

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 13 December 2011 Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Brad Inman 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. Brad Inman (sitting in for 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. Bren Haase (sitting in for Mr. Kirk Rhinehart), LA Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)

A copy of the agenda is included as **Encl 1**. A copy of the sign-in sheet is included as **Encl 2**.

2. The agency representatives thanked Ms. Gay Browning for her 38 years of service with the USACE and her outstanding contribution to the CWPPRA Program. Mr. Inman then asked the members of the Technical Committee to introduce themselves.

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

Ms. McCormick moved that the voting Agenda Items 16 and 17 be moved up in the agenda. Mr. Hartman suggested that Agenda Items 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 be addressed after Agenda Item No. 3. Mr. Clark pointed out that Agenda Item No. 3 has already been approved.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to move Agenda Items 13 through 17 to after Agenda Item No. 3. Mr. Paul 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 reported that the December forecast for the Department of Interior Work Allowance for Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 was expected to be higher and that the previous Program estimated total of \$84.8 million is now at \$79.2 million. However, the Program is currently showing a positive for the overall funding through 2019 whereas previously it had been showing in the negative. Today's meeting is beginning with a \$62.7 million available funding and with an additional \$24.9 million coming back into the Program from the South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration Project (ME-20), the total available for today's decision is \$87.6 million.

She pointed out that there may be additional de-authorizations that will return money as well. After the October meeting approvals, the total estimated funding amounts include the Phase II increases. The current unapproved fully funded estimate is \$2.556 billion and with the latest forecast, the Program funding is at \$2.395 billion (a deficit of \$160.7 million if all projects were funded for 20 years). She reminded the Technical Committee that these numbers could change with today's approvals and that the placeholders for Phase I and Phase II will increase to account for the new Project Priority List (PPL) approvals in January.

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

Mr. Clark pointed out that the \$2.5 billion purple line includes a placeholder for projects approved on all PPLs, up to PPL 20, as if the projects are fully funded for 20 years and that all projects cannot be funded for construction.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that some of these projects in the placeholders will likely drop out or move into other programs so that even though the fully funded placeholder looks high, the Technical Committee is not overcommitting its funding.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Request Approved by Task Force Fax Vote for a Scope Change for the PPL 15 – Venice Ponds Marsh Creation and Crevasses Project (MR-15) (Karen McCormick, EPA). EPA and CPRA requested approval for a change in scope for the Venice Ponds Marsh Creation and Crevasses Project. The Project originally included 178 acres of marsh creation, divided into three different areas between Grand Pass and Tiger Pass and north of Pass Tante Phine; construction of four crevasses; enhancement of three crevasses; and hydrologic features. During Phase 1, it was determined that the Phase 0 proposal was not feasible and redesign was necessary. The Project now consists of approximately 187 acres of marsh creation and four acres of marsh nourishment located between Grand Pass and Tiger Pass, the creation of one crevasse on Grand Pass and one crevasse on Tiger Pass, and the enhancement of two crevasses on Tiger Pass. At Phase 0, the total project cost was \$7,175,319, and after completion of engineering and design during Phase 1, the total project cost is now \$19,737,075. On October 21, 2011, the Technical Committee voted via email to recommend the proposal for Task Force fax vote. The Task Force voted via fax vote on November 7, 2011 to approve the requested scope change.

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

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

5. Agenda Item 4. Report: Report to Congress Outline (Karen McCormick, EPA). At the October 12, 2011 meeting, the Task Force approved utilizing the \$110,000 placeholder to create the 2012 Report to Congress, which will be a concise (10-15 pages) document concentrating on projects and providing monitoring information. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), USFWS, and EPA

have been leading the 2012 Report to Congress efforts and presented a draft outline for the 2012 Report to Congress.

Mr. Clark noted that a preliminary outline for the Report to Congress, developed with input from the EPA, USFWS, and USGS, was sent to the Technical Committee. He presented the preliminary sections of the report as follows: 1) executive summary; 2) introduction; 3) overview of the CWPPRA Program; 4) brief discussion of project types; 5) discussion of CWPPRA projects approved since 2009, including a brief description of each project and maps if applicable; 6) a section discussing CWPPRA progress and effectiveness, with each agency selecting one or two projects to present monitoring information on (including Coast-Wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) and/or project specific monitoring information); 7) conclusion; and 8) references. In order to decrease the length of the Report, it was suggested that the previously developed spreadsheet detailing the status of all approved CWPPRA projects be referenced to the LACoast website. Mr. Clark noted that although the goal would be to keep the report to around 15 pages, it should include the relevant information necessary to provide Congress a satisfactory update. He added that upcoming deadlines are completion of a rough draft by March 2012 and the final report by June 2012, with the USGS editing and producing the final document.

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

Ms. Browning inquired if additional funds would be needed to complete the Report. Mr. Clark stated that the \$110,000 allotment was sufficient at this time, but additional funds may be needed by the EPA later on.

Mr. Inman stated that no Technical Committee action was needed at this time and that the Report outline would be presented at the January Task Force meeting.

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

6. Agenda Item 5. Report: CRMS Report (Dona Weifenbach, CPRA). At the October 13, 2011 meeting, the Task Force directed that a CRMS report be presented at every meeting. Ms. Weifenbach provided a report on CRMS.

