have been some stellar projects, such as the Scofield Island Project, which have worked with the navigation industry, there are other projects that have been a surprise to the industry. He

added that projects are more successful and likely to be built when navigation industry input is sought. He emphasized that the Mississippi River is credited with a \$100 billion annual impact on the Nation's economy and that navigation and coastal restoration benefit all of Louisiana.

Mr. Rhinehart suggested that Mr. Duffy talk with the State attorney to start a dialogue on this matter.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Parish Corporation, pointed out that while he understands not wanting to spend limited coastal restoration funds on navigation channels, most of the Federal projects have a cost share and that the out-of-pocket cost share through CWPPRA may be less. He encouraged the State to change its position to include a percentage cutoff for bankline stabilization. He asked that if the State and USACE do not want to pay for bank maintenance, then they issue a general permit for maintenance of spoil banks along navigation channels. He reiterated that land is being lost through navigation channels and that time is of the essence.

Mr. Rhinehart agreed that implementation would be tricky because many CWPPRA projects have a navigation channel component. He added that restoration dollars are limited and that at some point a line must be drawn as to how those dollars are spent. The State wants the navigation industry, landowners, the USACE, and the Federal Government to understand the importance of this issue because when Federal coastal restoration dollars are spent to line canal banks, those funds get reduced.

Mr. Paul Kemp, National Audubon Society and part of the Rainey Conservation Alliance, applauded the Task Force on attempting to work this issue out and stated that they are very interested in helping the State reach a resolution on this matter.

Ms. Cynthia Duet, National Audubon Society, agreed that this is an important issue, but suggested that projects be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if the shoreline protection component is for the ultimate value of the overall project and if so, to keep those parts within the CWPPRA Program. She expressed a desire to help resolve the larger issue of thousands of miles of navigation channels in need of maintenance and hoped for a policy shift involving all players to resolve this issue. However, for the present, she urged the State to take a case-by-case approach, evaluating projects based on merits as to whether to vote for continued funding.

7. Agenda Item 7. Discussion: Initial Discussion of FY12 Planning Budget Development (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Brad Inman, USACE). Mr. Inman initiated the FY12 Planning Program Budget development, including the PPL 21 process.

Mr. Inman stated that the P&E Subcommittee is proceeding under the assumption that there will be a PPL 22. The recommended planning budget for FY12 is the same as last year's budget at \$5 million, with the addition of a line item to include the 2012 Report to Congress.

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

Mr. Clark expressed concern that the budget is being approved early, but understands that the Standard Operating Procedures require it. He agreed with the recommended budget and pointed out that the amount for the Report to Congress is only seed money to begin that process.

Mr. Hartman clarified that the early budget approval is necessary because the June Task Force meeting is the last meeting of the fiscal year. He suggested concentrating on projects that have been constructed since the last Report to Congress as a means to reduce costs.

Mr. Paul expressed support for the recommended planning budget approach.

Mr. Clark clarified that the general concept to have a budget similar to the FY11, with the addition of the Report to Congress, was being approved today, with actual numbers to be submitted later. He also asked if those numbers would be submitted before the June Task Force meeting and if a subsequent vote would be required. Mr. Inman responded, yes. Mr. Hartman clarified that a vote would be required before the June Task Force meeting to approve the funds.

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval of the P&E Subcommittee's planning budget approach for a 2012 planning budget similar to 2011 with the addition of seed money to start the 2012 Report to Congress. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 4. Report: Status of the PPL 11 – Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point (ME-21a) (Tom Holden, USACE). Mr. Holden provided a status update on the Tebo Point cost share agreement.

Mr. Holden reported that the USACE submitted a written copy of the cost share agreement to the State for its consideration and are awaiting the State's response.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that while the agreement had significant improvements from the last version, the analysis shows that, at this time, the State cannot execute the agreement. The fundamental issues relate to how the State views a partnership and the inability to capture those partnership components in the cost share agreement with the USACE.

Mr. Holden expressed disappointment that this agreement would not be accepted when similar issues have been resolved for agreements within the energy and water appropriations forum. He added that he looks forward to receiving the State's written comments and hopes that there will be an opportunity to move forward.

