

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 20 September 2011 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

Mr. 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. 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. Inman explained that Mr. Holden was currently in Washington D.C. meeting with the Congressional Delegation. He added that Ms. McCormick's plane was late and 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.

Mr. Hartman suggested covering non-decision agenda items first in order to allow Ms. McCormick time to arrive. Mr. Inman asked that additional Agenda Item No. 19 be discussed after Agenda Item No. 11.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to approve the agenda, with moving non-decision items to the front and discussing Agenda Item No. 19 after Agenda Item No. 11. 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 Outreach Committee and Report to Congress budgets on the agenda today are included in the Planning budget number. There is currently a \$345,000 surplus. Today's requests will increase the construction estimate by \$60 million and the funding approval by \$31 million. Currently, the Program is negative \$2.4 million with potential Fiscal Year 2012 (FY12) Federal funding of \$79 million. The Technical Committee is going into today's approvals with \$90 million, with a potential \$24.9 million back into the Program from de-authorizations and completed projects. The current estimate also includes a \$15 million set aside

for the West Bay Closure. The Cote Blanche fax vote has also already been accounted for in the funding status.

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

Mr. Hartman clarified that the decisions made today will hit the CWPPRA Program with approximately \$31 million, leaving only \$50 million for construction starts later on. Ms. Browning clarified that it would be \$69 million and not \$50 million. Mr. Hartman continued that in December there will only be about \$69 million to fund new construction starts and Phase I activities, rather than the usual \$80 to \$90 million. Ms. Browning clarified that today's votes would be an increase of \$60.9 million, making the Program need go from \$179 million to \$231 million and increase the current estimate from \$2.489 million to \$2.550 million. This shortage will continue to carry through the remaining life of the Program.

Mr. Clark added that the December Federal funding estimate is usually more accurate than the July estimate, but cautioned that the total CWPPRA allocation amount has decreased over the last two to three years. Ms. Browning responded that the 2012 estimate increased a little between December and July, but could change again before this December.

Mr. Hartman asked if there is a way to identify, by project, the money expected from de-authorized and completed projects so that the project sponsors can assist in verifying whether the estimates are correct. Ms. Browning answered that a project breakdown will be provided. Mr. Clark added that a project breakdown may also encourage agency sponsors to return money in a timely fashion.

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 Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Incremental Funding and Budget Increase for the Priority Project List (PPL) 3 – Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration Project (TV-04) (Britt Paul, NRCS). NRCS and CPRA requested approval for O&M Incremental funding and budget increase for the Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration Project (TV-04). Bids were opened on June 2, 2011 for a maintenance project to recap the School Bus Bayou rock dike and make minor repairs to several of the water control structures of the Cote Blanche Project. The low bid from Luhr Bros was approximately 18% higher than the construction cost estimate prepared for the O&M funding request approved by the Task Force on October 28, 2009. The low bidder agreed to extend his bid an additional 30 days until August 1, 2011. Approval was needed at least one week prior to this date in order to process the award of the contract. The Technical Committee recommended NRCS and CPRA's request for O&M Incremental funding and budget increase for Task Force Fax Vote approval. The Task Force voted via email on July 26, 2011 to approve the request for an O&M budget increase in the amount of \$231,456 and Incremental funding increase in the amount of \$240,530.

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 6. Report: Status of the PPL 1 – West Bay Sediment Diversion Project (MR-03) (Nick Sims, USACE). Mr. Sims provided a status update on the West Bay Project and Closure Plan.

Mr. Sims explained that at the last project update, there were delays obtaining survey information from the bank areas. They have received a State approval letter to use the State statute to obtain the right-of-way to conduct bank surveys. The letters to landowners are expected to be sent out no later than September 30, 2011, and bank surveys are expected to be conducted in mid-October. There are currently three alternatives for closure: rock dike semi-circle enclosure, pumped in earthen closure, and earthen dike plug. Once the bank surveys are completed, the alternative design is expected to take four to six months. After a design footprint is chosen, obtaining right-of-way access to construct the closure is expected to take eight to 12 months. The USACE project team recently visited the project site and there has been a lot of media attention on the Project. OCPR has completed the receiving area survey and is currently analyzing the data which will give better information regarding the amount of land being created. ERDC is conducting a sediment diversion work plan to see if they can figure out how much material is coming in from the West Bay Diversion. Yesterday was a webinar on the status of this investigation which includes four parts: data analysis, geomorphic assessment and one- and multi-dimensional modeling. Based on historical survey data, it appears that shoaling within the Pilottown Anchorage Area (PAA), along the right descending bank, was happening prior to opening the West Bay Diversion and then increased with the dredging of the navigation channel. ERDC has completed the models and is now conducting model runs which should tell them the percentage of shoaling caused by the West Bay Diversion.

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

Mr. Hartman asked for a best guesstimate of the timeline to initiate construction of closure activities. Mr. Sims replied that it will take approximately three months to get the design survey, six months to develop the design alternatives, and eight to 12 months for condemnation to construct. He emphasized that the condemnation will control the timeline, but estimated that construction of the closure will take place in a year and a half to two years.

