

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 12 December 2012 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

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

Mr. Thomas Holden, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman

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

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

Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

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

2. Mr. Holden asked the members of the Technical Committee to introduce themselves.

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

Mr. Haase asked to strike Agenda Item 7, the Coast-Wide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) update. CRMS will provide an update at the January Task Force Meeting.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Agenda Item 2. Report: Status of Breaux Act Program Funds and Projects (Susan Mabry, USACE). Ms. Mabry provided an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding.

Ms. Mabry reported that, with the December forecast for fiscal year (FY) 13, the current cost estimate for Project Priority Lists (PPL) 1 - 21 is \$2.528 billion. Based on the December forecast for FY 13 funding, the funding estimate is \$2.282 billion. If CWPPRA executes all current projects, the potential need will be \$251 million. This estimate will probably change based on other items on today's agenda. She estimated that with money back from the projects on today's agenda to initiate de-authorizations, the need will be reduced to \$138 million. None of these figures include the projects that will be recommended for PPL 22 today.

Approximately \$2.5 billion has gone into the CWPPRA Program, including estimated funds for FY 13. The current funding available for today's recommendation is going to be approximately \$63 million, plus an additional \$16.5 million for the reconciliation of de-authorized projects totaling \$79.5 million.

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

Mr. Clark explained that the FY 13 Federal funding estimate is from the Department of the Interior. The Internal Revenue Service estimates the amount of funding based on the Sport Fish Restoration and Boating Trust Fund. The anticipated Federal funding for FY 13 is \$79,626,177. The total available for today's recommendations, is \$63,115,717. However, this amount will increase with a possible \$16.5 million and \$4 million returned from de-authorizations and construction completions, for an available amount of approximately \$83 million.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Electronic Vote Approvals (Brad Inman, USACE). *Mr. Inman reported on electronic vote approvals.*

Mr. Inman reported that the Technical Committee and Task Force approved the scope change for the Lost Lake Marsh Creation and Hydrologic Restoration (TE-72) Project, which increases the cost from \$22.9 million to \$34.6 million, reduces the net benefits from 281 to 267 Average Annual Habitat Units, and reduces the net acres from 749 to 452. This adjustment will change the funding available for Phase II funding requests today.

The Technical Committee and Task Force also approved the scope and name change for the South Grand Chenier Hydrologic Restoration (ME-20) Project to remove the freshwater introduction feature. The cost of this project was reduced by \$7 million, from \$29 million to \$21.9 million.

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

Mr. Clark thanked Mr. Inman, Ms. Allison Murry, and Mr. Holden for their help in moving this forward.

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

5. Agenda Item 4. Report: 2012 State Master Plan Consistency and the CWPPRA Program (Bren Haase, CPRA). *Mr. Haase provided a briefing on the interpretation of the 2012 State Master Plan for CWPPRA projects on future PPLs.*

Mr. Haase reported that at the June 2012 Task Force Meeting, the Task Force approved a motion to change the CWPPRA Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to ensure that future projects constructed through CWPPRA are consistent with the 2012 State Master Plan. However, the term "consistent" was not defined. The State has met with the Federal agencies, local agencies, landowners, and other stakeholders to discuss this issue. Based on these discussions, the State has decided that projects need to be within a polygon or area identified in the Master Plan, be a similar type of project as identified in the Master Plan, and have a similar borrow source. However, this is a subjective analysis and there may be cases where a portion of a project may not lie within an area identified in the Master Plan, but serves the same purpose as another project, and so CWPPRA can make "exceptions." The State is very interested in engaging with the public and other stakeholders and developing projects that everyone can support. CWPPRA

is an integral part in developing projects in the Master Plan. Mr. Haase noted that there has been some discussion related to the upcoming Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings in January. He encouraged stakeholders to meet with the State to discuss projects before these meetings. In the absence of those conversations and time for careful analysis, the State will probably take a strict interpretation of what will or will not be consistent with the Master Plan. It is important to remember that this is a growing process that will hopefully continue in the future.

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

Mr. Clark thanked Mr. Haase and pointed out that there are many good projects in the Master Plan, although some areas are not covered by the Master Plan. The SOP is written so that the PPL process for this year will be consistent with the Master Plan, and the State will have representatives at each RPT meeting to determine whether a project fits with the Master Plan and whether or not the State will cost share a project. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Haase if the State representatives would make on-the-spot calls at the RPT meetings whether projects are in line with the Master Plan.

Mr. Haase responded affirmatively. He reiterated that if the State has not had previous conversations with the proposer about a particular project, they will be conservative in their determination of what is consistent with the Master Plan.

Mr. Hartman urged Federal partners to give proposed projects to the State early if there are any questions about consistency. Mr. Paul and Ms. McCormick stated that NRCS and EPA have worked with the State on proposed projects and the process has worked well. Mr. Haase stressed that State representatives will be available after today's meeting, and anyone who wishes to propose a project that may not be consistent with the Master Plan should contact him, Mr. Chris Allen, Mr. Stuart Brown, or Mr. Karim Belhadjali.

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

Mr. James Harris, USFWS – Southeast Louisiana Refuges, said that he appreciates the work that the State did on the Master Plan and he understands the State's position in trying to make the most of limited resources. He stated that he will be coordinating with the State on projects that he plans to propose at the RPT meetings. Mr. Harris expressed concern that a strict interpretation is contrary to the concept of adaptive management that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been implementing for the past decade. He would like for the State to consider that conditions do change and projects that are not currently in the Master Plan may become very important later. Mr. Harris also asked what would happen to those projects that do meet the general criteria and goal of the Master Plan, but are not deemed consistent at the current time. He inquired whether those projects can be moved forward to some degree if other members of the Technical Committee or Task Force deem those projects to have value. He asked what agency is the final arbiter of what projects can move forward in CWPPRA. If it is the State, then Mr. Harris said that he will do all of his coordination with the State.

Mr. Hartman replied that the State has a veto position, but it cannot force a project onto a Federal agency. Mr. Harris responded that if the only projects that will get through the process are those on the State's list, then he just has to choose from that list.

Mr. Haase stated that there are many great projects that are not in the Master Plan. The Master Plan is resource limited, and the State had to make choices about what would and would not be included. There is a strong adaptive management component in the Master Plan, and CPRA is legislatively mandated to update the Master Plan. If there are ideas for good projects that are not currently in the Master Plan, the State wants to know about them now so that they can be considered in the 2017 Master Plan Update.