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

Mr. Hartman requested that before the next Task Force meeting, the other agencies receive a briefing on where exactly the disagreements lie within this cost share agreement.

Mr. David Peterson, with the State Attorney General's Office, responded that there was an indemnity issue that the State agreed to capitulate on for the Tebo Point Project, but will review on a case-by-case basis for future cost share agreements. However, the fundamental issue is that the State feels the USACE is attempting to impose inapplicable USACE policy and statutes onto the CWPPRA Program. There is also a major disagreement involving review of costs incurred by either entity and determination of work-in-kind reasonableness. The USACE is asking for broad discretion to determine the cost reasonableness for work-in-kind by the State, but is not allowing the State to have similar review and discretion for USACE costs. The USACE is asking for provisions different from those in agreements between the State and other Federal agencies. There are no hold harmless clauses in the CSAs of other Federal agencies.

Mr. Rhinehart asked for clarification on the indemnity issue. Mr. Peterson responded that the State indemnifies the USACE for all aspects of the project, excepting the USACE's own negligence or their contractor's negligence. However, the problem is that existing case law could impose liability on the State for unintended aspects of the project, for example shoaling at the West Bay project.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if such liability risks are shared with other agencies. Mr. Peterson replied that without an indemnity agreement, which is not included with other agency agreements, the responsibility is shared equally or according to each party's cost share. However, the USACE is requiring the indemnity clause because it is part of their statutes, while such a clause is not required in the statutes for other agencies.

Mr. Hartman asked if there is a legal reason the State cannot sign the cost share agreement. Mr. Peterson responded that there is a State provision making it contrary to public policy for the State to sign indemnity agreements with third parties, with an exception involving landowners who volunteer property for projects, or when Federal Law supercedes State Law.

Mr. Rhinehart offered to provide the Technical Committee and Task Force with a written explanation of the State's concerns regarding the cost share agreement.

Mr. Clark suggested that the main issue is the USACE allowing the State to review their books for project expenses and suggested that if this issue could be overcome, perhaps an agreement could be reached. Mr. Holden responded that the USACE is willing to open their books, but that they cannot allow an audit of their costs, which would be a review with intent of approval. He added that the USACE applies the water and energy rules to cost share agreements, and has for two centuries, and that the State does not agree that these rules are applicable in this instance. He clarified that the State can review the costs, but cannot use that review to disapprove their cost share portion. The State has signed agreements with these provisions outside of CWPPRA in the past and this is not something that the USACE can set aside. He added that this is a decision made by the Army General Counsel.

Mr. Holden expressed disappointment that an impasse has been reached and emphasized that the bigger question here is whether the USACE will be able to be a full-fledged partner in future CWPPRA projects. He continued that the Tebo Point Project was low-hanging fruit and that if an

agreement cannot be reached here, the USACE role within CWPPRA may no longer include project construction. He asked the State to respond with terms they would be willing to accept.

Mr. Peterson stated that the USACE has offered to open their books, but it would be for review only, without remedy. He also pointed out that the latest cost share agreement draft had new language that was not included in previously signed agreements. He stated that his opinion would be to use similar language to that in previous agreements between the State and other Federal partners, but clarified that the USACE stance is that such language is not fundamentally allowed under USACE statutes.

Mr. Clark asked if there was any likelihood of an agreement by the June Task Force meeting. Mr. Rhinehart responded that these are fundamental issues and may not be quickly resolved.

Mr. Hartman expressed concern at the possibility that the USACE could be relegated to an administrative only role and no longer participate in constructing CWPPRA projects. He added that it was very troubling that a solution could not be reached.

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

Mr. Paul Kemp, National Audubon Society, suggested a step in the transparency direction with a sunshine provision where cost information is available to whomever wants to see it.

Mr. Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, agreed that the legal issue needs to be resolved, but asked that good projects not be held up in the interim. He requested that the Tebo Point Project be shifted to another Federal agency for construction.