Mr. Inman clarified that the current work is just to obtain survey data, but that to actually build the final design, land rights will have to be obtained. He added that construction will also depend on the timing of a low water event.

Mr. Hartman stated that based on yesterday's webinar, it appears that the PAA was silted in very quickly after dredging. He added that he would like to ensure the closure timeline is such that no additional dredging is required before closure.

Mr. Clark asked about the State letter. Mr. Sims clarified that the USACE officially asked to use the State statute to obtain entry to gather survey data. Mr. Clark added that, based on the webinar, some modeling is showing that the West Bay Diversion may account for only 14% of the total increased shoaling in the navigation channel and the PAA and that significant shoaling

was observed since the 1992 navigation channel was dredged, 10 years before the diversion was opened.

Mr. Rhinehart asked for the estimated range contributed by the West Bay Diversion. Mr. Sims responded that currently, the range is showing at 18 to 40%, but that the number will be tightened up with further modeling. Mr. Rhinehart stated that modeling is good, but that empirical data is better, if available. He added that it has always been fairly clear to him that based on the geomorphic data, significant shoaling has been happening since the deepening of the navigation channel. The final component will be to see what happens after the diversion is closed. It has been suggested that the river will blow the increased accumulated material out, re-deepening the navigation channel, but that may not be the case. He suggested that if the modeling supports some maximum contribution to shoaling from the West Bay Diversion, it may limit the amount of dredging money supplied by CWPPRA. He added that it may even be illegal to spend CWPPRA dollars beyond the contributed amount.

Mr. Inman stated that he was not sure of the legalities, but agreed that the funding contribution would need to be analyzed. Mr. Rhinehart responded that a contract cannot contain a clause that trumps Federal law and that the dredging agreement may have to be adjusted if it invalidly spends CWPPRA dollars.

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

Mr. Paul Kemp, National Audubon Society, explained that they are developing a short report on delta development in the receiving area and that the surveying efforts will help with this study. They are currently estimating that 2.3 million cubic meters of sand has entered the area since 2009. When calculating shoaling amounts, it is important to remember that the diversion has become more efficient at passing sand over time and is now passing a tremendous amount of sand. He cautioned that when they close the diversion, they will have to determine where that sand will go. He added that the diversion has also told us a lot about the preliminary stages of sub-delta development. Sub-deltas require initial shoaling and scouring before they begin building levees and that they have seen this crevasse go through that developmental stage. He encouraged the Technical Committee to keep an open mind when contemplating closure.

Mr. Paul asked about the alignment projection. Mr. Kemp answered that crevasses all have moon holes like this area and that now it is 90 feet and more a pivot point for the channel. It was originally oriented 120 degrees to the flow of the river, but is now less than 90 degrees because the diversion is more efficiently passing sand. He added that this sub-delta has opened and closed many times so that they have a good idea of how big it will get.

Mr. Rhinehart emphasized that Mr. Kemp should receive the survey and webinar data to continue his analysis.

Mr. Kemp thanked the Technical Committee for approving and financing the receiving area survey, which will help quantify the amount of sand passing through the diversion. Mr. Inman agreed that there is real interest in these survey results to quantify the amount of sediment being deposited.

Ms. Maura Wood, National Wildlife Federation, stated that she is working on the Myrtle Grove Diversion as a marsh building diversion and that some of the partners have worked with the State to put together modeling and data in terms of what they hope to do to encourage land building. The West Bay Diversion is an example of sub-delta development and that one of the things they can do with the morphologic data is predict what will happen, but to continue they need to translate from cubic yards of sand into acres of land. West Bay presents an opportunity to collect empirical data on how the depositional cycle behaves once you have emergent land and vegetation. She added that they need this empirical data to include in the models to better understand and more accurately predict how cubic yards of sediment become acres of land. She stated that she is sad to hear they are considering closure of the West Bay Diversion when it presents an exciting laboratory of data needed to get from the diversion designs of the past to a marsh building model to create sustainable coast.

Mr. Clark agreed, but emphasized that the cost of dredging the PAA is the issue. He extended an invitation for someone to come forward with a solution to the dredging costs and added that if the data shows the diversion is only responsible for 40% or less of the build-up than maybe CWPPRA can reduce its dredging costs. Ms. Wood replied that the cost is not a diversion problem and that they need to find a venue to solve the cost problem, but pointed out that the actual diversion is performing as it should.

Mr. Hartman suggested that one solution would be to have the Congressional Delegation add the PAA to the list of areas the USACE is authorized to dredge, but that even then there is limited funding. Ms. Wood replied that there is a great opportunity here and that she hopes creative thinking can solve this problem.

Mr. Rhinehart echoed Mr. Clark's comments in that he supports keeping the diversion open, but that CWPPRA cannot afford its dredging obligations. He asked Mr. Inman if the requirement to dredge is an USACE issue or if it is in the agreement based on stakeholder input. Mr. Inman replied that his understanding is that it was done based on stakeholder input. Mr. Rhinehart asked if the stakeholders released the dredging obligation and if the PAA is expected to continue to shoal after closure, would the USACE be willing to modify the dredging requirements. Mr. Inman responded that there is a cost share agreement between two parties and that he would have to consult with counsel.