6. Agenda Item 5. Decision: Request for Approval to Initiate De-authorization on six projects (Bren Haase, CPRA). CPRA is requesting that formal de-authorization procedures be initiated on six projects. These projects face technical implementation issues, have an unfavorable benefit-to-cost ratio, or have languished for an extended period of time.

Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization (TV-11b), PPL 9, USACE

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

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

Mr. W.P. Edwards III, Vermilion Corporation, said that a lot of time has been spent on the Master Plan and it contains many good projects. However, many of these are very large projects, which are unsuitable for CWPPRA unless all funding for any given year goes to one project. He does not support that approach. He expressed skepticism because the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization Project is in the Master Plan, and the State is asking to de-authorize it. As he has stated before, Mr. Edwards believes that the record should show the reason for de-authorization. This project took too long to design, and by the time it was designed, there were cost share problems. However, it is a shovel-ready project and could be constructed by another agency. Mr. Edwards asked for an update on what the State plans to do with good CWPPRA projects that have been evaluated and designed, but are not constructed. He wants to ensure that in the future, other agencies know that these projects were not de-authorized because they were failed projects.

Mr. Haase confirmed that this project is part of the Master Plan, but added that the State is concerned about spending coastal restoration funds on navigation channels. CPRA recently issued a new policy on this issue. The State recognizes that this is an important project, but disagrees with the method of funding and implementation. The State does not want to use restoration funds on navigation projects.

Mr. Edwards asked whether this policy means that other shoreline or bank stabilization projects along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), Freshwater Bayou, Houma Navigation Canal, and other navigation channels should be removed from consideration by CWPPRA as well. Mr. Haase responded affirmatively.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Haase to list the other reasons that the State is asking for de-authorization of the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization Project. Mr. Haase stated that the cost has increased and the benefits have decreased, so the benefit-cost ratio is not what it was when the project was first proposed. It has been nominated for funding several times and has not been funded.

Mr. Hartman noted that the State is the common agency on all projects, and hopefully all of the documents that have been produced for the de-authorized project(s) would reside with the State, so that if another entity wanted to construct a project, they could request the information from the State. They could also request that any existing permits be transferred.

Mr. Haase agreed that the State always has available projects if someone wants to construct something. The Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization Project may be a viable project for another program.

On an unrelated note, Mr. Edwards noted that the Master Plan includes reefs in east and west Cote Blanche Bay and reducing the size of Southwest Pass in Vermilion and Iberia Parishes. He asked for confirmation that these items are in the Master Plan. Mr. Haase stated that he was unsure. He suggested that Mr. Edwards speak to Mr. Belhadjali.

Delta Building Diversion North of Fort St. Philip (BS-10), PPL 10, USACE

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

Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Haase for clarification on why each project is being requested for de-authorization. Mr. Haase stated that this project had a problem with induced shoaling, which required a closure plan. Also, a natural crevasse has developed, making the project unnecessary.

Mr. Holden stated that the USACE is monitoring the crevasse from a navigation standpoint, and there does not seem to be any problems. The project is just no longer needed.

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

Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish Government, confirmed that there are many cuts in this area thanks to Mother Nature.

Avoca Island Diversion and Land Building (TE-49), PPL 12, USACE

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

Mr. Haase stated that this project has constructability problems. It was originally intended to be a freshwater diversion, but the scope was changed to marsh creation. Due to soil conditions, it is just not constructible.

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

Spanish Pass Diversion (MR-14), PPL 13, USACE

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

Mr. Haase stated that the problems with this project are the cost benefit ratio and constructability. It consists of a very long culvert through a marina which is very difficult to construct.

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

Mr. P.J. Hahn, Plaquemines Parish Government Coastal Zone Director, expressed his frustration about this process because decisions about these projects are being made in a vacuum. No one contacted the Parish about this being on the agenda today. He was told that this project has cost benefit problems because the benefits are too low. He would like to sit down with members of the Technical Committee to show them a map of other projects that could benefit from this project. The fact that other, very expensive projects, such as the \$42 million Grand Liard Marsh Ridge Restoration Project, would be nourished by this project should be included in the benefit analysis. The Parish also spent \$800,000 for the Jump Basin marsh creation project. Mr. Hahn stated that it is common sense that this project should go forward.

Mr. Hahn also stated that Tidewater Road goes underwater regularly, and a lot of the oil and gas companies that have to use this road are considering moving to Mississippi because of this issue. The Parish put up \$150,000 of its own money to begin engineering and design (E&D) on this project.

Mr. Haase responded that this issue was discussed in October. Mr. Hartman reminded the group that this vote is just for the initiation of de-authorization procedures. He also reiterated that the project consists of a long culvert going through a marina, which is a difficult design. He asked Mr. Hahn to talk to the State and the Federal sponsor if the Parish has a different design that is more feasible. Mr. Hahn responded that the Parish has begun E&D themselves, and if they just have to do the project themselves, then they will. Mr. Haase responded that if the Parish is working on the design, the State would like to see their work. He advised Mr. Hahn to speak with him after the meeting to discuss the design.

Mr. Hartman added that the CWPPRA Program should not be addressing the Tidewater Road issue, and the Parish should discuss that with the appropriate State agency.

White Ditch Resurrection (BS-12), PPL 14, NRCS

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

Mr. Haase stated that this project has landowner issues and operational constraints. Bank line stabilization requirements that are being imposed by the landowner make this project unfeasible.

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

Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction (BS-15), PPL 17, EPA

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

Mr. Haase said that this is the project location where Mardi Gras Pass has naturally developed. Mr. Holden noted that these projects consist of a large portion of the USACE portfolio.

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

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force initiate de-authorization procedures on the Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization (TV-11b) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force initiate de-authorization procedures on the Delta Building Diversion North of St. Philip (BS-10) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Haase made a motion to recommend that the Task Force initiate de-authorization procedures on the Avoca Island Diversion and Land Building (TE-49) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force initiate de-authorization procedures on the Spanish Pass Diversion (MR-14) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members except for Ms. McCormick voted in favor and the motion passed. Ms. McCormick abstained.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force initiate de-authorization procedures on the White Ditch Resurrection (BS-12) Project. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to recommend that the Task Force initiate de-authorization procedures on the Bohemia Mississippi River Reintroduction (BS-15) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 6. Report: 2012 Report to Congress (Karen McCormick, EPA). Ms. McCormick presented an update on the 2012 Report to Congress. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), USFWS, EPA, and CPRA have been leading the 2012 Report to Congress efforts.