Ms. Weifenbach reported that at the October meeting, the Task Force approved the CRMS budget through FY 2018 to 2019 and requested that at future meetings, a CRMS progress report be presented, of which this is the first presentation. Recent milestones include meeting with the Monitoring Work Group, putting the report cards on the website and soliciting comments from the work groups and agencies, conducting bi-annual training, setting up the annual CRMS roadshows to demonstrate recent website additions to agencies, and producing 20 project specific reports. CRMS will also assist the agencies with the monitoring portion of the Report to Congress. The basin level and coast-wide report cards are now in draft form and should be available on the website at the end of February to early March. Ms. Weifenbach then went through a detailed example of how CRMS monitoring can be used for a particular project, the Cote Blanche Bay project.

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

Mr. Hartman pointed out that he does not think the Task Force update request was meant to be a 20 minute presentation on one project. He suggested that the update be more succinct and that only a few indices be highlighted. He added that the Task Force is looking to see what has been learned from CRMS across basins and not looking for a project specific update.

Mr. Clark stated that it was a good presentation, but agreed that this may not be what the Task Force was requesting. He cautioned that CRMS is not the entire monitoring program for CWPPRA and suggested that the CRMS group make a statement explaining that project specific monitoring is also a part of CWPPRA and that information can be found on the project websites as well as the CRMS site.

Mr. Haase pointed out that he believes the Task Force is particularly interested in the CRMS Program and how it is supporting CWPPRA. Mr. Paul agreed that the Task Force is focusing on CRMS.

Mr. Hartman suggested that the presentation be made to the Task Force and their feedback be taken, but reiterated that he believes the Task Force wants to know what is being learned from CRMS on a basin and coast-wide level.

Ms. Weifenbach responded that they had discussed with the Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Committee what to present and decided to start at the project level for the first status update and then move to more coast-wide information over the next three meetings. She added that the coast-wide report card is still in draft form now.

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

7. Agenda Item 6. Report/Discussion: Decision Structure for Projects Reaching 20-Year Life Span (Brad Inman, USACE). At the October 13, 2011 meeting, the Task Force directed the Technical Committee to develop a decision structure (a course of action for the CWPPRA Standard Operating Procedure) to be used as a tool for making logical decisions for projects reaching their 20-year life span. The P&E Committee reported on their initial discussion about the decision structure.

Mr. Inman reported that the P&E Committee met to discuss developing a decision structure for projects reaching their 20-year life span. They determined that a structure must be in place by 2013 since the first projects would reach their 20-year life in 2014. The P&E Committee suggested a project completion report including items such as project completion timeline, project type, cost share agreement evaluation, responsible parties, etc. be completed for projects as they near the 20-year cutoff. Mr. Inman also noted that the 20-year project life span does not seem to be defined by the Act which would mean that a successful project could be extended and/or maintained beyond 20 years with additional funds if available. As such, a decision structure would be helpful in identifying the success level of a project and the subsequent steps leading up to and beyond the 20-year project life span. The P&E Committee is seeking further guidance on the approach and deliverable from the Technical Committee and Task Force.

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

Mr. Clark thanked the P&E Committee for their work and stated that if the 20-year project life span was not a part of the Act, but instead a policy decision, it would be logical to continue project maintenance if practicable. However, if the 20-year timeline was part of the Act then it would have to be adhered to.

Mr. Hartman stated that the presented decision structure is good, but emphasized that the question of liability for a project after the 20-year life must still be addressed. For example, who is responsible if rock is left on a project after 20 years and a barge hits the rocks. He pointed out that it is less costly to maintain than to re-build, but if projects are not decommissioned a perpetual liability risk remains for the permit holder that must be evaluated. Mr. Clark responded that currently, CWPPRA and the agency sponsors would be liable, but that after the 20 years, the cost share agreements would have to be reviewed and re-issued.

Mr. Clark stated that he would be opposed to spending money to remove rock. Mr. Hartman agreed, but added that the liability issue must be addressed. Mr. Clark stated that on a USFWS sponsored project, the USFWS would consider assuming the liability to keep the project in place and not have the rock and/or structures removed. Mr. Paul agreed that the solution may be project specific because some agency sponsors and/or landowners may be willing to assume liability to keep project features in place.

Mr. Inman stated that at this point, the P&E Committee wanted to encourage discussion and that a future solution may be for each agency to determine how to handle the projects they sponsor. However, if projects need to be decommissioned, it would be CWPPRA's responsibility.

Mr. Haase noted that he liked the decision structure, but requested that further consideration be given to when the project end evaluation begins. He suggested that it start in year 15 or 18 of a project's life and not be held until year 20.

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

8. Agenda Item 7. Report/Discussion: Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for Project Transfers Between Federal Agencies (Brad Inman, USACE). At the June 8, 2011 meeting, the Task Force directed the Technical Committee to develop a SOP to address the situation where a project is transferred from one Federal Sponsor to another. The USACE provided a recommendation for the Technical Committee to consider.

Mr. Inman stated that the Task Force requested a SOP for project transfers between Federal agencies developed for the January Task Force Meeting. He explained that the proposed SOP has been modeled after the SOP for transferring a project to another program, noting that it has been drafted in conformance with the appointments clause such that only Federal agencies would vote on the transfer. He asked the Technical Committee to submit any input or changes they would like to see.

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

Mr. Clark commented that he did not think the second sentence of Item 2 and the second sentence of Item 5 of the proposed SOP were necessary. Mr. Inman responded that Mr. Clark's suggestions would be taken under advisement.

Mr. Paul asked if the P&E Committee had reviewed the proposed SOP. Mr. Inman responded that it had not. Mr. Paul then recommended that it be reviewed by the P&E Committee and Mr. Hartman agreed. Mr. Inman stated that the proposed SOP would be sent to the P&E Committee.