Ms. Mary Kinsey, counsel for USACE, explained that the dredging requirement was imposed upon the USACE because it was found that the diversion would impact the PAA, which is outside of USACE's maintenance authority; therefore, the diversion impact was made the responsibility of the project sponsors. The USACE cannot take on responsibility for dredging the PAA without Federal authorization. If it is found that the diversion is not responsible for all of the shoaling, the Task Force could possibly take a post-authorization change report to the Assistant Secretary of the Army who would have to review the matter. She explained that without more information, she cannot say whether she agrees with the State's position or not. At the time the dredging agreement was made, all the shoaling was assumed to be caused by the diversion. Some people have indicated that the PAA is not used as much as originally thought, but the PAA is part of the Coast Guard so their input would be needed as to its necessity.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that this was a helpful discussion and requested that the USACE speak with Headquarters about a post-authorization change if a conclusion can be reached regarding West Bay's contribution to shoaling. He added that many comments were received at the last CWPPRA meeting regarding keeping the diversion open and suggested that that attention be focused on other stakeholder groups beyond CWPPRA. Ms. Kinsey reiterated that the Coast Guard should be engaged in the discussion.

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemine Parish Government, thanked the Technical Committee for all of their work on West Bay and added that she looks forward to the site visit on October 4th.

Ms. Cynthia Duet, National Audubon Society, asked if anyone has investigated whether closing a CWPPRA project that is working could trump the dredging agreement signed in the first place. Mr. Paul responded that the problem is purely fiscal, with the dredging costs far exceeding the funding estimate. He added that CWPPRA would like to see the project work, but can no longer pay for it; therefore, closure is the only option unless another source of funding is found. Mr. Inman responded that the first dredging cost approximately \$3 million and the next event was approximately \$10 million, with projections of increasing costs in the future.

Mr. Steven Peyronnin, Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana, stated that at the very least, the diversion has been informative on sediment delivery. He asked if there has been a legal analysis on CWPPRA's ability to spend money for navigation expenses. Ms. Kinsey replied that her opinion will be based upon the facts, which she has not received at this time, but if the PAA is not part of the official USACE navigation mission, then it is not primarily a navigation expense.

Mr. Rhinehart added that he would interpret navigation to be broader than just USACE authorized navigation and that he feels it is worth exploring. Ms. Kinsey replied that she will explore all aspects. Mr. Peyronnin encouraged such a legal analysis as part of the closure decision before moving forward.

6. Agenda Item 7. Report: Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection/Commercial Canal Freshwater Redirection (TV-19) Alternative Analysis Report (Michael Somme, CRS, Inc.). Mr. Somme presented the findings and recommendations of the Weeks Bay Alternative Analysis Report.

Mr. Somme stated that Iberia and Vermillion Parishes have funded a study using CIAP funds and Shaw Coastal, Inc. performed the analysis. Mr. O'Neil Malbrough with Shaw explained that the land bridge historically suffered erosion and habitat loss of about eight to nine feet per year and that this area has been subject to a number of studies, including the AGMAC Feasibility Study and as part of the Section 203 Study for the Port of West St. Mary. Iberia and Vermillion Parishes have now joined forces to ensure that this project continues to move forward after discussions of de-authorization. He explained that the purpose of the work conducted by Shaw was to evaluate existing problems in the area, review past studies of the area, and develop new and innovative alternatives to keep the Project moving, including a recommendation for the most efficient and effective alternative to maintain shoreline integrity. Problems in the area include wind and wave erosion from the GIWW, land loss, navigation problems, and salinity in the rice and sugar cane fields. The erosion rate has been reduced in recent years because much of the area

is now open water. Mr. Malbrough presented the different alternatives and cost estimates evaluated by Shaw and the recommended approach.

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

Mr. Clark asked for clarification on the recommended alternative. Mr. Malbrough replied that the recommended alternative is the concrete wall with the creation of a site for later marsh creation.

Mr. Hartman asked if the pipeline operators would allow the recommended concrete wall alternative. Mr. Malbrough responded that the wall is on pilings and not directly over the pipeline so they hope to obtain operator support. He added that they are prepared to meet with the project sponsors to help move the project forward.

Mr. Clark stated that the next step is for the USACE and State, who are the project sponsors, to look at this report and then return with a project recommendation. Mr. Rhinehart responded that this is new information and they would like time to digest and understand the suggested new benefits in comparison to the original project. Mr. Inman agreed that they only received the report two or three weeks ago and would like to give it to the Engineering Work Group for review. They hope to have a recommendation by the next Technical Committee meeting.

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

Pres Marshall, representing Iberia Parish President Ernest Freyou, stated that they support Shaw's analysis and believe in the project enough that the Parish committed their own funding and are extremely interested in the eventual success of the project. He added that President Freyou is an enthusiastic supporter of this project and is especially concerned about the wave action in the bay when the land bridge is gone.

Randy Moertle, McIlhenny Company, stated that Vermillion Parish put up an equal amount of money because they want to keep sediment from the Atchafalaya River moving westward. They are very much in favor of the project and appreciate the job Shaw did.