Ms. McCormick reported that all of the Task Force recommendations and changes have been incorporated and the 2012 Report to Congress is ready for printing. Mr. Clark stated that the report has been given to the final editors, who think they can get the final product completed before the January 24, 2013 Task Force Meeting. Scott Wilson of USGS stated that printed copies should be available six weeks after that.

McCormick added that it was a pleasure to work with everyone on this project.

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

Mr. Hartman and Mr. Clark thanked Ms. McCormick for her leadership on this project. Mr. Clark added that this was one of the quickest Reports to Congress that has been done so far in the Program.

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

8. Agenda Item 8. Report: Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection/Commercial Canal Freshwater Redirection Project (TV-19) (O'Neil Malbrough, Shaw Group). *At the October 11, 2012 meeting, the Task Force voted to initiate deauthorization procedures for this project with a final decision to be made at the June 2013 Task Force Meeting. The Task Force requested a presentation at the January 2013 meeting on suggested adjustments to the project's scope and design. Mr. Glenn Ledet from Shaw Group provided a status update.*

Mr. Ledet, Shaw Group, is contracted by Vermilion and Iberia Parishes through a Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) grant to review alternatives for shoreline protection and restoration. The Shaw Group looked at several different alternatives for the Weeks Bay landbridge, which separates the GIWW from Weeks Bay and has suffered from shoreline erosion. They evaluated several different types of structures and materials, and ultimately decided that a concrete panel wall was the most sustainable, cost effective solution in both the short and long term. Shaw studied the concrete panel project in Bayou Rigolettes (NRCS Barataria Basin Landbridge CWPPRA project) for guidance because the soil conditions in Weeks Bay are similar.

Vermilion and Iberia Parishes would like to re-scope this project because they think that a freshwater diversion using the GIWW as a pipeline can be cost effective. Shaw is recommending using concrete panels as terraces to recreate the landbridge and nourish the Teche-Vermilion Basin. Shaw has met with USACE, USGS, and CPRA to review additional project benefits. Fresh water from the Atchafalaya River has historically been contained in the GIWW, and they want to prevent this freshwater from leaving through Weeks Bay. The goal is to maintain fresh and intermediate marshes in the Teche-Vermilion Basin.

The entire landbridge on the south bank of the GIWW was intact in 1921 and 1937. Shaw is hoping to use this fact to show the benefits of the freshwater and sediments. The USACE recommended review of a 2003 USGS study by Chris Swarzenski which focused on the effect of the GIWW transporting Atchafalaya River water and sediment east and west of the Wax Lake Outlet. The average flow at Cypremort Point is 2,100 cubic feet per second (cfs) with a maximum flow of almost 5,000 cfs during high river conditions. Shaw believes that this shows that water and sediments can be moved via the GIWW up to 50 miles east and west of Morgan City. Terraces at Weeks Bay could extend this distribution. Shaw would like to use this information in the environmental benefit analysis. Without this landbridge, up to 75 percent of the freshwater in the GIWW enters the Gulf of Mexico at Weeks Bay via Vermilion Bay. With the closure, this could be reduced to only 35 percent.

Dr. Ehab Mesehle is trying to use the Southwest Coastal Model to show similar results for CPRA. They should have preliminary results by the January Task Force Meeting. Hopefully, this can translate into benefits that make the project cost effective.

Vermilion and Iberia Parishes would like to re-scope this project to a freshwater and sediment diversion project. They would also like to include secondary benefits in the benefit cost analysis, such as those benefits that would accrue to navigation, a potential future marsh creation site, the protection of valuable infrastructure, and salinity benefits.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if the cost of the project is \$12 million. Mr. Ledet answered affirmatively. Mr. Clark asked if this included 20 years of operations and maintenance (O&M). Mr. Ledet answered that the initial construction is \$10.7 million and the total cost over the life of the project is \$12.2 million. The long term O&M costs for these terraces are lower than those for a rock dike.

Mr. Clark said that in his opinion the project is still a shoreline protection project, but Shaw is focused on looking at the freshwater and sediment component.

Mr. Hartman said that he does agree that freshwater flows through the GIWW, but the problem with the project is identifying the benefits under the current methodology. The benefiting area appears to be any marsh that is hydrologically connected to the GIWW, but this is not consistent with normal freshwater diversion projects where there is a specific outflow site.

Mr. Clark asked the project sponsors for comments. Mr. Haase stated that he thinks the modeling effort will provide information that will be important to assigning benefits. They are making progress, and will hopefully have results soon.

Mr. Holden stated that this is an unusual way to consider a diversion, but it is not necessarily wrong to approach this project differently because of the unique aspect of the GIWW. CWPPRA could create notches further west in areas where they want to build land. Ultimately, the Technical Committee needs to be able to advise the Task Force on the initial comments, and the Task Force will rely on the Technical Committee in January and June to decide whether or not CWPPRA can move forward with the project. The project team needs to corroborate the models with information from various times of the year, and it would have been great to have done this over the past two years when they had very high water followed by very low water.

Mr. Chris Allen, CPRA, stated that their approach is to use the model to show whether or not the GIWW can move the water. If the model does indicate that this is possible, then CPRA will proceed with the benefit analysis, which will be much more cumbersome. If the model does not show that the GIWW will move water, then CPRA would stop working on the project.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification that the model runs would be completed prior to the Task Force meeting. Mr. Allen answered that the initial run has already been completed and they are just waiting for the report.

Mr. Clark noted that this is not the only opening in the GIWW and asked whether other openings were being considered in the model. Mr. Allen responded that the modeling is being conducted with and without other canal openings.

Mr. Hartman asked if CPRA would be able to propose what the benefit area might be once the model results are complete. Mr. Allen said this would be difficult, and this issue would need to go to the work groups.

Mr. Hartman stated that he did not think the Technical Committee could give this issue to the Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee yet because they need to at least be able to identify what the benefit area might be. Mr. Allen said that if the model shows that the GIWW can move fresh water, then it should be able to show where this water goes. The Environmental Work Group does have a lot of experience with this type of analysis, although this particular project will be more difficult.

Mr. Hartman stated that he is intrigued by the possibilities of this project, but CWPPRA cannot just spend \$12 million without having some sort of expected benefit area.