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

9. Agenda Item 8. Report: Status of the PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project (CS-28) (Scott Wandell, USACE). *Mr. Wandell provided a status update of the Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project.*

Mr. Wandell presented an overview of the project, explaining that an operations and maintenance (O&M) schedule manual must be drafted and approved by both the local and federal sponsors prior to using the completed pipeline for a Calcasieu River maintenance dredging event and that the project does not yet have funding designated for O&M. Mr. Wandell stated that coordination has begun with CPRA for the preparation of an O&M plan and budget, and that a first draft is expected over the next few weeks. He continued that the USACE is proposing to use the remaining \$5.6 million from the project's approved construction budget for the construction of a new marsh creation site (labeled Area D). He explained that construction of the new marsh creation site is an opportunity for the permanent pipeline to be utilized for its intended use and is the only known option for beneficial use during the next river dredging event (late summer 2012). The alternative would be for the dredged material to go to a USACE disposal site. Mr. Wandell stated that USACE is seeking support to modify the existing cost share agreement for Cycle 2 to show a location change to the marsh creation site footprint in order to meet the schedule for the next river dredging event.

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

Mr. Hartman inquired if the remaining \$5.6 million would be enough for the construction of Area D, to which Mr. Wandell responded that a cost estimate has not yet been developed.

Mr. Clark pointed out that the \$5.6 million should be enough, but that it does not include O&M funding. He added that USFWS fully supports this proposed beneficial use project.

Mr. Haase also cited support for the proposal, but cautioned that the revisions to the existing cost share agreement would need attorney review and approval. Mr. Inman responded that the USACE has discussed this proposal with their counsel and that it should be workable. He added that the dredging maintenance folks may even push back the next dredge event to accommodate their schedule.

Mr. Hartman asked if an Environmental Assessment will be needed for the new marsh creation site. Mr. Inman answered that they already have an Environmental Assessment for the proposed beneficial use area so they are using an area that has already been cleared for this use. Mr.

Hartman inquired if a project scope change would be required to include a new cycle. Mr. Inman responded that this work would be a different footprint, but in the same area of one of the five approved dredging cycles.

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

10. Agenda Item 9. Report: Status of the PPL 11- River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp (PO-29) (Karen McCormick, EPA). Travis Creel, USACE, provided a status update on the River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp Gap Analysis.

Mr. Creel reported that they have completed the gap analysis and will provide a draft report to the EPA soon. They are currently going through the technical edits and incorporating all law references for complete documentation. The report will go to vertical team review in approximately one month.

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

Mr. Clark asked for a timeline and what the report contains. Mr. Creel replied that the report states where gaps are and identifies areas of additional information required for an USACE Chief's Report if projects are to be moved to the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA).

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

11. Agenda Item 10. Report: Status of the PPL -1 West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) (Nick Sims, USGS). Mr. Sims provided a status update on the West Bay Work Plan and Closure Plan and presented final results from the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) study.

Mr. Sims provided a status update on the project, stating the project is moving forward with the Task Force directive to close the West Bay Diversion. Cost estimates and design for the three closure alternatives are being prepared using existing survey information and that right of entry was granted on November 22, 2011 for any additional survey data needed. The alternative design process should be completed around March 2012. Once the design alternative is chosen, the condemnation process with the State can begin for the construction phase. He also noted that the State and USACE are currently analyzing and comparing 2009 and 2011 survey data from the receiving area to help measure the effectiveness of the diversion, and this analysis should be completed by January 2012. Additionally, the ERDC sediment analysis is complete and that report should be completed in December 2011. ERDC will hold a webinar in January 2012 to present the report results. They have found that approximately 15 to 20% of the shoaling can be attributed to the West Bay Diversion.

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

Mr. Clark asked that the data be sent out as soon as possible and Mr. Sims agreed.

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

A member of the public asked if the ERDC report will be available on the internet and was answered, yes.

Sean Duffy, representing the Big River Coalition and navigation industry, stated that he would be checking the transcripts from the previous meetings where it was acknowledged that issues related to the diversion closure needed to be looked at more closely and that the navigation industry needed to be in consultation throughout the closure process. Mr. Duffy stated that there are other diversion projects being planned, yet plans are in the works to close this diversion which is working. He continued that this diversion has been studied for at least 10 years and that this is the first time land production has been realized. He noted that the motion to close the diversion was made prior to the appearance of land. He also cited that no land was present in 2008 following a high river event, but that following the installation of shreds over the 2009/2010 dredging cycle and a subsequent high river event, the generation of land was noticeable in the receiving area. He reiterated that the navigation industry wants to be included in the closure discussions and that the dredging of the anchorage area should not just be looked at as a cost expenditure, but that the beneficial use of the material generated from the dredging should also be considered.

Mr. Sims stated that they will coordinate with the navigation industry in the February/March timeframe.

P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, reminded everyone that 12 years of study and \$22 million has gone into this project and that the project is working. He questioned why the State is not looking for alternative funds since the State has other diversions planned. He continued that he would be embarrassed to ask for more money to fund these future planned diversions when there are plans to close this working diversion. Mr. Hahn stated that we collectively need to find a way to stop the closure of the West Bay Diversion because it does not make sense to close a working diversion.

Mr. Hartman stated that he wanted to reiterate previous comments on the diversion closure. He acknowledged that the Technical Committee and Task Force are not against the diversion, but that if funding runs out in 2019 there will be no money left for closure or to maintain the anchorage after that time.