7. Agenda Item 4. Report/Decision: 2012 Report to Congress (Brad Inman, USACE). At the June 8, 2011 meeting, the Task Force approved the FY12 Planning budget, which included a placeholder for the 2012 Report to Congress budget until further discussed. The Technical Committee and Planning & Evaluation (P&E) Committee met on August 23, 2011 and discussed the direction of the Report to Congress. The Technical Committee will make a recommendation to the Task Force concerning the 2012 Report to Congress budget and scope.

Mr. Inman explained that \$110,000 was approved to develop the 2012 Report to Congress. Ms. McCormick added that the EPA has volunteered to develop an outline to make the report as succinct as possible.

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

Mr. Clark stated that he felt though previous year reports were good, the 2012 Report to Congress could be shortened significantly. He then asked if the Technical Committee needed to give the Task Force a recommendation on the amount of funding and the general direction for the report.

Mr. Hartman suggested obtaining Task Force concurrence on the direction of the report and explained the general thinking was a 10 to 15 page document focusing on project updates since the last report. He added that there was also discussion that the report be posted on the webpage rather than printed.

Ms. McCormick responded that the entire \$110,000 would most likely not be required. She added that the goal of the 2012 Report to Congress is to provide a more succinct document, including more monitoring information based on good science and project updates.

Mr. Clark recommended that the USGS write the report and that Congress be provided a printed document. Ms. McCormick added that the EPA would help the USGS with the report.

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

Scott Wilson, USGS, stated that the USGS would be more than happy to work with the EPA.

Mr. Hartman recommended that since money has already been set aside, the EPA and USGS be tasked to develop a report outline for review by the next Task Force meeting. Mr. Clark suggested that a motion or consensus be presented on the funding and direction and that an outline or draft be developed by the December Technical Committee meeting in order to be presented at the January 2012 Task Force meeting.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick moved to recommend Task Force approval of the 2012 Report to Congress, utilizing the placeholder budget of \$110,000, with an outline developed by the December Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 5. Report/Decision: Outreach Budget (Brad Inman, USACE). The Task Force approved the FY12 Planning budget with a placeholder for the 2012 Outreach budget until further discussed. The Technical Committee and P&E Committee met on August 23, 2011 and discussed the Outreach Committee budget and work plan. The Technical Committee will make a recommendation to the Task Force concerning the Outreach budget and work plan.

Mr. Inman explained that there is a \$452,000 placeholder in the FY12 budget for the Outreach Committee and that it has been reduced by a small amount from last year.

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

Mr. Clark asked for clarification on the number and Ms. Browning replied that \$452,400 is the correct number. Mr. Clark expressed appreciation for the work that the Outreach Committee has been doing.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval of the Outreach Committee budget in the amount of \$452,400 and work plan for FY12. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Brad Inman, USACE). The P&E Committee reported on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects that have been experiencing project delays, projects considered “critical-watch”, projects recommended for de-authorization or transfer, and milestones for these projects.

Mr. Inman explained that the P&E Committee met and looked at why some projects are not moving forward and developed a critical watch list. He then turned it over to the Project Managers to explain the status of projects on the critical watch list.

a. Critical-Watch Unconstructed Projects Status and Milestone Updates:

West Pointe a la Hache Outfall Management (BA-04c)

Mr. Bill Feazel, OCPR, reported that he became the project manager of the project in 2009. He explained that by August 2009 they had a design consultant and schedule lined up, but that since then the schedule has slipped almost a year. The project hold-ups have been corrected and last Wednesday they received the 30% design package from the design consultant, which is now under review. If the previous concerns are addressed, they will be able to set the 30% design review meeting for mid-November and then continue to 95% design.

Small Freshwater Diversion to the Northwest Barataria Basin (BA-34)

Mr. Paul Kaspar, EPA, reported that the feasibility analysis is almost complete, but there are concerns with the cost and complexity of the originally planned water delivery to the benefit area. He said that they may be looking at a scope change to focus on just the hydrologic restoration components within the benefit area. The current schedule is to report to the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups in November with a path forward.

Mr. Clark asked for a time estimate on the 30% design review meeting and if a location has been chosen. Mr. Kaspar answered November 2012 and that yes, a location has been chosen.

River Reintroduction into Maurepas Swamp (PO-29)

Mr. Kaspar reported that the USACE is in the process of developing a gap analysis for the project which should be completed in December. The EPA is working on the NEPA aspects to provide a final document to the USACE in January. They will report on the gap analysis at the April Technical Committee meeting and then expect to continue toward design completion scheduled for August of next year.

White Ditch Resurrection (BS-12)

Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, reported that they are scheduling a meeting between NRCS, OCPR, and State upper-level management to determine the path forward, after which they will be ready to move into design surveys and geotechnical investigations. Mr. Clark asked if a siphon location has been selected. Mr. Kinler answered that the decision will be made at the meeting.

GIWW Bank Rest of Critical Areas in Terrebonne (TE-43)

Mr. Kinler reported that they are awaiting land rights for the project to go to contract bid.

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

- b. Unconstructed Projects Recommended for De-authorization or Transfer Status and Milestone Updates:

Little Pecan Bayou Hydrologic Restoration (ME-17)

Mr. Kinler reported that the State and NRCS have agreed to go to de-authorization and are currently in the process of making contact with stakeholders, after which they will move to formal de-authorization procedures.