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

Mr. Edwards stated that the Little Vermilion Bay Project was proposed and built with the expectation that the Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection Project would also be built. There was a white paper that identified this project as a lynchpin project for Vermilion Parish in the Coast 2050 program. Vermilion Parish gets very little freshwater from the Teche-Vermilion, and they need this water from the GIWW. The Little Vermilion Bay Project is working and is trapping sediment, although there are no CRMS stations in any of those western Vermilion Bay terraces to show the results. From Weeks Bay to Four Mile Canal, there are several openings, but they are very small. Oaks Canal is less than 100 feet wide. Boston Canal is 80 to 100 feet wide. There is a terracing project at Tiger Lagoon as well, and all of these projects are capturing sediment. A lot of fresh water will be pushed as far west as Four Mile Canal, which is the first significant waterway that could capture this flow and is 1,000 feet wide. This water will nourish the Four Mile Canal Terracing Project and it will continue to the Little Vermilion Bay Terracing Project. The benefited area of the Weeks Bay Marsh Creation and Shore Protection Project would be South Pecan Island, all of the marshes owned by Vermilion Corporation, Little Vermilion Bay, and all the way to Rockefeller Refuge and Rainey Wildlife Sanctuary. This will freshen the western extreme of Vermilion Bay. There will also be benefits to agriculture. If CWPPRA is not going to build the shoreline protection on Freshwater Bayou, this is the least CWPPRA can do to negate the tidal actions in this area.

Mr. Randy Moertle, McIlhenny Company, stated that they have always said that they can capture the sediment at Weeks Bay. They have planted bullwhip in this area, and the sediment is very deep. If CWPPRA can slow the water with panels, then sediment can be built at the terraces. A set of jetties was built at Boston Canal, and the area around the jetties filled with 4 feet of sediment within one year. Every opening does not need to be closed, but if they can strategically align projects to slow the water down long enough for it to settle, land can be built.

Mr. Edwards stated that it is true that Boston Canal filled with sediment within a year. The TV-11 Project, which is the State's only project on Freshwater Bayou, was copied from a USACE project for the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet. TV-04 has a different design, and the Technical Committee needs to be aware of that and study the differences between the two projects. Behind TV-11, land has accreted and there is grass now. On the west bank, behind TV-04, the project has stopped shoreline erosion, but there is no accretion. Tidal interaction has continued, and mudflats have formed, but there is no accretion. CWPPRA has a project built by the State that is working, and it has been ignored. No one has said, "Wow, we're building marsh and we're not having to pay anyone to pump marsh." Mr. Edwards asked why CWPPRA is not studying what works. He said that that is what CWPPRA is supposed to do.

Mr. Clark responded that the Technical Committee needs to see the modeling results. Mr. Hartman added that he hopes the modeling group can identify the project benefit areas. Mr. Clark said that if the information is provided soon enough, the Environmental Work Group could evaluate the results by the April Technical Committee Meeting. Mr. Kevin Roy, USFWS, said that they could look at the results and look at the benefiting areas, but would need more information if the Technical Committee wants them to perform a full Wetlands Value Assessment (WVA).

Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Malbrough to please provide any information or input that is available. Mr. Malbrough responded that Shaw is available to assist as quickly as possible. Mr. Clark added that sediment concentration and total suspended solids information would be helpful, and the 2003 report may have some information. Mr. Malbrough responded that the 2003 report does have some information about sediment concentration. Mr. Holden asked Mr. Malbrough to provide this information in March, before the April Task Force Meeting.

9. Agenda Item 9. Report: Status of the Non-Rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection Demonstration Project (LA-16) (Quin Kinler, NRCS). *The final design (plans and specifications) and final cost estimates for five alternative shoreline protection systems at each of three sites will be submitted by previously approved offerors to NRCS on December 12, 2012. Those submittals will be evaluated and a final ranking of the alternative systems will be available in January 2013. At that time, NRCS and CPRA will make a recommendation and funding request for a specific number of alternative systems at a specific number of sites. Mr. Kinler provided a status update for the project.*

Mr. Paul noted that this demonstration project consists of trying to evaluate several different non-rock shoreline protection methods. Mr. Kinler presented the work that has been done to-date and the path forward with a preliminary estimated cost.

Mr. Kinler reported that there are many places along the Louisiana coast where rock cannot be used as shoreline protection because of poor soil conditions. This demonstration project will look at several non-rock alternatives that could be used in place of rock in these locations. NRCS considered 27 different locations for this demonstration. Several factors were considered in the location selection. One factor was erosion rate; NRCS wants a relatively smooth shoreline so that all of the materials tested will be exposed to the same conditions and accurate comparisons can be made. Another factor is soil conditions; they do not want to test these

materials in locations with good soil conditions because they are looking for a solution for areas with poor soil conditions. Other factors include reasonable proximity to a boat landing, fetch, shoreline length, and minimal hindrances such as pipelines or oyster leases. NRCS selected three sites: Vermilion Bay, Lake Salvador, and Bayou Perot. All three of these locations suffer from significant erosion. Specific data was obtained for each of these locations, including field surveys, topographic surveys, and geotechnical surveys.

NRCS is using a three-phase approach for this project. Phase I was an open request for proposals, and they received 17 proposals. Phase II was the selection of five of the proposals for final design. NRCS has awarded five contracts for final design and cost estimates, which are due today. NRCS will use these final designs and cost estimates to update the rankings of the five alternatives. This should be complete by January 12, 2013. Phase III will consist of ranking the proposals, and NRCS and the State will need to come back to the Technical Committee and Task Force to request funding for up to five products, depending on the cost estimates. The team will need to amend the cost share and obtain a new Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request (MIPR). If any dredging is required for access, NRCS will create a single access channel under a separate contract. Dredging needs are somewhat unknown, and will contribute to the costs. The contractors are trying to reduce dredging needs, which could reduce the costs. NRCS will then award individual contracts for each design chosen and each company will be responsible for construction. There will be a three-year monitoring period to monitor the wave action in front of the structures and to track the shoreline and water depth behind each structure.

The current cost estimates are preliminary. The projects are ranked, but one part of the ranking is cost and this may change once the final designs are reviewed. Based on current cost estimates, five projects at all three sites would cost \$13.5 million. Top ranking products will be installed before low ranking projects, depending on the amount of money the Task Force is willing to spend on this demonstration. The cost estimate does include a removal cost in case the product fails, a maximum cost for anticipated dredging, supervision and three years of monitoring, and a 15 percent contingency.

The demonstration project was initially funded at \$1.9 million. They have spent \$1.2 million. The \$700,000 remaining can be subtracted from the current cost estimate to estimate funding requirements.