Mr. Clark added that the closure was recommended on an economic basis due to the costs of dredging the anchorage.

Mr. Haase stated that he hoped the final report would answer what happens to the anchorage area after the diversion is closed.

Mr. Duffy again stated that the navigation industry wants to be included in discussions related to beneficial use, and noted that there need to be more discussions than a meeting every few months. He suggested closed meetings with navigation experts present if approved by legal. He understands that there are large costs associated with this project, but that other funding sources are coming up which need to be looked at collectively. He gave the example of the Sabine Marsh

proposal today for beneficial use and reiterated that that is the type of thing they want to see along the Mississippi River.

12. Agenda Item 11. Report/Decision: Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection/Commercial Canal Freshwater Redirection Project (TV-19) (Scott Wandell, USACE). The USACE and CPRA received a report from Vermillion and Iberia Parishes providing project alternatives. The agency engineers reviewed the alternative analysis and recommended a path forward. The Technical Committee voted on the recommendation to the Task Force on a path forward for the Project.

Mr. Wandell reported that the USACE and State have conducted their review of the alternatives analysis report for the recommended alternative, which is a concrete paneled wall structure with potential marsh creation. Mr. Wandell stated that, while the efforts of Shaw and those involved are appreciated, the report review yielded deficiencies related to project design and cost, including an under-estimate of costs associated with mobilization/demobilization, the removal of pipelines, and the costs of special considerations and manufacturing requirements of panels and installation. He also noted that the recommended alternative was determined in the report to be inadequate for the containment of material in the future marsh creation area due to poor soil conditions and that this design option was not costed-out in the report. Although the report cites benefits of 260 acres from the recommended alternative, credit cannot be given for benefits from future products. He continued that this leaves the recommended alternative with estimated benefits of only 60 acres protected at a cost of \$12.5 million, with a cost effectiveness of \$208,333 per acre. Mr. Wandell explained that the estimate presented in the report appears to only be for construction costs and does not account for inflation over the life of the project. Based on limited benefits and the high cost per acre associated with the project, the Federal and local sponsors propose de-authorization of this project.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if the project would be recommended for suspension. Mr. Inman responded that the USACE recommends de-authorization based on the engineering issues. Mr. Haase and Mr. Clark concurred with de-authorization. Mr. Clark also clarified that the determination of the recommended alternative's inadequacy for the containment of material meant that the wall could not withstand the weight of the marsh creation behind it.

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

W.P. Edwards, Vermillion Corporation Land Manager, stated that it was a sad day for Vermillion Parish and Southwest Louisiana and that he would be ashamed and embarrassed to ask for more Federal money for river diversions when a project with multiple benefits is now in the past. He noted that the only way to save Southeast Louisiana is through river diversion and that the closest thing Southwest Louisiana has to a river is the Atchafalaya. He continued that by de-authorizing this project, water would continue to flow into the bay and not reach the west where the Mermentau Basin is in peril. He noted that there are other viable projects in Southwest Louisiana, such as a river diversion from the Mississippi River across the Atchafalaya Basin and into the Mermentau Basin. He agreed that pumping five feet of sediment behind a 60 to 80 foot

concrete panel three to four feet out of the water would not be sustainable; however he stated that if the sediment were lifted, the wall could be sustainable. He expressed that he was not surprised that the Federal agency did not agree with the private firm's alternative design and assessment given that the Federal agency itself could not develop a viable alternative. He hoped that the Technical Committee would give Vermillion Parish a chance to do some other things to save their wetlands and not stand as an impediment.

Sherrill Sagrera, Vermillion Parish, is in rice production and stated that this project was their saving grace for moving water from the Atchafalaya Basin to the Mermentau Basin. He expressed that killing this project will kill agriculture on that end of the State.

DECISION: Mr. Haase moved to recommend Task Force approval to begin de-authorization of the Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection/Commercial Canal Freshwater Redirection Project (TV-19). Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Request for Scope Change of the PPL 14 – South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project (BA-41) (Britt Paul, NRCS). NRCS and CPRA requested a change in project scope which would remove the northern marsh creation site of BA-41 so that it can be built by USACE as a Risk Reduction Project (Barataria Basin Landbridge). The Risk Reduction Project was authorized by the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery of 2006 (P.L. 109-234, Title II, Chapter 3, Investigations), commonly known as the Fourth Supplemental. The balance of the BA-41 Project, which consists of 11,750 feet of shoreline protection and the southern marsh creation (63 acres) and nourishment (14 acres) will now constitute the CWPPRA project at a fully funded cost of \$21,639,575. Phase II approval has already been granted for these components and construction is ongoing. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the requested scope change.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend Task Force approval for the requested change in scope to remove the northern marsh creation site of the PPL 14 – South Shore of the Pen Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation Project (BA-41). Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

14. Agenda Item 13. Decision: Request for a One Year Time Extension for the PPL 11 – South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration Project (ME-20) (Darryl Clark, USFWS; Kirk Rhinehart and Andrew Beall, CPRA). USFWS and CPRA requested a one-year time extension for the Project for the completion of major landowner land rights. Project construction was approved by the Task Force in January 2010 at a fully funded cost of \$29,046,128, for a benefit of 352 net acres. Most land rights approvals from the major landowner have been received and project sponsors are confident that the remaining major landowner land rights can be acquired in early

2012. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve this time extension.