Weeks Bay Marsh Creation/Shore Protection/Commercial Canal/Freshwater Redirection (TV-19) (also "critical-watch")

Mr. Inman reported that the USACE needs a cost share agreement with the State to move forward on the project.

Mr. Rhinehart clarified that new information was going to be taken back to the P&E Committee and engineers for evaluation.

Benneys Bay Diversion (MR-13)

Mr. Scott Wandell, USACE, reported that they are estimating \$10 million per O&M event with at least ten events, making the project cost exceed \$100 million. Mr. Inman added that because of this high cost, the USACE is recommending the project for de-authorization.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if there were any anticipated issues with the rationale behind this de-authorization request since the high maintenance cost would be due to induced shoaling. Mr. Inman replied that no issues are anticipated and that other factors, such as the Mississippi River Commission's (MRC) hesitance to approve uncontrolled diversions, also contributed to the decision.

Mr. Clark stated that he would support the project, but understands the cost to be greater than what CWPPRA would normally fund. He added that he thought the cost was \$300 million over

20 years. Mr. Wandell replied that the \$100 million cost is a low estimate, but that they have not found a way to accurately quantify the amount of anticipated shoaling.

Fort Jackson Sediment Diversion – complex study

Ms. Browning explained that the complex study is like a feasibility study and six were approved under FY 2000 planning. Most of the studies moved to Phase 1 and then Phase 2. Mr. Sims reported that the project is recommended for de-authorization due to cost. In 2003, the cost estimate was \$50 million, but now is over \$100 million. Additionally, the MRC has a policy of not approving uncontrolled diversions. Ms. Browning clarified that it is not really a de-authorization, but rather officially closing the study and removing it from the books.

Mr. Clark pointed out that he thought the MRC required a closure plan for uncontrolled diversions. Mr. Sims replied that he was correct. Mr. Inman clarified that much more information would be required before the MRC would be convinced to move forward on this project.

Mr. Rhinehart added that the State disputes the MRC authority to approve or disapprove diversions and that the policy memo published in March referred to future actions and studies and therefore should not affect these projects as a basis for de-authorization. Mr. Inman replied that the cost speaks for itself.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if they will see requests for de-authorization for these projects in the future. Mr. Inman answered, yes.

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

Dr. Jenneke Visser, Chairman of the Academic Advisory Committee, stated that these sediment diversions have an opportunity for success. She expressed hope that different channel alignments were considered before going to the de-authorization process since it has been found that different channel alignments can greatly impact the amount of induced shoaling by such diversions.

Mr. James Harris, USFWS, stated that while he is aware of the fiscal responsibility associated with these diversions, there are much larger issues that the Technical Committee will need to address at some point. One issue is the all or nothing caveats being placed on diversions, such as the West Bay Diversion, where CWPPRA has to pay for all induced shoaling or get nothing. Another issue is MRC opposition to diversions and the third issue is to favor projects upriver rather than constructing larger projects in the lower river. He emphasized that these issues will have to be resolved or the cost for any diversion will always be too high. If these restrictions are going to be placed on large scale diversions, then diversions will no longer be able to be part of large scale restoration projects in the lower river. Additionally, these issues have the potential to affect current projects. A resolution needs to be reached so that people can decide whether it is worth the effort to propose such projects in the future.

10. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Annual Request for Incremental Funding for FY14 Administrative Costs for Cash Flow Projects (Gay Browning, USACE). The USACE requested funding approval in the amount of \$14,730 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request for funds.

Ms. Browning stated that these projects were non-cash flow, but became cash flow when they received long term O&M increases.

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 in the amount of \$14,730 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for Funding for the CWPPRA Program's Technical Services (Scott Wilson, USGS). The USGS and CPRA requested funding for technical services for the CWPPRA program in the amount of \$186,018. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the request for funding.

Scott Wilson, USGS, stated that the request is based on a determination that these services benefit the overall program more than just planning so the budget was moved from planning to construction.

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. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval in the amount of \$186,018 for technical services for the CWPPRA Program. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

12. Agenda Item 19. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE). USACE requested a discussion about the CWPPRA Program's future funding capacity and implications for future PPLs. It has been three years (October and November 2008 meetings) since this topic was discussed; therefore, the Program's funding capacity needs to be reassessed with the upcoming budget commitments that are under consideration.

Mr. Inman presented three items for discussion. First, a reminder that the current authorization, which only approves funding through the end of the fiscal year, will end September 30, 2011. Thereafter, the Program will be operating on carryover funds. He reminded the Technical Committee that they are preparing to vote on many cost increases, but wanted to point out that

appropriations could once again be in question. Secondly, there are not enough Program funds to fulfill the current construction, monitoring, and O&M obligations. Decisions will have to be made as to how many more PPLs the CWPPRA Program can generate. Options include skipping PPL years, approving up to four projects per year through 2015, or approving fewer PPL projects per year. Lastly, if Congress decides not to re-authorize the CWPPRA Program, they will have to start looking at project and program close-outs. The cost of closing out projects, closure agreements, and O&M and monitoring costs beyond 2019 will have to be considered. He added that 2014 is the first time a project within the Program will meet its 20-year life. The Technical Committee will need to consider how to continue with a project after 20 years or consider moving projects into other programs.