Captain Ryan Lambert, President of Cajun Fishing Adventures and Vice-President of the Charter Boat Association, pointed out that there are real life consequences to these legal delays. He added that in the six and a half years the Spanish Pass Project was held up, an entire fishery was lost along with millions of dollars of income for lower Plaquemines Parish. Similarly, in six and a half years, Yellow Cotton Bay filled from a depth of 89 feet to 12 feet. He stated that he will be lobbying for Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) money in Washington and would like to give those funds to CWPPRA, but that funding will not be offered as long as these in-house issues are unresolved. He encouraged the Technical Committee to come to an agreement.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Parish Corporation, suggested settling this issue as the private sector would and allowing the local sponsor to choose the Federal construction agency for each project based on expertise and the ability to work together. He further suggested allowing the USACE to build, with USACE money, navigation channel components and to use CWPPRA dollars to allow the other Federal agencies to construct restoration components. He asked if CWPPRA money was being used to pay for the attorney fees to resolve this issue and suggested that that money would be better spent building projects. He stated that while the USACE is a vital partner, if they cannot work to build projects, then alternative Federal agencies should be used. He added that money is being wasted in Phase I design if projects cannot be built.

Mr. Holden responded that it is only projects with the USACE and the State as co-sponsors which are affected. He expressed concern that the most capable engineering construction element in the United States Government may not be a partner in building CWPPRA projects. He clarified that this is a historic moment because the reality is that the USACE can do whatever it is asked to do, but must have a willing cost share partner. He expressed disappointment because the USACE staff wishes to build projects, but will take on an administrative only role within CWPPRA if required. He reiterated that the USACE has expertise in hard structural projects that require the management of water and impacts and balancing of flood control and navigation.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Parish Corporation, replied that there is no question that the USACE is capable of building projects and that this is a legal matter. He questioned why the State is able to partner successfully with the other Federal agencies, but not with the USACE and encouraged the parties to reach a resolution.

Mr. Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, stated that this discussion should not be a USACE bashing and that the USACE conducts a phenomenal amount of work, but suggested that while these legal issues are being resolved, the Tebo Point Project be built under an alternative option.

Mr. Randy Moertle, Little Lake Land Company, asked if there was really a major question as to how each entity was spending project money and suggested that both entities open their books for this project and then reach an agreement moving forward. Mr. Hartman responded that USACE policy prevents another agency from disallowing USACE costs.

Mr. Rhinehart suggested pushing this matter to the Task Force for resolution to avoid similar delays on future projects. He added that while he understands the USACE perspective, as a Technical Committee member, he feels that projects must be built. He then moved to transfer Federal sponsorship of the Tebo Point Project to the NRCS.

DECISION: Mr. Rhinehart moved to transfer Federal sponsorship of the PPL 11 – Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point (ME-21a) from the USACE to the NRCS. Mr. Paul seconded.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to amend the motion to transfer Federal sponsorship of the PPL 11 – Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point (ME-21a) from the USACE to the NRCS, to add that Task Force approval could not be done via fax vote. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed. Mr. Holden did not vote, as the Committee Chairman, but expressed that the USACE would not support this motion.

Ms. McCormick commented that while she believes that the USACE is a valuable partner in the CWPPRA Program, that for the good of Louisiana, projects need to move forward. She strongly recommended that the State and USACE try to reach a resolution in this matter.

Mr. Holden cautioned that today's voting was removing a Federal sponsor within the CWPPRA Program and could have future ramifications.

Mr. Clark suggested adding the phrase “if an agreement cannot be made before the June Task Force meeting, then” to the motion to transfer Federal sponsorship. Mr. Rhinehart stated that the timing was implicit in the original motion. Mr. Clark agreed and withdrew the suggestion to amend.

DECISION: Mr. Rhinehart moved to recommend Task Force approval to transfer Federal sponsorship of the PPL 11 – Grand Lake Shoreline Protection, Tebo Point (ME-21a) from the USACE to the NRCS. Mr. Paul seconded. Ms. McCormick, Mr. Hartman, Mr. Clark, Mr. Paul, and Mr. Rhinehart voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Holden opposed the motion. The motion passed with a majority vote.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to discuss Agenda Item No. 12 next. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 21 (Brad Inman, USACE). The Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits of the nominee projects and demonstration projects, listed in the table below, as PPL 21 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects that will be approved for Phase I (Planning and Engineering Design).