Mr. Clark requested that instead of an extension, the project be suspended and the unexpended funds be returned to the CWPPRA Program due to failure to receive landowner approval from two of the seven principal family members (29%). It is not likely that such agreement would be received in the next six months. USFWS requests the return of the \$24,921,491 Phase II construction funds. The total fully funded budget for the project is \$29,046,128 (\$2,358,420 for Phase I and \$26,687,708 for Phase II). Almost \$1 million in funds remain in Phase I and a small reserve will be needed to cover the CPRA in-kind credits for 2010/2011. Once those credits are recorded, any additional funding will be returned to the Program. When the land rights are finalized, the USFWS will once again request construction funding.

Andrew Beall, CPRA project manager, explained that five of the seven landowner family members have signed off on the project, but that the remaining two signatures were contingent on a reciprocal lease agreement that fell through. The project request for suspension is in anticipation of obtaining the remaining landowner signatures.

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

Mr. Hartman explained that according to the SOP, once a project receives construction funds, there is a two-year time period to use the funds or explain why they are not being used.

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

Martin O. Miller III, landowner, stated that five of his family members are in support of this project and that they are working with the rest of the family to secure the remaining signatures.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval for suspension of the PPL 11 – South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration Project (ME-20). Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

15. Agenda Item 14. Decision: Request for Approval to Initiate De-authorization of the PPL 10 – Benneys Bay Diversion Project (MR-13) (Scott Wandell, USACE). USACE and CPRA requested formal de-authorization procedures be initiated for the Project based on the high cost of dredging associated with the Project. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to initiate de-authorization.

Mr. Wandell reported that a de-authorization request letter has been prepared. The USACE is requesting de-authorization because of the significant cost estimated to maintain the project over its 20-year life and the great burden this cost would put on the CWPPRA Program.

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

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

Randy Moertle, representing the McIlhenny and Little Lake Land Companies, suggested that this project be kept on the CWPPRA list until conditions change. He asked the Technical Committee to think very seriously before de-authorizing projects because a lot of money has already been spent on engineering and design and de-authorizing a project is equivalent to placing it in a black hole. He expressed frustration from a landowner standpoint that once a project has been de-authorized, it is extremely difficult to get another project approved in the same area. He proposed that an SOP be developed that would allow the Technical Committee to put a project on hold and return money into the Program without de-authorizing the project. He noted that this project would not have gone to 95% design if it was not deemed a good project. He also explained that the landowners are investigating alternative funding methods and that if the project were set aside, but not de-authorized, it could be revived when it becomes economically viable.

Mr. Hartman and Ms. McCormick agreed that it is an interesting idea and thanked Mr. Moertle for bringing it to the Technical Committee's attention.

Mr. Inman pointed out that there is nothing in the rules that would preclude creating a new category for something like this and that an SOP should be created to account for projects to be set aside and the money put back into the Program.

Mr. Clark spoke in support of the Benneys Bay Project and added that the de-authorization is because of the high induced shoaling costs and not the merits of the project itself.

Mr. Hartman stated that he can see merit in this for some projects because new funding alternatives could arise in the future; however, in this case, he does not see resolving the induced shoaling cost issue and believes this particular project has terminal difficulties.

Mr. Paul pointed out that the project has not received Phase II money yet, so nothing in the Program funding status would change whether the project is de-authorized or suspended. He asked Mr. Haase if the State would be in favor of suspension. Mr. Haase cautioned that they could end up with a list of projects in suspension that are never addressed again, but added that in this case, he believes the State would be in favor of suspension.

Mr. Clark suggested that a time limit, such as five years, be placed on any project suspensions. Mr. Hartman disagreed that a time limit would be required.

Mr. Moertle added that it does not hurt anything for projects to be suspended indefinitely.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval for de-authorization of the PPL 10 – Benneys Bay Diversion Project (MR-13). Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Haase, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Paul opposed and Mr. Hartman and Ms. McCormick voted in favor. The motion failed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval for suspension of the PPL 10 – Benneys Bay Diversion Project (MR-13) and that the P&E Committee work out SOP language for suspensions. Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Hartman and Ms. McCormick opposed and Mr. Haase, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Paul voted in favor. The motion passed.

16. Agenda Item 15. Decision: Request for Approval for Final De-authorization of the PPL 14 – Riverine Mining-Scofield Island Restoration Project (BA-40) (Rachel Sweeney, NMFS). NMFS and CPRA requested approval for final de-authorization of the Project. The Project was authorized for engineering and design on PPL 14. A Preliminary Design Review was held on March 16, 2010. Currently, CPRA intends to construct the Scofield Island Project using State funds. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the final de-authorization.

Ms. Sweeney explained that the State is going to undertake the construction efforts for this project and therefore de-authorization is being requested within CWPPRA.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval for de-authorization of the PPL 14 – Riverine Mining-Scofield Island Restoration Project (BA-40). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

17. Agenda Item 16. Report/Decision: 21st Priority Project List (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The Environmental Workgroup Chairman presented an overview of the ten PPL 21 candidate projects and three PPL 21 candidate demonstration projects. The Technical Committee voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force for selecting PPL 21 projects, including demonstration projects for Phase I Engineering and Design.

Mr. Kevin Roy gave a brief overview of the below listed candidate projects in PPL 21 nominated for Phase I Engineering and Design.