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

Mr. Clark explained that the Transportation Act and the Sport Fish and Restoration Trust Fund have been continued since 2009. The USFWS oversees this and doles out money to CWPPRA and the USFWS people in Washington are confident that the Transportation Act will be continued. They do not think a new act will be enacted this year, but perhaps in 2012. They are also hopefully confident that CWPPRA will be re-authorized in 2019.

Mr. Hartman asked if the Technical Committee could get an analysis from the State and USACE counsel as to what de-authorization of the CWPPRA Program would mean in regards to who owns water control structures, who will be responsible for operating CWPPRA projects after the Program is closed, etc. While they would not want to remove rock or structures at year 20, there are liability issues associated with these projects. The Technical Committee needs to identify who is responsible for these projects after they reach their 20-year life and the life of the Program. He added that there needs to also be an in-house discussion as to use of CWPPRA funds moving forward. He suggested that perhaps CWPPRA be used to engineer projects for construction under other programs.

Mr. Rhinehart added that the State has given this matter some thought. No analysis has been conducted yet, but the State will begin exploring the matter.

Mr. Clark stated that the Gulf of Mexico Task Force has no money yet, but could get BP money and that there are CWPPRA projects on the BP Oil Spill Early Restoration and Gulf of Mexico Task Force Lists.

Mr. Inman thanked the Technical Committee for entertaining the discussion and encouraged them to start considering these issues.

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

13. Agenda Item 11. Decision: Request for Monitoring Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (Dona Weifenbach, CPRA). The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$23,225,765 and monitoring budget increases totaling \$56,351,583.

Mr. Hartman suggested grouping the projects as presented in the agenda for discussion and voting. The Technical Committee agreed.

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY14 incremental funding in the total amount of \$143,526 for the following projects:
- Delta Management at Fort St. Philip (BS-11), PPL-10, USFWS
Incremental funding amount (FY12-14) (Vegetation, 1 Report): \$51,226
 - Coast-wide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$92,300

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group A.

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

Mr. Hartman clarified that the \$93,000 is for nutria aerial surveys.

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 total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$143,526 for the Delta Management at Fort St. Philips Project (BS-11) and Coast-wide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

- b. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for a monitoring budget increase in the total amount of \$1,769,619 and FY14 incremental funding in the total amount of \$496,830:
- Freshwater Introduction South of Hwy 82 (ME-16) PPL-9 USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20)
Budget increase amount: \$139,395
Incremental funding amount (FY12-14): \$70,288
 - East Sabine Hydrologic Restoration (CS-32), PPL-10, USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20, and 2 continuous recorders for 2 years)
Budget increase amount: \$188,133
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14): \$ 72,329
 - Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge (BA-36), PPL-11, USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20, and topographic surveys years 3, 5, 20, and 3 reports)
Budget increase amount: \$443,810
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14): \$99,703
 - Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation (TE-48) PPL-11, NRCS
Budget increase amount: \$217,791
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14): \$80,755
 - Goose Point/Point Platte Marsh Creation (PO-33), PPL-13 USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20)
Budget increase amount: \$111,665
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14): \$29,891

- Lake Hermitage Marsh Creation (BA-42), PPL-15 USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20, and topographic surveys years 3, 5, 20 and 3 reports)
Budget increase amount: \$260,740
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14): \$62,161
- North Lake Mechant Marsh Creation (TE-44), PPL-10, USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20; vegetative survey)
Budget increase amount: \$211,498
Incremental funding amount: \$29,212
- West Lake Boudreaux Shore Protection and Marsh Creation (TE-46), PPL-11, USFWS (land/water years 1, 10, 20, 3 vegetation, and 3 reports)
Budget increase amount: \$196,587
Incremental funding amount: \$52,491

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group B.

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

Mr. Clark explained that project sponsors met with the State last year to review which projects needed more specific monitoring and these requests are based upon that analysis. He added that USFWS is fine with using coastal flights at one meter resolution rather than contracting for special land/water analysis flights to reduce costs.

Mr. Hartman pointed out that these projects will have been closed out by the time the year 20 data is received. USFWS responded that the cost estimates account for the last round of photography happening earlier than year 20.

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval for total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$496,830 and monitoring budget increases totaling \$1,769,619 for the above listed projects. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

- c. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for a monitoring budget increase and FY14 incremental funding:
- Naomi Outfall Project (BA-03c), PPL-5, NRCS (vegetation in 2012 and one continuous recorder through 2022)
Budget increase amount: \$104,545
Incremental funding amount: \$34,786

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group C.

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 total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$34,786 and monitoring budget increases in the amount of \$104,545 for the above listed projects. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

d. CRMS-Wetlands

Budget Increase (through FY18-19) in the amount of \$54,477,419

Incremental funding (FY 12-14) in the amount of \$22,580,623

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group D.

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

Mr. Clark pointed out that no one is happy about the CRMS cost increase, but that the alternative would be to vastly reduce monitoring efforts.