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

Mr. Clark thanked Mr. Kinler for his report. Mr. Clark asked if NRCS has paid or is paying five different companies to do design and whether or not this included surveys. Mr. Kinler responded that all of the companies were given the survey and geotechnical data that NRCS collected, although some may have wanted to go back to update the surveys. They each have a contract and will produce a final set of designs and a cost estimate.

Mr. Clark asked for confirmation that the next price should be an accurate price, and Mr. Kinler responded affirmatively.

Mr. Clark asked about monitoring using replicates in different areas. Mr. Kinler responded that everything will be monitored, whether that is one product in one location or two products in two locations. If they build projects at three sites, then they will monitor all three sites. Mr. Clark asked whether Mr. Kinler was satisfied that the current plan will give CWPPRA adequate information for statistical comparisons. Mr. Kinler said that this was coordinated with the Academic Work Group. The specifics of the monitoring plan have not been fully vetted by the Monitoring Work Group, so that could be modified. The monitoring plan is consistent with other demonstration projects.

Mr. Hartman asked Dr. Jenneke Visser if the Academic Work Group could review NRCS' proposal, particularly considering the lessons learned from the Lake Salvador demonstration project. Dr. Visser responded that they have coordinated with NRCS. She recommends the three sites.

Mr. Hartman also noted that two of the three sites are in the Barataria Basin and are very near each other. Mr. Kinler responded that they looked coast-wide, but their stringent criteria reduced the number of possible sites. They needed areas with challenging soil conditions, but long stretches of uniform coast conditions to be able to compare up to five different materials. Dr. Visser noted that with the Lake Salvador demonstration project, the structures were placed too close together and therefore interfered with each other. The Academic Work Group ensured that that problem would not be replicated for this demonstration.

Mr. Hartman asked whether two sites would be sufficient, since Lake Salvador and Bayou Perot are so similar in terms of sediment quality. Dr. Visser stated that three is a lot better than two. Two sites may not represent enough of a range of conditions. If, due to costs, CWPPRA could only do two sites, she recommended the site in Vermilion Bay and one of the Barataria sites.

Mr. Paul informed the Technical Committee that NRCS would come back to request funding once they have the final costs, and then they can decide how many products they are willing to fund and in how many locations.

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

10. Agenda Item 10. Report/Decision: 22nd Priority Project List (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The Environmental Work Group Chairman presented an overview of the ten PPL 22 candidate projects. The Technical Committee voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force for selecting PPL 22 projects for Phase I E&D.

Mr. Hartman stated that since two of the four demonstration projects are non-rock alternative projects, and the NRCS demonstration is a non-rock alternative demonstration, he recommends not selecting any new demonstration projects this year, and to put aside \$2 million for potential future use by the NRCS demonstration. Mr. Clark agreed.

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

Ms. Jane Rowan, Normandeau Associates, stated that she originally suggested the bioengineering technique for the Bioengineering of Shorelines and Canal Banks using Live Stakes Demonstration Project. This project is a combination of engineering and biology, using natural materials to create systems. It is a tried and true methodology and has been used for shoreline stabilization in other locations, but is not commonly applied in Louisiana. It is a non-rock alternative, but it is also a living alternative for restoration. She stated that the Chinese tallow tree is capturing soils, but it is an invasive species. If the State could use some native Louisiana plants to capture soils, they could replace the Chinese tallow. One recommendation is the Black Willow. We do not know the best trees and best living materials to use for this part of Louisiana. We could have an opportunity to see what would work in addition to the Black Willow tree. This is a great opportunity to see if plant material can be used to stabilize shorelines. Rock sinks and many non-living materials cannot adapt to the changing coasts the way a living material can adapt with changes in the environment.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to not select new demonstration projects and to put aside \$2 million for the NRCS Non-Rock Alternatives to Shoreline Protection Demonstration (LA-16) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee except for Mr. Holden voted in favor and the motion passed. Mr. Holden abstained.

Mr. Roy gave a brief overview of the below listed candidate projects in PPL 22 nominated for Phase I E&D.

Region	Basin	PPL 22 Nominees	Agency
2	Breton Sound	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	Terracing and Marsh Creation South of Big Mar	USFWS
2	Barataria	Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 3	EPA
2	Barataria	NE Turtle Bay Marsh Creation & Critical Area Shoreline Protection	NRCS
2	Barataria	Elmer’s Island Restoration	NMFS
3	Terrebonne	North Catfish Lake Marsh Creation	NRCS
3	Terrebonne	Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement and Terracing	USFWS
3	Teche-Vermilion	South Little Vermilion Bay Plantings and Terracing	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Front Ridge Freshwater Introduction and Terracing	NRCS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS

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

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

Ms. Marietta Greene, Madison Land Company, stated that they own a lot of land in the Barataria Basin. The most exciting thing that has happened in this area is the sediment trapping and land creation using a spray delivery system.

Mr. Phil Phrect, ConocoPhillips, expressed support for the Northeast Turtle Bay, North Catfish Lake, and Grand Bayou Freshwater Projects.

Mr. Jason Smith, Jefferson Parish, gave support to all three projects in the Barataria Basin. The overarching goal is to try to create this landbridge from east to west; the Bayou Dupont Project has been shown to be successful, and the third cycle will take that successful project and extend it to the east. Elmer's Island is also critical because it helps protect the critical infrastructure of Highway 1 to Grand Isle.

Mr. Hahn said that Plaquemines Parish Government supports the Bayou Dupont Project because it protects their levees. They support both projects in Breton Sound.

Mr. Archie Chaisson, Lafourche Parish Government, said that the Catfish Lake Project is their number one priority, and they have built other similar projects with CIAP money. They know that projects in this area work. Also, the Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement and Terracing Project area has a lot of healthy marsh and the more fresh water that is available, the better the marsh will be.

Mr. Nic Matherne, director of Coastal Zone Management for Terrebonne Parish, said that Grand Bayou project is important to Terrebonne Parish. The GIWW is Terrebonne's only source of fresh water. There is no marsh creation in the Master Plan in this area because of the lack of sustainability due to the lack of a source of fresh water. Ducks Unlimited is working on this issue, but they need a big CWPPRA project.

Mr. Moertle gave his support to the Freshwater Bayou and South Little Vermilion Bay Projects.

Mr. Tommy Wright, manager of Dore Energy, gave his support to the Cameron Meadow Marsh Creation Project. This is an excellent project for this area, it has been well planned, and the professors that reviewed this project are supportive as well.