Region	Basin	PPL 21 Nominees
1	Pontchartrain	Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing
1	Pontchartrain	LaBranche Central Marsh Creation
2	Breton Sound	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation
2	Breton Sound	White Ditch Marsh Creation Sediment Delivery
2	Barataria	Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection
2	Barataria	Bayou Grande Cheniere Marsh Creation
2	Barataria	Bayou L'Ours Terracing
3	Teche-Vermilion	Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment

Region	Basin	PPL 21 Nominees
3	Teche-Vermilion	Cole's Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Oyster Bayou Restoration

	PPL 21 Demonstration Project Nominees
DEMO	Automated Marsh Planting (formerly called "Alternative to Manual Planting")
DEMO	Deltalok
DEMO	Habitat Enhancements through Vegetation Plantings Using Gulf Saver Bags

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

Mr. Hartman suggested not voting on or recommending any demonstration projects this year due to limited funding. Ms. McCormick agreed and suggested that money go towards construction. Mr. Clark also stated support for not recommending any demonstration projects this year. He asked Mr. Inman if the P&E Committee had discussed not doing demonstration projects and Mr. Inman responded, no.

Mr. Hartman asked about the NRCS demonstration project from last year. Mr. Paul replied that the Request for Proposal (RFP) will be issued this spring, but that once proposals are received, more money may be needed. He pointed out that the NRCS project will test rock replacement methods that have been discussed for many years.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend to the Task Force that no demonstration projects be included this year. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

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

There were no public comments on the Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing, LaBranche Central Marsh Creation, Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation, Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment, or Oyster Bayou Restoration Projects.

P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in support of the White Ditch Marsh Creation Sediment Delivery Project. He stated that it is Plaquemines Parish's number one project. He also stated that the Bayou Grande Chenier Marsh Creation Project is their number two project choice.

Phil Precht, representing ConocoPhillips and Louisiana Land and Exploration, stated that the Northwest Turtle Bay Project is 100% on their property and that they fully support the project and will provide any needed access. He also spoke in support of the Bayou L'Ours Project as the 95% landowner for that project area.

Luke Ehrensing, representing the Little Lake Duck Club, a landowner to the north of project, spoke in support of the Northwest Turtle Bay Project as it is one more piece of the puzzle for the Jefferson landbridge.

Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that Jefferson Parish strongly supports the Northwest Turtle Bay Project because it is an important component of the land bridge and that the plug is keeping Bayous Rigolets and Perot from merging with Turtle Bay. She added that previous similar work in this area shows that this project will work and pointed out that it is the most cost effective project on the list per net acres.

Archie Chaisson, Lafourche Parish Government, stated that the Bayou L’Ours Project is Lafourche Parish’s number one project.

Randy Moertle, representing the Little Lake Land Company spoke in support of the Bayou L’Ours Project as the landowner in this project area. He stated that the east/west ridge here is the best salt water barrier protecting everything to the north. He pointed out that once the salt water breaches this area it will head north, and that as landowners, they very much support this project.

Randy Moertle, representing the McIlhenny Company, spoke in support of the Cole’s Bayou Project as the sole landowner of the project area. He added that this project has several restoration and protection techniques, including hydrologic restoration setup.

Cynthia Duet, with the National Audubon Society, spoke in support of the Cole’s Bayou Project as adjacent landowners. She added that this project is a great start and will help to keep this area somewhat intact.

W.P. Edwards, Vermillion Corporation Land Manager, also spoke in support of the Cole’s Bayou Project as an adjacent landowner. He reiterated that the project uses several restoration techniques.

The voting results were as follows:

Region	Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of point score	Phase I Fully Funded Cost	Phase II Fully Funded Cost
4	Oyster Bayou Marsh Restoration	3	6	3	2	6	4	6	24	\$3,165,322	\$26,616,033
1	LaBranche Central Marsh Creation	6		4	1	2	3	5	16	\$3,885,298	\$38,273,910
2	Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation	5			3	5	6	4	19	\$2,354,788	\$20,843,969
2	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation	2	2		4	4		4	12	\$3,277,356	\$28,000,656
2	Bayou L’Ours Terracing	1	4	2			5	4	12	\$903,617	\$4,543,902
3	Cole’s Bayou Marsh Restoration	4	3			3	2	4	12	\$3,136,805	\$23,494,419
1	Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing		5		6	1		3	12	\$4,080,095	\$42,000,658
3	Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation		1	6			1	3	8	\$2,273,834	\$20,258,471
2	Bayou Grande Cheniere Marsh			1	5			2	6	\$3,669,775	\$44,997,107

Region	Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of point score	Phase I Fully Funded Cost	Phase II Fully Funded Cost
	Creation and Terracing										
2	White Ditch Marsh Creation			5				1	5	\$2,807,119	\$27,713,363

Tie breaker voting results were as follows:

Project	COE	State	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	No. of votes	Sum of point score
Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation	2	1	1	3	2	1	6	10
Bayou L'Ours Terracing	1	3	3	1	1	3	6	12
Cole's Bayou Marsh Restoration	3	2	2	2	3	2	6	14

Mr. Hartman asked Ms. Browning for an updated available funding amount before moving to the next voting item. Ms. Browning responded that there would be \$75.1 million available for construction after accounting for the Phase I costs of these four projects and the suspended and final de-authorization projects voted on earlier today.

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend Task Force approval of the four top voted projects (Oyster Bayou Restoration, LaBranche Central Marsh Creation, Northwest Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection, and Cole's Bayou Marsh Creation and Restoration). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

18. Agenda Item 17. Report/Decision: Request for Phase II Authorization and Approval of Phase II Increment 1 Funding (Brad Inman, USACE). The Technical Committee considered requests for Phase II authorization and approval of Increment 1 funding for cash flow projects, for recommendation to the Task Force. Due to limited funding, the Technical Committee recommended a list of projects within available program construction funding limits. Each project listed in the following table was discussed individually by its sponsoring agency. Following presentations and discussion on individual projects, the Technical Committee ranked all projects to aid in deciding which to recommend to the Task Force for Phase II authorization and funding.