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

DECISION: Mr. Rhinehart moved to recommend Task Force approval for total incremental funding in the amount of \$22,580,623 and budget increase in the amount of \$54,477,419 for CRMS. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

14. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Request for O&M Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (David Burkholder, CPRA). The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$5,125,613 and O&M budget increases totaling \$1,637,128.

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY14 incremental funding in the total amount of \$2,160,568 for the following projects:
- Four Mile Canal Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL-9, NMFS
Incremental funding amount (FY13) (O&M and State Insp): \$4,269
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$28,556
 - Pass Chalard to Grand Bayou Pass Barrier Shoreline Restoration (BA-35), PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14) (O&M and State Insp): \$13,971
 - Little Lake Shoreline Protection/Dedicated Dredging near Round Lake (BA-37), PPL-11, NMFS
Incremental funding amount (FY13 – FY14) (O&M and State Insp): \$11,505
Incremental funding amount (FY13 – FY14) (Federal S&A): \$2,965
 - Coast-wide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL-11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$2,091,621
 - South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22), PPL-12, COE
Incremental funding amount (O&M and State Insp): \$5,761
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$1,920

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group A.

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 total FY14 incremental funding in the total amount of \$2,160,568 for the projects listed above. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

- b. PPL 1-8 Projects requesting approval for FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$1,080,114 for the following projects:
- Point au Fer Canal Plugs (TE-22), PPL-2, NMFS
Incremental funding amount (FY13 & FY14) (O&M and State Insp): \$13,239
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A):\$ 2,277
 - Lake Chapeau Sediment Input & Hydrologic Restoration (TE-26), PPL-3, NMFS
Incremental funding amount (FY13 & FY14) (O&M and State Insp): \$1,016,267
Incremental funding amount (Federal S&A): \$26,520
 - Black Bayou Hydrologic Restoration (CS-27), PPL-6, NMFS
Incremental funding amount (FY12 – FY14) (O&M and State Insp): \$21,811

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group B.

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 total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$1,080,114 for the projects listed above. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

- c. PPL 9+ Project requesting approval for an O&M budget increase and FY14 incremental funding:
- Pelican Island and Pass La Mer to Chalard Pass (BA-38), PPL-11, NMFS
Budget increase amount: \$180,966
Incremental funding amount: \$325,347

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group C.

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 FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$325,347 and an O&M budget increase in the amount of \$180,966 for the Pelican Island and Pass La Mer to Chaland Pass Project (BA-38). Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

- d. PPL 1-8 Projects requesting approval for an O&M budget increase and FY14 incremental funding:
- Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration (CS-21), PPL-2, NRCS
Budget increase amount: \$25,808
Incremental funding amount: \$96,244
 - GIWW to Clovelly Hydrologic Restoration (BA-02), PPL-1, NRCS
Budget increase amount: \$1,430,354
Incremental funding amount: \$1,463,340

Mr. Inman presented the projects in group D.

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 total FY14 incremental funding in the amount of \$1,559,584 and O&M budget increases in the amount of \$1,456,162 for the two projects listed above. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

15. Agenda Item 13. Decision: Request for a Time Extension for PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project Cycles 4 and 5 (CS-28) (Brad Inman, USACE, and Darryl Clark, USFWS). In June 2011, the Task Force extended the Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation project cost-share agreement deadline to January 2012. The Federal project sponsors, USACE and USFWS, requested that the Technical Committee recommend that the Task Force approve an additional one-year time extension from January 2012 to January 2013. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve this time extension.

Mr. Clark explained that this is a request for a time extension of 12 months to January 2013 for additional time to reach a cost share agreement.

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. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval for a one-year time extension from January 2012 to January 2013 on the PPL 8 – Sabine Refuge Marsh

Creation Project Cycles 4 and 5 (CS-28) cost share agreement deadline. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

16. Agenda Item 14. Decision: Request to Increase the Construction Budget for the PPL 11 – Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation Project (TE-48) (Britt Paul, NRCS). *Due to time delays associated with the BOEMRE Memorandum of Agreement and changing site conditions, NRCS requested approval for an increase in the construction budget in the amount of \$2,475,000 (\$2,200,000 for construction contract and \$275,000 for supervision and inspection). The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the increased construction budget requested.*

Mr. Paul explained that this is a request to increase the construction budget. This is the second phase of the project, the dredging component. There have been many delays in the permit process and when the new cost estimate was developed, there were cost increases for mobilization, supervision, and inspection. Additional funds are needed to advertise the project for construction this coming year.

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.

Mr. Robert Barham, Secretary of the LA Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, asked for support for the project and the additional funding, as this would be a dramatic addition to what is needed for bird nesting along the coast.