The Technical Committee then voted on the projects. 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
3	North Catfish Lake Marsh Creation	6	5	5	5	6	6	6	33	\$3,216,194	\$27,138,815
2	Terracing & Marsh Creation South of Big Mar		2	1	6	2	1	5	12	\$2,308,599	\$21,384,106
2	Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery - Marsh Creation 3		6	6	1		4	4	17	\$3,415,930	\$34,863,233
4	Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation & Terracing	1	4	3		4		4	12	\$3,108,025	\$24,577,795
3	Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement & Terracing		3	2	4		3	4	12	\$3,206,177	\$27,138,815
2	Northeast Turtle Bay Marsh Creation & Critical Area Shoreline Protection	5			2		5	3	12	\$3,474,110	\$37,020,012
2	Lake Lery Shoreline Marsh Creation & Terracing	4			3	3		3	10	\$3,198,248	\$28,178,782
2	Elmer's Island Restoration		1	4		5		3	10	\$3,974,176	\$31,771,024

4	Front Ridge Freshwater Introduction & Terracing	3					2	2	5	\$1,954,290	\$11,668,133
3	South Little Vermilion Bay Plantings & Terracing	2				1		2	3	\$777,158	\$5,729,763

The tie breaker 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
3	Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement & Terracing			1	1		1	3	3	\$3,206,177	\$27,138,815
4	Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation & Terracing	1	1			1		3	3	\$3,108,025	\$24,577,795

The second tie breaker 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	Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation & Terracing	1	1	1		1		4	4	\$3,108,025	\$24,577,795
3	Grand Bayou Freshwater Enhancement & Terracing				1		1	2	2	\$3,206,177	\$27,138,815

Mr. Holden passed the Chair to Mr. Inman.

DECISION: Mr. Clark moved to recommend Task Force approval of the four top voted projects (North Catfish Lake Marsh Creation, Terracing and Marsh Creation South of Big Mar, Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery Marsh Creation III, and Cameron Meadows Marsh Creation and Terracing) for Phase I E&D. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 11. Report/Discussion: 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.

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
--------	-------------	-----	--------------	----------------------	--------------	---------------	------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

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	Jan 2014	\$3,742,053	\$63,820,773	\$67,562,826	195	\$346,476
FWS	ME-20	11	South Grand Chenier Marsh Creation	Dec 2013	\$2,358,419	\$19,574,666	\$21,933,085	427	\$51,366
EPA	MR-15	15	Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses	Sep 2013	\$1,074,522	\$21,112,602	\$22,187,124	318	\$69,771
NRCS	PO-34	16	Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration & Shoreline Protection	Sep 2013	\$1,660,985	\$38,665,259	\$40,326,244	192	\$210,033
NMFS	BA-76	19	Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration	Oct 2013	\$3,419,263	\$34,968,751	\$38,388,014	308	\$124,636
FWS	TE-72	19	Lost Lake Marsh Creation & Hydrologic Restoration	Aug 2013	\$2,320,214	\$32,306,514	\$34,626,728	452	\$76,608
FWS	PO-104	20	Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation	Jan 2014	\$2,567,244	\$25,456,740	\$28,023,984	478	\$58,628

Ms. Mabry reported that \$67,620,034 is available for Phase II projects. Mr. Clark asked for the total from Phase I and Ms. Mabry responded \$12,048,748. Mr. Hartman asked whether the \$12 million included the \$2 million that was set aside for the NRCS demonstration. Ms. Mabry responded that after removing the \$2 million, they have \$65,620,034 available. These figures include assumptions about returned funds.

Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration

Mr. Paul Kaspar, EPA, stated that this project is in Terrebonne Parish in Region 3. The project area is the western spit of Whiskey Island. This deteriorating island chain is reducing the effectiveness of the State's first line of defense, barrier islands. This project will restore the integrity of the island and rebuild the natural structural framework. This will complement previous CWPPRA work on Whiskey Island and other surrounding islands in this chain. This project would use the Ship Shoal borrow site, which is an excellent sand sediment source for barrier island restoration. The total acres will be about 500 acres of island habitat. At the end of 20 years, the net increase would be approximately 200 acres of the habitat. The total funded cost is approximately \$65 million. The benefits include restoring the first line of defense, stabilizing the rapidly changing shoreline, and introducing new sediment into the system.

South Grand Chenier

Mr. Clark stated that there was a recent scope change on this project that removed the freshwater component, and it is now a marsh creation project. This project was first approved for E&D in 2002. There was a modest scope change in 2009 to remove one fresh water introduction area. Funding was approved in 2010, but was returned in January 2012 due to landowner issues. The land rights issues were resolved in April 2012. A scope change to remove the fresh water

component was approved by the Task Force yesterday. This project is in the Chenier subbasin, south of Grand Chenier and northwest of Rockefeller Refuge. Loss has moderated to only -0.16 percent per year now, but was as high as a few percent each year. The current project includes two marsh creation areas east and west of Second Lake. The goal is to restore 453 acres of marsh, reduce loss, and improve marsh productivity. They plan to use the Gulf of Mexico as a borrow site. They will degrade retention levees, re-vegetate, and construct tidal creeks. The net acres are 427 after 20-years. The construction target is 453 acres, so they are only expecting to lose 30 acres over 20 years. This project ranks first in cost effectiveness and would help provide some storm protection for the community of Grand Chenier. The revised cost is \$21.9 million.

Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses

Mr. Kaspar reported that this project consists of marsh creation and nourishment in the Mississippi River Valley Basin. This area has a very high conversion rate from land to water. From 1932 to 1990, 87 percent of land was lost in this area. More than 91 percent of the remaining land will be lost by 2050. Land loss reduces the protection of the Venice area. This project had a scope change last year. The current project has two marsh creation cells and crevasse creation and enhancement. Marsh creation will use material from Grand Pass. It will include 190 acres of marsh creation with dredged material and one crevasse in Grand Pass, one crevasse in Tiger Pass, and the enhancement of two existing crevasses. It also includes over 4,000 cypress plantings. The cost is \$22 million.

Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration & Shoreline Protection

Mr. John Jurgensen, NRCS, stated that this project consists of shoreline protection along the Orleans Land Bridge, which is between the Rigolets and Lake Borgne. This project protects the City of New Orleans as well as the shoreline of Lake Pontchartrain. Even though the total acres created or benefited is less than a marsh creation project, this type of project is essential to coastal protection and restoration. This project includes over 30,000 feet of shoreline protection. Material dredged for shoreline protection will be placed behind the rock dike and over time could cause accretion. This project also includes vegetative planting along about half of the shoreline protection structure. There is already grass growing here and planting will be placed strategically to maximize growth. About every 1,000 feet there would be fisheries access. Fish dips are also included where there are natural cuts in the bank. This type of project has been proven to work to halt erosion behind the project features. With maintenance, this type of project is sustainable. The 192 acres are not the only benefit of this project. NRCS is asking for approximately \$27 million today.

Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration

Ms. Rachel Sweeney, NMFS, stated that this project area is one of the only areas along the barrier islands that contain something resembling trees. This is in the middle of a series of CWPPRA barrier island projects. The Program has, in a piece by piece way, made some real progress one project at a time. These projects have benefited 12 miles of shoreline and over 2,000 acres of habitat. Beach and dune construction is a significant component. This is a structural component from an engineering standpoint and it really needs a good sediment source.

These types of projects are designed to maintain continuous shoreface that will remain unperforated for the 20-year project life. Without these types of projects, there would be more open water. These islands allow us to keep the boundary of what we consider the Gulf of Mexico versus the State of Louisiana. The other component to this type of project is the back barrier marsh platform. This provides a structural platform that continues to support the island in an unbreached formation. This is the structural basis for land migration. This project will restore 8,000 feet of continuous shoreline and create or restore 274 acres of marsh. For every NMFS project, NMFS has invested in project-specific monitoring. This has provided data for future projects, and one result is that NMFS is building dunes higher now. Other people, like the USACE Engineer Research Development Center, are also using their data now. Increment I funding would be about \$34 million. Every time the shoreline overwashes into a pond, perforation and breaches occur. This increases the linear feet of shoreline, and as the shoreline increases, it is more susceptible to erosion. The longer we wait with these projects, the bigger the hole gets. With some projects, it gets to the point that there are constructability challenges regardless of the budget. High quality sand is extremely limited in this part of south Louisiana. The current estimates for sand requirements have been updated since Hurricane Isaac passed over this area. The project needs 1.6 million cubic yards, so NMFS needs 2.1 million cubic yards of sand available in the borrow areas. The sand is coming from the Gulf of Mexico. The primary area that has the best quality sand has just enough to be able to construct this project now. If CWPPRA waits, they will have to use a secondary borrow site which will not only be more expensive, but will also be less sustainable. This is one of the last remaining pieces to the barrier island protection.

Lost Lake Marsh Creation & Hydrologic Restoration

Mr. Roy stated that this project is in the western Terrebonne Basin. This project acquired Phase I approval in January 2010. It was developed to tie in and complement other projects in this area to protect intermediate marsh. This is the buffer between fresh marshes to the north and salt marshes to the south. This project will extend the landbridge function of the TE-44 North Lake Mechant Landbridge Restoration Project. This Project strives to better distribute Atchafalaya River water to help other CWPPRA projects in the area. It includes marsh creation in five cells, for a total of 468 acres in Lake Pagie and Bayou Mechant. Also, some cells will be constructed behind a rock dike that protects the Bayou Decade Shoreline. There are several breaches between Lost Lake and Carencro Lake, which has introduced some fresh water into the area, but scour has occurred and USFWS does not want the marsh cell between the two lakes to disappear. They will also do hydrologic restoration along Carencro Bayou. This is an excellent source of fresh water, and a small delta could emerge at the mouth of Crochet Canal. The impounded area of marsh south of this is where hydrologic restoration would occur by removing fixed crest weirs and replacing them with more open structures that can be left open for much of the year. This project would take advantage of the increase in fresh water coming down Brady Canal due to a recently implemented structure. The project benefits 7,312 acres of marsh. The net acres after 20 years are 452. The fully funded cost is \$35 million. The Increment I request is \$29 million. This project builds on several other restoration efforts in this area, particularly in the narrowing intermediate marsh zone. Based on the 2012 Master Plan, this project will be the last opportunity to create marsh in the western Terrebonne Basin.

Mr. Hartman added that there has been some discussion that if a cutback had to be made due to a limited budget, the water control structures would be removed from the project. Mr. Hartman noted that this action would not be his preference on what would be removed. Mr. Roy responded that USFWS would consider Mr. Hartman's comments and could look at other options, but the water control structures would be easier to modify than the marsh creation component. Mr. Hartman said that these structures are out there causing harm to the marsh, and he thinks that if CWPPRA does this project, then they need to remove those structures. Mr. Roy stated that hopefully CWPPRA will not have to remove any of the project features.

Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation

Mr. Kenneth Ballinger, CPRA, stated that this project is a few miles west of Slidell, and right behind this project is a residential area. As a whole, Lake Pontchartrain has systemic problems of deteriorating marsh. A project was completed in Big Branch a few years ago to fill in holes, and this project would add to ongoing efforts to restore the shoreline of Lake Pontchartrain. This was a stable marsh area, but since Hurricane Katrina, it has rapidly deteriorated. The goal of this project is to restore 621 acres of marsh. The marsh was starting to fragment before Hurricane Katrina, but after Hurricanes Katrina and Gustav it has opened up quite a bit, and it is in even worse condition after Hurricane Isaac. Most of the project is on the Big Branch Wildlife Refuge, but a small portion is on private land. The landowners are supportive, and their only request is that a few holes remain so that they can duck hunt. The net acres for the project are 478. It is a cost effective project, and it protects a residential area. This is an easy project that has been done before.

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

Mr. Hartman stated that there has been some discussion about the settlement from the Deepwater Horizon incident. The money coming to Louisiana will be required to be used on diversions and barrier islands. There has been some discussion about why CWPPRA funds should go to barrier islands if there are other dedicated funds. First, Mr. Hartman noted that this settlement has not been finalized and approved by the judge. Second, there are some very large diversion projects being designed right now that could require most, if not all, of the Deepwater Horizon funds. Chenier Ronquille is time sensitive in terms of sediment quality. Mr. Hartman thinks that Technical Committee members should vote for the best project regardless of whether there may be dedicated funding in the future.

Mr. Haase said that the State's intent was just to lay out priority projects, not to say that they want to save any projects for certain sources of funds.