Region	Basin	PPL 21 Nominees
1	Pontchartrain	Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing
1	Pontchartrain	LaBranche Central Marsh Creation
1	Pontchartrain	Guste Island Marsh Creation
2	Mississippi River Delta	Pass a Loutre Restoration
2	Breton Sound	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation
2	Breton Sound	White Ditch Marsh Creation Sediment Delivery
2	Breton Sound	Wills Point Marsh Creation
2	Barataria	Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection
2	Barataria	Bayou Grande Cheniere Marsh Creation
2	Barataria	Bayou L’Ours Terracing
3	Terrebonne	Lake Tambour Marsh Creation
3	Terrebonne	Lake Decade Marsh Creation and Nourishment
3	Terrebonne	Carencro Bayou Freshwater Introduction
3	Atchafalaya	West Wax Lake Wetlands Diversion
3	Teche-Vermilion	Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment
3	Teche-Vermilion	Cole’s Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation and Wetland Restoration
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Oyster Bayou Restoration
4	Mermentau	Front Ridge Freshwater Introduction and Marsh Creation
4	Mermentau	Southwest White Lake Shoreline Protection
	Coastwide	Backfilling Canals
DEMO		Automated Marsh Planting (formerly called “Alternative to Manual Planting
DEMO		Bioengineering Solutions using Fascines and Coir Mattresses
DEMO		Deltalok
DEMO		Habitat Enhancements through Vegetation Plantings using Gulf Saver Bags

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to omit individual project presentations and accept public comments. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

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

Mr. Holden introduced each nominee project and demonstration project and then accepted public comments.

Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish Government, spoke in support of this project, explaining that the project has been nominated three or four times, has incorporated past comments to accommodate agency concerns, and is a great project.

Mr. James Harris, USFWS Southeast Louisiana Refuge, supported the project because it is located on the Big Branch Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, an area hit hard by Hurricane Katrina. Because the Refuge is open to the public, the project also has many public benefits.

LaBranch Central Marsh Creation

There were no public comments.

Guste Island Marsh Creation

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish Government, also supported this project, explaining that this area was leveed in the 1950's or 60's and has been in a state of decline since. Without this project, some significant breaches could occur on either side of the project footprint, merging this area into Lake Pontchartrain. He added that he believes this project would have a good chance of success.

Pass a Loutre Restoration

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in support of the project.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, supported the project, adding that he believes it is one of the best bangs for your buck of all the projects. He stated that it is the Parish's number four top priority project and that he personally thinks it is one of the better projects.

Mr. James Harris, USFWS Southeast Louisiana Refuge, supported the project because it would have tremendous benefits for the Refuge and the State Management Area at Pass a Loutre. The project would restore some of the historic hydrology to the area, allowing beneficial freshwater flows.

Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation

There were no public comments.

White Ditch Marsh Creation

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, supported the project because it will protect the highway from flooding in an area that has no back levee, as well as protecting the area's oil and gas infrastructure.

Mr. Jay Lebrano, landowner, supported the project because diversions take too long, are too controversial, and have higher O&M costs through continued maintenance and monitoring; whereas, this project would provide immediate results from the marsh creation.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, supported the project and pointed out that it is also very cost effective.

Wills Point Marsh Creation

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, supported the project because it will protect the levees, ridges, and trees.

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, supported the project and added that it is the Parish's number three top priority.

Mr. Hartman asked what the top priority projects for Plaquemines Parish are. Mr. Hahn responded that Pass a Loutre is number four, Wills Point is number three, White Ditch is number two, and Bayou Grand Cheniere is number one.

Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that this is Jefferson Parish's number one top priority project. The piece of land between Bayou Perot and Harvey Cut connects the Barataria Land Bridge and without it, Turtle Bay and Little Lake will open into Bayou Perot and Bayou Rigolets.