Mr. Inman asked that the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock Project be removed from today's voting and go into suspension in light of recent data on the reduction to the estimated rate of loss of the channel bank which will tremendously reduce the wetland benefits for the project. There were no objections to removing the project from the list, so Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock Project was removed from consideration.

A project overview was then presented by the agency sponsor for each nominated project listed below except for the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock Project.

Agency	Project No.	PPL	Project Name	Construct Start Date	Phase 1 Cost	Phase II Cost	Total Fully Funded Cost Est.	Net Benefit Acres	Total Cost per Acre
--------	-------------	-----	--------------	----------------------	--------------	---------------	------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

EPA	TE-47	11	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration	Apr 2013	\$3,742,053	\$62,347,496	\$66,089,549	195	\$338,921
EPA	MR-15	15	Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses	Apr 2012	\$1,074,522	\$21,081,770	\$22,156,292	318	\$69,674
NRCS	PO-34	16	Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration & Shoreline Protection	Oct 2012	\$1,660,985	\$56,006,898	\$57,667,883	192	\$300,354
FWS	BS-16	17	South Lake Lery Shoreline and Marsh Restoration		\$2,665,993	\$38,984,308	\$41,650,301	507	\$82,150
NMFS	BA-68	18	Grand Liard Marsh & Ridge Restoration		\$3,271,287	\$39,308,329	\$42,579,616	370	\$115,080
NMFS	BA-76	19	Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration		\$3,419,263	\$33,308,188	\$36,727,451	308	\$119,245
NRCS	LA-39	20	Coastwide Planting		\$156,945	\$12,532,780	\$12,689,725	779	\$16,290
COE	TV-11b	9	Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock		\$1,498,968	\$34,135,100	\$35,634,068	241	\$147,859

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

Mr. Clark thanked Ms. Sweeney for her work on the barrier islands in eastern Barataria Bay and pointed out that all were engineered and designed within CWPPRA even if they were not built by CWPPRA.

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

Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, spoke in support of the Ship Shoal Project. He understands the hesitation at the large price tag on this project, but he pointed out that the project has been around for 10 years and \$4 million has been spent on engineering and design. He added that it would be a shame to look back in 10 more years and say that this was a good project that was not built. It is a good project and is the first line of defense in Terrebonne Parish for barrier islands and the Parish supports the project.

P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in favor of the Venice Ponds Project because there is over a billion dollars of infrastructure in this area that would be protected by this project. The Project is vital to the area and this area has always been prone to storm surge. There is concern that if the oil and gas industry in that area relocates, they will relocate out of Louisiana.

George Pivach II, representing landowners who own 7,000 acres of marsh around the project area, spoke in support of the Venice Ponds Project because it is a triple win, giving storm surge protection, coastal restoration, and supports navigational interests by maintaining shorelines and reducing USACE dredging costs.

Steven Redman, landowner on the south shore of Lake Lery, spoke in support of the South Lake Lery Project. He stated that there are a lot of good projects on the list, but historically his family owned land on the south shore in the 1960's and 1970's, during which time a gasoline pipeline

was installed. His father had a clause in the pipeline contract to prevent tidal flow along the pipeline. Hurricane Katrina destroyed the shoreline and marsh behind it which is a viable reason to enforce and fund this project to protect marsh from opening up to the south and ultimately to the Gulf of Mexico.

P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in support of the Grand Liard Marsh Project because it is the last ridge to protect this area of Venice and rarely do projects combine coastal restoration and storm surge protection.

Phil Precht, representing ConocoPhillips and Louisiana Land and Exploration, spoke in support of the Grand Liard Marsh, Chenier Ronquille, and Coast-wide Planting Projects as the landowner in the project areas.

Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, stated that the numbers one to four projects for the Parish, as voted on by their Coastal Zone Advisory Committee are the Grand Liard Marsh, Chenier Ronquille, Venice Ponds, and Lake Lery Projects.

P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government, spoke in favor of the Chenier Ronquille Project. Several years ago, Plaquemines Parish started working on a coastal plan with the USACE and found that it is good to build barrier islands. He stated that this is a great project which would afford storm surge protection which protects levees and marshes.

Ms. Browning asked why construction is scheduled for 2013 but funds are being requested now for the Chenier Ronquille Project. Ms. Sweeney answered that while it would normally take a couple of months to execute an agreement with the State, this project will require more time, thus it will be a minimum of one year from when the project moves from Phase II until it is advertised.

W.P. Edwards, Vermillion Corporation Land Manager, spoke in support of the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization Project. He asked that today's minutes accurately reflect the reason for suspension of this project, which is on PPL 9, but would have funding if it had been on PPL 8. He stated that monitoring is done right along the shoreline and that they are not accounting for the land loss behind the shoreline back into the marsh system and therefore not taking a comprehensive look at what is happening. He stated that the real reason the project is being suspended is because the State refuses to pay its share of the cost on Federal navigation projects and that the State and USACE cannot reach a cost share agreement.

Randy Moertle, Rainey Conservation Alliance, asked to see the data for the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization Project and how much bank line is being eroded before the project is suspended. He requested a private meeting with the USACE to review the data. He added that some areas of the bank are in good shape and some are not, so if they are taking an overall assessment, it may not be accurate.