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend Task Force approval for an increase in the construction budget for the Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Restoration Project (TE-48) in the amount of \$2,475,000 (\$2,200,000 for construction contract and \$275,000 for supervision and inspection). Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

17. Agenda Item 15. Decision: Request to Allow Completion of Engineering and Design (Phase 1) for the Alligator Bend Shoreline Protection Project (PO-34) (Britt Paul, NRCS). *On August 18, 2011 NRCS and CPRA conducted a Preliminary (30%) Design Review and with concurrence from CPRA are prepared to continue design efforts associated with the Project to the 95% review stage. However, at the January 21, 2009 Task Force meeting, the Project was approved for a change in scope and continuation of design efforts to the 30% level, but the Task Force stipulated that further approval would be required from the Task Force prior to additional work. Therefore, NRCS and CPRA requested a Task Force fax vote for approval to proceed to the 95% review. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve proceeding to the 95% review via fax vote.*

Mr. Paul stated that this is a request to allow completion of engineering and design Phase 1 activities. The project had a successful 30% design review, but the Task Force has requested that they get approval to move to 95% design.

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 to allow completion of engineering and design on the Alligator Bend Shoreline Protection Project (PO-34). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

18. Agenda Item 16. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope, Budget Increase and Incremental Funding approval for the PPL 3 – Cameron-Creole Maintenance Project (CS-04a) (David Burkholder, NRCS). NRCS and CPRA requested a change in scope to include operations of the structures as a project feature. Due to the change in the scope, they also requested a budget increase of \$233,607 and incremental funding approval of \$525,807. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve a change in scope, budget increase, and incremental funding for the Project.

Mr. Burkholder explained that the project was constructed before CWPPRA and has 19 miles of marsh management levee and five water control structures. Due to funding and staff constraints, the USFWS will have to cease the operations at the end of this year and have requested that CWPPRA include the operations as part of this project. Operations would be conducted by CPRA through a contract, which is the basis for the cost estimates. This request would represent an increase in the 20-year budget of \$233,607 and additional incremental funding of \$525,807. The project has been very successful with land loss reversed prior to Hurricane Rita and freshening of the marsh. Hurricane Rita degraded the structures and levees and repairs have been made with FEMA money. The project is now in a condition to return to pre-Rita operations and this funding would allow operations to continue and re-emergence of the benefits which occurred prior to Hurricane Rita.

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.

Tina Horn, Cameron Parish Police Jury, stated that they have come to CWPPRA because they have nowhere else to go. The marsh has come a long way from when it was first enacted and now that post-Rita repairs have been made, the project will make the marsh viable again.

Mr. Hartman agreed that the project was working and that it will hopefully start restoring the area again. He cautioned that it seems the USFWS is abdicating its responsibility to operate its property to someone else and does not see why CWPPRA should maintain USFWS property. Mr. Clark agreed, but pointed out that the refuge system has lost a lot of personnel and financial support over the years and that there are proposals to make further cuts in the future. He expressed disappointment that USFWS is unable to continue the project operations.

Ms. McCormick asked if it was lack of personnel or money. Mr. Clark responded, both.

Mr. Paul stated that today's request is to pick up the project operations, whereas before CWPPRA was only conducting the maintenance.

Mr. Hartman asked if there is going to be a contract or if parish personnel will run the operations. Mr. Burkholder answered that they could bid out the operations with a request for proposal or utilize existing contracts on a task order basis. Existing contracts may be used short term, but it will most likely be bid long term.

DECISION: Mr. Paul moved to recommend Task Force approval for a change in scope, budget increase in the amount of \$233,607, and incremental funding approval in the amount of \$525,807 for the PPL 3 – Cameron-Creole Maintenance Project (CS-04a). Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

19. Agenda Item 17. Decision: Request for a Change in Scope for the PPL 18 – Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project (BA-68) Due to Estimated Budget Increase (Rachel Sweeney, NMFS). NMFS and CPRA requested a change in project scope due to an estimated cost increase. The Project was approved for engineering and design on PPL 18. The original approved total project cost is \$31,390,699. The current estimated fully funded project cost is \$44,705,498. The sponsors wish to proceed to final design pending approval of this change in scope. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the change in scope for the Project.

Mr. Hartman explained that this change in scope is being requested because the estimated cost has increased 142%. Additionally, the constructed acres have changed 97% and the total 20-year net acres have increased 130%. The cost per net acre has increased 109% since Phase 0.

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 a change in project scope due to an estimated cost increase for the PPL 18 – Grand Liard Marsh and Ridge Restoration Project (BA-68). The original approved total project cost is \$31,390,699 and the current estimated fully funded project cost is \$44,705,498. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

20. Agenda Item 18. Decision: Request to Initiate De-Authorization of the PPL 14 – Riverine Mining – Scofield Island Restoration Project (BA-40) (Rachel Sweeney, NMFS). NMFS and CPRA requested that formal de-authorization procedures be initiated. 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 Project using State funds. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve de-authorization.

Mr. Hartman explained that the State is using funds from other sources to build the project so there is no need for CWPPRA to invest; therefore, they are requesting de-authorization.

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 to initiate de-authorization of the PPL 14 – Riverine Mining – Scofield Island Restoration Project (BA-40). Mr. Rhinehart seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

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

22. Agenda Item 21. Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE). *The next Task Force meeting will be held October 12, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. at the USACE, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, LA, in the District Assembly Room (DARM).*

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

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 13, 2011	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
January 19, 2012	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans

24. Agenda Item 23. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rhinehart seconded. Mr. Inman adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:35 p.m.