Mr. Joe Baucum, Jefferson Parish citizen, supported the project because this area had flooding as a result of Hurricanes Rita and Ike and will be worse in the future. The citizens of Barataria north of this area view the plug of land there as an intracoastal barrier island and this project would help to reduce flooding.

Mr. Buddy Smith, ConocoPhillips LL&E, stated that this project is on their property and has their full support, as well as the Bayou L'Ours Terracing, Lake Tambour Marsh Creation, Lake

Decade Marsh Creation and Nourishment, and Carenco Bayou Freshwater Introduction Projects, all of which are on a portion of ConocoPhillips property.

Ms. Marietta Greene, Madison Land Company, stated that this project is crucial to saving the lower part of Jefferson Parish. She added that as a landowner, they have never refused rights-of-way and support this project fully.

Mr. Jason Smith, Jefferson Parish Marine Fisheries Advisory Board, stated that Mayor Kerner is on record with the town of Lafitte in support of this project. He emphasized that if this small piece of land is lost, Little Lake and Turtle Bayou will be closer to joining with Bayous Perot and Rigolets and will put Barataria, Crown Point, Lafitte, and the greater metropolitan area at risk. He added that Jefferson Parish has been working on the land bridge from the western point to the Mississippi River and would like serious consideration of this project.

Bayou Grande Chenier Marsh Creation

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, expressed that this is the Parish's number one top priority project because it would convert open water into land in an area that is rapidly deteriorating. He added that the project is cost effective and would work well to complement existing projects in the area

Bayou L'Ours Terracing

Ms. Charlotte Randolph, Lafourche Parish President, stated that this is Lafourche Parish's number one top priority project and the only project in Lafourche Parish nominated. She explained that the Parish has not had a CWPPRA project in five years and that this project has been submitted five times in an effort to adapt to concerns and questions raised. While terracing is not a popular method, it is the only cost effective method in this area. The project benefits include protection of the South Lafourche Levee System to the west and since there is no way to bring sediment from the river to this area, it is the only way to protect this valuable piece of land. She pointed out that a past concern was landowner cooperation and that the landowner has spoken in support of the project today.

Mr. Randy Moertle, Little Lake Land Company, supported the project as the landowner to the north.

Ms. Marietta Greene, Madison Land Company, added that they also own property in this area and have had terracing done on either side of the Barataria Waterway, which has been extremely successful.

Lake Tambour Marsh Creation

Mr. Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that this is Terrebonne Parish's number one top priority project this year. The project would work great with the Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation and Nourishment Project that was recently designed and would substantially help to solidify this area of highly deteriorating marsh.

Lake Decade Marsh Creation and Nourishment

Mr. Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that the landowner in this area is very marsh conscientious, manages marshes well, and that this would be a good project to help the landowner's efforts.

Carencro Bayou Freshwater Introduction

Mr. Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that this is Terrebonne Parish's number two top priority project this year. He also expressed support for Agenda Item No. 8 to conduct sampling beyond the project boundary on the Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project, and highlighted the request as an example of fiscal responsibility. He summarized Terrebonne Parish's top choice projects as Lake Tambour as number one, Carencro Bayou as number two, and Lake Decade as number three.

West Wax Lake Wetland Diversion

There were no public comments.

Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment

There were no public comments.

Cole's Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration

Mr. Gerald Butaud, Vermilion Parish Police Jury, supported this project as their number one priority project.

Mr. Randy Moertle, E.A. McIlhenny Enterprises, supported the project as a major landowner in this area.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Corporation, also supported the project as a landowner within the project area.

Mr. Paul Kemp, National Audubon Society, also supported the project as a landowner to the south of the project area.

Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation and Wetlands Restoration

There were no public comments.

Oyster Bayou Restoration

There were no public comments.

Front Ridge Freshwater Introduction and Marsh Creation

Mr. Gerald Butaud, Vermilion Parish Police Jury, supported this project as their number one priority project.

Mr. W.P. Edwards, Vermilion Corporation, also supported the project as the major landowner within the project area.

Southwest White Lake Shoreline Protection

There were no public comments.