The voting results were as follows:

PPL	Project No.	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	State	No. of vote	Sum of weighted score	Phase II Increment 1 Funding	Total Phase II Cost
-----	-------------	---------	-----	-----	-----	------	------	-------	-------------	-----------------------	------------------------------	---------------------

									s		Request	
20	LA-39	Coastwide Planting	3	2	1	1	4	1	6	12	\$4,433,718	\$12,532,780
18	BA-68	Grand Liard Marsh & Ridge Restoration	1		2	2	2	2	5	9	\$38,823,875	\$39,308,329
17	BS-16	South Lake Lery Shoreline and Marsh Restoration	4		4	3	3		4	14	\$36,518,340	\$38,984,308
19	BA-76	Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration		1	3	4		4	4	12	\$32,504,233	\$33,308,188
15	MR-15	Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses	2	4					2	6	\$19,930,492	\$21,081,770
16	PO-34	Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration & Shoreline Protection					1	3	2	4	\$41,761,744	\$56,006,898
11	TE-47	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration		3					1	3	\$62,186,707	\$62,347,496
9	TV-11b	Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Canal to Lock							0	0	\$30,668,583	\$34,135,100

Mr. Clark pointed out that if the first two voted projects are recommended then \$31 million will be remaining. As the agency sponsor for the South Lake Lery Project, they have determined that the removal of Cell 6 would reduce the incremental cost from \$36.5 million to approximately \$29.5 million. Mr. Clark and Mr. Roy explained that Cell 6 has been determined as the most problematic area from a construction standpoint for this project because of the soils in the area. Mr. Clark made a motion to remove Cell 6 from the project to lower the cost.

Mr. Hartman stated that this would be a scope change that would need to be presented to the Technical Committee. Ms. McCormick agreed that the proper process should be followed and hasty decisions should not be made just to approve construction.

Mr. Clark stated that he believes the project cost will be below \$31 million and that this preliminary cost estimate was completed by a member of the Economic Work Group. He suggested they would get official budget numbers and transmit those to the Technical Committee and Task Force. Mr. Hartman suggested a fax vote be requested before the January Task Force meeting and Mr. Clark agreed that a fax vote would be requested once the numbers were reviewed. The Technical Committee agreed to hold an e-mail/fax vote on a re-scaled South Lake Lery project after the project sponsors presented more information and after work group review.

Chris Llewellyn, EPA (sitting in for Ms. McCormick who had to leave the meeting early), asked if the project would need to run through all of the work groups again. Mr. Haase asked if the other projects on the list would be afforded the same opportunity to trim their budgets for re-evaluation. Mr. Clark responded that this project was voted number three. Mr. Paul agreed that this project was number three, but that the numbers need to be revisited.

Mr. Hartman stated that as sponsor of the number four voted project, they would not want to revise the project to reduce the budget. He also expressed concern over the precedent that this may set. He cautioned that nothing be rushed into and that the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups need to review the South Lake Lery Project to ensure that it is still cost effective with the suggested changes.

Mr. Llewellyn pointed out that the Venice Pond Project falls within the remaining \$31 million without any reevaluation with a fully funded cost of only \$22 million. Mr. Hartman responded that he would not be in favor of jumping down the agency voting list and that while the Venice Pond Project was not in the top four voted projects, the South Lake Lery Project was voted as number three, indicating that most agencies thought it was a good project. Mr. Inman agreed that they would not jump down the voting list. Mr. Llewellyn responded that he just wanted to point out that the Venice Pond Project is the most cost effective after the Coast-wide Plantings Project. **DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend Task Force approval for Phase II funding for the top two voted projects (Coast-wide Planting and Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.**

19. Agenda Item 18. Discussion: CWPPRA Program Funding Capacity (Brad Inman, USACE). The Technical Committee discussed the CWPPRA program’s future funding capacity and implications for future PPLs to provide the P&E Committee guidance on developing action items by the next Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Inman explained that the current trend in the CWPPRA Program funding capacity is not sustainable. While today’s decisions will change the numbers, he still suspects that the funding needed will fall short and that the trend line will continue in this direction. This potential shortage of funding raises questions as to how to spend the remaining Program funds. How much money needs to be set aside for the 20-year life of approved projects needs to be determined as part of a comprehensive analysis of the Program’s remaining capacity. Though no decisions will be made at this time, Mr. Inman suggested that a discussion on these matters begin and encouraged agencies to evaluate a real analysis as to what money is needed to finish or close out the approved projects in the event that the CWPPRA Program is not reauthorized.

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

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

20. Agenda Item 19. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE). There were no additional agenda items.

21. Agenda Item 20. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE). There were no additional public comments.

22. Agenda Item 21. PPL 22 Regional Planning Team (RPT) Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE). The PPL 22 RPT Meetings will be as follows.

January 24, 2012	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Abbeville
January 25, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
January 26, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 26, 2012	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 15, 2012	10:00 a.m.	RPT Voting Meeting	Baton Rouge

23. Agenda Item 22. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE).

January 19, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
January 24, 2012	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Abbeville
January 25, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
January 26, 2012	9:00 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 26, 2012	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 15, 2012	10:00 a.m.	RPT Voting Meeting	Baton Rouge
April 19, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	New Orleans
June 28, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 12, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 11, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
November 14, 2012	7:00 p.m.	PPL 23 Public Comment Meeting	Abbeville
November 15, 2012	7:00 p.m.	PPL 23 Public Comment Meeting	New Orleans
December 12, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee Meeting	Baton Rouge

24. Agenda Item 23. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Inman adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:30 p.m.