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

Mr. Nic Matherne stated that he loves the Whiskey Island Project, but understands that its cost would mean that it would be the only project funded this year. A more palatable solution is the Lost Lake Project. This type of project is more sustainable in the western portion of Terrebonne Parish because of proximity to the Atchafalaya River, but it is becoming less sustainable because of movement north of the Gulf of Mexico. This project will create marsh, but will also have tidal

creeks to reduce ponding in the future. It will also include terracing and hydrologic restoration. This will work well with other projects in the area. Mr. Matherne stressed that removing water control structures is an important feature of this project because the other project features are not sustainable unless these structures are removed.

Mr. Brian Fortson, Coastal Resources Manager for St. Tammany Parish, stated that Bayou Bonfouca area has been a focus since CWPPRA began. The Parish has wanted to see a solution to this problem for the last 23 years. The Parish has spent \$1.25 million of local funding directly to the north of this project area because of the high population. They have also dedicated \$1.8 million of CIAP funds to this area. This project is in close proximity to Goose Point, which is a remarkable success, and there is no reason to believe that this project is less sustainable than Goose Point.

Mr. Martin Miller, Rellim Surface Management, representing most of the Miller family, showed support for the South Grand Chenier Project. The land rights issues of this project have been resolved. This is one of the only projects that is ready to start construction. This project is the lowest in overall total cost and cost per acre and is in the 2012 Master Plan. Hog Bayou has silted in, and that has dramatically helped this marsh survive. They can pump this area and drain it, and Beach Prong closing naturally has been a big help. This is a huge project and Rellim cannot do it alone, but their management can help make this project a huge success.

Ms. Leslie Suazo, Ducks Unlimited, spoke on behalf of the North Lost Lake Project. All of the Technical Committee members should have received an email of support from Ducks Unlimited. They are very interested in seeing this project move forward. This will work in concert with other projects. CPRA and the landowner, ConocoPhillips, are contributing to another project that will increase water flow to this area. All of these projects will work together to maintain an intermediate buffer zone. To address the comment regarding the water control structures, she hopes that as the project moves forward, the Technical Committee would approach the landowner or Ducks Unlimited to discuss different options. For example, Ducks Unlimited has submitted an application to the North American Waterfowl Conservation Program for a grant for a water control structure in Liners Canal. She would encourage the Technical Committee to consider similar solutions.

Mr. Harris spoke on behalf of the Bayou Bonfouca Project. The project west of this area was a great success. By diverting the dewatering, they were able to capture and nourish the existing marsh, effectively doubling the affected nourished and benefited marsh. They can use lessons learned to mimic that success at Bonfouca. Also, as a public refuge in close proximity to Slidell and New Orleans, it receives a tremendous amount of public use, in addition to the protection it provides to Slidell and Lacombe.

Ms. Cynthia Duet, National Audubon Society, stated that the Chenier Ronquille area, particularly the back bay of the island, is very important to bird habitat. She is hopeful that Mr. Hartman's and Mr. Haase's comments will be noted by the rest of the Committee. She urged the Committee to support this project now if they are planning to support it rather than wait on "magic funding" from another source.

Mr. Moertle noted that the South Grand Chenier Project is in the Master Plan.

Mr. George Pivach, Louisiana Fruit Company – Venice Port Complex, stated that the Venice project between Tiger and Grand Pass is sustainable. The Venice Port Complex is located about 300 feet from this project. Venice is home to the USACE, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administrations, oil and gas companies, private plants, and other organizations. This project would not only provide marsh creation, but also protect at least half a billion dollars of investment.

Mr. Hahn stated that Plaquemines Parish Government’s number one project is the barrier island project because this is the State’s first line of defense. There is a series of smaller bird islands behind Chenier Ronquille, and the Parish is considering using their own money to protect those islands, but without this project, all of the islands will be lost. Louisiana only has six bird sanctuaries for the pelicans and they are all disappearing. Also, three years after BP pledged \$1 billion to “make it right,” the State has only received seven percent of those funds. It is critical to close this island chain.

The Technical Committee then voted. The voting results were as follows:

PPL	Project No.	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	STATE	No. of Agency Votes	Sum of Weighted Score	Phase II, Increment 1 Funding Request	Cumulative Phase II, Increment 1 Funding
20	PO-104	Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation	4	2	4	3	1		5	14	\$25,456,740	\$25,456,740
19	TE-72	Lost Lake Marsh Creation & Hydrologic Restoration	1		3	2	4	2	5	12	\$32,306,514	\$57,763,254
11	ME-20	South Grand Chenier Marsh Creation	3		1		3	3	4	10	\$19,574,666	\$77,337,920
15	MR-15	Venice Ponds Marsh Creation & Crevasses	2	4	2	1			4	9	\$21,112,602	\$98,450,522
19	BA-76	Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration		1		4		4	3	9	\$34,968,751	\$133,419,273
16	PO-34	Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration & Shoreline Protection					2	1	2	3	\$38,665,259	\$172,084,532
11	TE-47	Ship Shoal: Whiskey West Flank Restoration		3					1	3	\$63,820,773	\$235,905,305

Mr. Inman noted that the results will be sent out via the CWPPRA Newsflash.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman moved to recommend Task Force approval of the two top voted projects (Bayou Bonfouca Marsh Creation and Lost Lake Marsh Creation & Hydrologic Restoration) for Phase II authorization and approval of Increment I funding. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

13. Agenda Item 12. Additional Agenda Items (Tom Holden, USACE). There were no additional agenda items.

14. Agenda Item 13. Request for Public Comments (Tom Holden, USACE). There were no public comments.

15. Agenda Item 14. Priority Project List 23 Regional Planning Team Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE).

January 29, 2013	11:00 a.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Abbeville
January 30, 2013	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
January 31, 2013	8:00 a.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 31, 2013	11:30 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
February 19, 2013	10:30 a.m.	Coast-wide Electronic Voting	<i>(via email, no meeting)</i>

16. Agenda Item 15. Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE). *The next Task Force meeting will be held January 24, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. at the USACE, 7400 Leake Avenue, New Orleans, LA, in the District Assembly Room (DARM).*

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

January 24, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
January 29, 2013	1:00 p.m.	Region IV Planning Team Meeting	Abbeville
January 30, 2013	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team Meeting	Morgan City
January 31, 2013	9:00 a.m.	Region II Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
January 31, 2013	1:00 p.m.	Region I Planning Team Meeting	New Orleans
April 16, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	New Orleans
June 4, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 11, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 10, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
November 13, 2013	7:00 p.m.	PPL 23 Public Comment Meeting	Baton Rouge
December 12, 2013	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge

18. Agenda Item 17. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. Mr. Inman adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:10 p.m.