Backfilling Canals

Mr. Paul Kemp, National Audubon Society, expressed support for this concept as one that needs to be developed, as well as bringing in sediment from outside the area to fill canals. He added that he thinks it would be well regarded in Washington and is worth pursuing.

Ms. Vickie Duffourc, Bayou Segnette Boaters' Association, expressed support for this project and stated that the oil and gas canals need to be closed because they have decimated the Barataria Land Bridge. She suggested identifying essential canals, closing non-essential canals, and not allowing new canals because directional drilling can be used instead. She added that this would be a great project where lessons could be learned all over the State.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, also supported the project and added that this has worked in the John Lafitte National Park and in areas of Jefferson Parish. She stated that this is a relatively cheap way to restore natural hydrology in these areas.

Automated Marsh Planting (aka “Alternative to Manual Planting”)

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish Government, stated that a recent dedicated dredge project near Slidell dredged Hurricane Katrina debris from Big Branch National Wildlife Refuge which included root balls, marsh grass, and debris. As these materials were dredged and the chopped up rhizomes were distributed throughout the discharge area, there was marsh emergence before the pipe was moved. He expressed that this rapid emergence of marsh from a similar process is an indication that this project has potential to work.

Bioengineering Solutions using Fascines and Coir Mattresses

There were no public comments.

Deltalok

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, expressed support for this product as the Parish's number one demonstration project choice, stating that it is a solid product and an excellent way to keep existing marsh in place. He also expressed support for the Gulf Saver Bags, adding that they would be a good complement to put behind the Deltalok.

Mr. Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that this is Terrebonne Parish's number one demonstration choice as well. He said that this is a good technology that can be put to good use in coastal areas.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, also supported this project, stating that it has worked on the riverine systems and that it is time to demonstrate its use on the coast.

Habitat Enhancements through Vegetation Plantings using Gulf Saver Bags

Ms. Allison Sickle, Global Green USA, expressed support for this demonstration. She added that having participated in the two pilot projects at Pass a Loutre, the project has been extremely successful in enhancing some of the marsh.

The Wave Robber

Mr. Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated the Wave Robber is Terrebonne Parish's second choice.

Additional Comments

Mr. Brian Fortson, St. Tammany Parish Government, stated that while St. Tammany Parish supports both projects in its basin today, the Fritchie Marsh Project would be their priority choice due to the amount of consideration and revisions that have been invested in the project and because it is located primarily on public land. He also added that the landowners for the Guste Island project are in full support.

Ms. Charlotte Randolph, Lafourche Parish President, reiterated that Lafourche Parish only has one nominee project today.

The Technical Committee voted on the PPL 21 nominee projects. The top projects are listed below in order by the number of agency votes with the weighted score shown in parentheses.

The top ten candidate projects were:

1. Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh Creation – 5 agency votes (22)
2. Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation - 4 agency votes (33)
3. Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment – 4 agency votes (29)
4. Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing – 4 agency votes (25)
5. LaBranche Central Marsh Creation – 4 agency votes (24)
6. White Ditch Marsh Creation Sediment Delivery – 4 agency votes (22)
7. Cole's Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration - 4 agency votes (18)
8. Oyster Bayou Restoration - 4 agency votes (18)
9. Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection - 3 agency votes (23)
10. Bayou L'Ours Terracing - 3 agency votes (17)

The top three candidate demonstration projects were:

1. Automated Marsh Planting (aka “Alternative to Manual Planting”) - 5 agency votes (10)
2. Deltalok - 4 agency votes (11)
3. Habitat Enhancements through Vegetation Plantings Using Gulf Saver Bags - 4 agency votes (6)

Mr. Clark asked if there were any ties in the results. Mr. Holden responded that there were not.

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend Task Force approval of the following ten projects: Bayou Grand Cheniere Marsh Creation, Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation, Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment, Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing, LaBranche Central Marsh Creation, White Ditch Marsh Creation Sediment Delivery, Cole’s Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration, Oyster Bayou Restoration, Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection, and Bayou L’Ours Terracing, and the following three demonstration projects: Automated Marsh Planting (aka “Alternative to Manual Planting”), Deltalok, and Habitat Enhancements through Vegetation Plantings Using Gulf Saver Bags, as PPL 21 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Holden excused himself from the meeting and passed the chair to Mr. Wingate at this time.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to discuss Agenda Item No. 9 before Agenda Item No. 8. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

10. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request for O&M Incremental Funding and Budget Increase for the PPL 10 – Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project (PO-30) (Paul Kaspar and Karen McCormick, EPA). During the September 28, 2010 Technical Committee meeting, EPA made an initial request for an O&M budget increase in the amount of \$3,349,711, and an Increment 1 funding increase in the amount of \$3,356,181. The Technical Committee deferred making a decision until the project’s alternatives had been analyzed. At the December 8, 2010 Technical Committee meeting, a \$3 million “set-aside” was approved for the project. The project team has completed the alternatives analysis, selected the preferred alternative, and developed a revised project cost estimate. The project team requested a Technical Committee recommendation to approve the request for an O&M budget increase of \$3,327,676 and Phase II Increment 1 funding increase of \$3,333,417.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval for an O&M budget increase in the amount of \$3,327,676 and Phase II Increment 1 funding increase in the

amount of \$3,333,417 for the PPL 10 – Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection Project (PO-30). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 8. Decision: Request for a Change in Project Boundary for the PPL 16 – Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project (TE-51) (Dr. John Foret, NMFS). *Dr. Foret provided a status on the Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project. NMFS and OCPR requested approval from the Technical Committee to adjust the project boundary and to expend up to \$60,000 of existing project funds to acquire geotechnical data in an area outside the currently approved project boundary.*

Mr. Hartman corrected the request (see page 80 transcripts) to state that the NMFS was only requesting to use existing funds to investigate an area outside of the project area and was not requesting a project boundary change.

Dr. Foret explained that there are five reasons the project is no longer feasible for construction within the originally intended project footprint. The project area has over 1,200 landowners, multiple oyster leases, and a variety of infrastructure, including pipelines and wellheads. Additionally, the Morganza to the Gulf project area impedes on the project footprint and the geotechnical results show that the sediments in the area are very soft and not conducive to construction. Because of these issues, the project sponsors are investigating two alternative locations. One is to the south, adjoining the USFWS North Terrebonne Bay Marsh Creation Project, for which the geotechnical data could be shared. The other alternative is to the northeast and today's request is to use \$60,000 to conduct a geotechnical investigation to the northeast in order to properly evaluate the two alternatives.

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

Mr. Clark asked if the requested money is additional or current funding. Dr. Foret responded that the money is currently in the budget and today's request is to use the money to investigate outside of the original project boundary.

Mr. Hartman added that if neither of the alternatives work, then the project will have to be de-authorized because the current project location is not feasible for construction.

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

DECISION: Ms. McCormick moved to recommend Task Force approval to expend up to \$60,000 of existing project funds for the Madison Bay Marsh Creation and Terracing Project (TE-51) to acquire geotechnical data in an area outside of the currently approved project boundary. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope for the PPL 13 – Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection Project (TV-20) (Britt Paul, NRCS, and Kirk Rhinehart, OCPR). *NRCS and OCPR requested a project scope change to separate the Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection Project*

into three segments and proceed with the design to 30% and 95% of Segment 1, which consists of 23,082 feet out of the original 35,776 feet of shoreline protection. NRCS and OCPR also requested a cost estimate increase from the original amount of \$23,082,000 to an estimated \$64,825,325 due to the plethora of pipelines and flow lines in the project area requiring unconventional construction techniques.

Mr. Paul explained that because of the pipeline infrastructure in the project area, the best method for construction is end-on-end which is very expensive. He corrected the existing cost shown in the binders from \$23 M to \$32 M. Therefore, the project sponsors are proposing to divide the project into three segments and only construct the center segment, which is considered the most critical. Today's request is to move forward with the 30% and 95% design on only the center segment, and to increase the cost from \$32 M to \$38M.

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

Mr. Clark asked if the remaining two segments are being removed from the project. Mr. Paul answered that they are presented as part of the original project scope, but that there is very little chance of those segments being constructed.

Mr. Hartman expressed concern at the cost/benefit ratio of the proposed change in project and recommended not spending any more money on the project. Ms. McCormick agreed that based on the information currently available, the project is no longer cost effective. Mr. Clark agreed and suggested another means of construction. Mr. Paul responded that all alternatives have been investigated.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval to move the Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection Project to de-authorization. Ms. McCormick seconded. Ms. McCormick, Mr. Hartman, and Mr. Clark voted in favor. Mr. Paul and Mr. Rhinehart opposed the motion. The motion passed with a majority vote.

12. Agenda Item 11. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope for the PPL 17 – Caernarvon Outfall Management/Lake Lery Shoreline Restoration Project (BS-16) (Darryl Clark and Robert Dubois, USFWS, and Kirk Rhinehart, OCPR). USFWS and OCPR requested a project scope change to delete the Mississippi River freshwater introduction component because it has been incorporated into the USACE's 4th Supplemental Caernarvon Project. The scope change includes an extension to both shoreline restoration and marsh creation components to include stabilization of 37,500 linear feet (versus 32,000 feet) of the western Lake Lery shoreline and to restore a net 453 acres (versus 652) acres of marsh via dredged material. USFWS and OCPR also requested a cost estimate increase from \$25,137,149 to an estimated \$43,624,191 due to the requested scope changes.

Mr. Clark stated that Robert Dubois, the project manager, was prepared to make a presentation to the Technical Committee. The committee indicated that the presentation would not be necessary.

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

Mr. Hartman suggested approving the change in scope.

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

Mr. Eddie Fisher, King Fisher Marine, requested that for this project and other larger marsh restoration projects, the specifications not be limited to a 30-inch dredge since his company and many competitors have several 22 to 24-inch dredges. He added that the smaller dredges have approximately a 35 percent lower production rate, meaning a 12-month job would take 16-months, but that they can pump the same distance and use less horsepower.

Mr. Clark stated that USFWS and the State, as sponsors of this project, would keep the dredge size under consideration.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval for the scope change as presented and a corresponding increase in the cost estimate from \$25,137,149 to an estimated \$43,624,191 for the PPL 17 – Caernarvon Outfall Management/Lake Lery Shoreline Protection Project (BS-16) to the Task Force. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

14. Agenda Item 13. Additional Agenda Items (Mark Wingate, USACE).

Mr. Rhinehart informed the Technical Committee that in the fall, the State would be asking for an allocation for a fully funded budget through the life of the Coast-wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) Program to 2019 in order to simplify the contract process and provide a level of funding certainty for the CRMS work. The funding would only raise the cap, with the actual approved money on a one-year budget with two outyears of funding.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification as to the funding amount. Mr. Rhinehart answered that the current program life budget is \$60 million, but that an additional \$50 million will be requested for a total of approximately \$110 million for the whole life of the Program.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that there will be a potential for cost savings once the Louisiana Coastal Area begins to pick up monitoring station costs.

Mr. Clark suggested that the Technical Committee begin thinking about the format of the Report to Congress and whether the previous format is acceptable. Mr. Hartman expressed a desire to reduce the previous Report to Congress budget from \$150,000 to approximately \$100,000 for the 2012 report.

15. Agenda Item 14. Request for Public Comments (Mark Wingate, USACE). There were no public comments.

16. Agenda Item 15. Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE). *The next Task Force meeting will be held June 8, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Fisheries and*

Habitat Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana. Mr. Inman pointed out that there may be a potential conflict with the levee board meetings in December. Mr. Clark asked that the dates be locked in as soon as possible for the other meetings. Mr. Paul asked that alternative dates be given to the Technical Committee for the December meeting.

17. Agenda Item 16. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE).

June 1, 2011 June 8, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 20, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 12, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
November 16, 2011	7:00 p.m.	PPL 21 Public Meeting	Abbeville
November 17, 2011	7:00 p.m.	PPL 21 Public Meeting	New Orleans
November 30, 2011 December TBD, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
January 19, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans

18. Agenda Item 17. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Clark moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wingate adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:20 p.m.