

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 5 April 2016 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Mr. Mark Wingate opened the meeting at 9:30 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

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

Mr. Adrian Chavarria, sitting in for Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Bren Haase, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)

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

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

Mr. Mark Wingate, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman

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

2. Agenda Item 1. Meeting Initiation

Mr. Wingate introduced himself and asked the members of the Technical Committee to introduce themselves. Mr. Wingate asked if the Technical Committee had any opening remarks. Mr. Wingate reminded everyone that the January Task Force meeting was canceled due to the Mississippi River high water event. The Task Force voted electronically on several items. Mr. Brad Inman, USACE, announced that there will a report at the May Task Force Meeting describing the electronic vote that replaced the January meeting. Five projects and one demonstration were selected to move to Phase I Engineering and Design (E&D): Fritchie Marsh Creation and Terracing, Caminada Headlands Back Barrier Marsh Creation Increment #2, Barataria Bay Rim Marsh Creation, East Leeville Marsh Creation and Nourishment, Oyster Lake Marsh Creation and Nourishment, and the Shoreline Protection, Preservation and Restoration Panel Demonstration. Three projects were selected to move into Phase II Construction: Cole's Bayou Marsh Restoration, Rockefeller Gulf Shoreline Stabilization, and Hydrologic Restoration and Vegetative Planting in Lac des Allemands Swamp. This vote completed the Project Priority List (PPL) 25 Process.

Mr. Wingate reminded everyone of the rules for public participation. The public will be given a chance to comment on each agenda item; if a member of the public would like to make a comment, he or she should use the microphone provided and clearly speak their name and affiliation. Mr. Wingate also reminded everyone to sign in.

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

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

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

Ms. Jernice Cheavis, USACE, reported on the status of CWPPRA Program Funds. The current estimate for PPLs 1-25 is \$2.391 billion. Funding through Fiscal Year (FY) 19 is estimated to be \$2.011 billion, which includes Department of Interior (DOI) funding, as well as funding from other sponsors. If the CWPPRA Program were to construct all projects approved to-date, there would be a \$382 million gap in necessary funding. The total for currently approved phases is \$1.756 billion, which includes Phases I and II, Operations and Maintenance (O&M), and Monitoring. The total for currently funded projects is \$1.640 billion, which includes Phase I and II projects with only incremental funding for O&M and Monitoring.

In December, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act increased CWPPRA’s DOI funding as a share of the Sport Fish Restoration and Boating Trust Fund, bringing CWPPRA’s available balance for PPL 25 to \$82,863,825. The December Technical Committee Meeting recommended \$73,431,139 for Phase I and Phase II authorizations, leaving a surplus of \$9,432,685. Since no agenda items are requesting funding at this meeting, CWPPRA will continue to carry forward this \$9,432,685 balance.

Agenda Item 6 will request approval of the FY17 Planning and Outreach budgets. The proposed FY17 Planning Budget is \$4,556,019, and the proposed FY17 Outreach Budget is \$446,113, for a total budget request of \$5,002,132. If this request is approved, \$238,124 will remain in the CWPPRA Planning Program.

The CWPPRA Task Force has approved 210 projects. The 155 active projects include: 102 that have completed construction, 25 in Phase I, 23 in Phase II, and five technical support projects. The 55 inactive projects include: four that have been transferred, four that are in the ‘inactive’ category, and 47 that have been deauthorized.

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

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report/Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 26 (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The Technical Committee considered the preliminary costs and benefits of the 26th PPL project and demonstration project nominees listed below. The Technical Committee selected 10 candidate projects and three demonstration projects to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis.

Mr. Kevin Roy, USFWS, presented each of the PPL 26 nominee projects, providing the fully-funded cost and the net acres for each project. These projects are listed below.

| Region | Basin | PPL 26 Nominees | Agency |
|--------|---------------|--|----------|
| 1 | Pontchartrain | Bayou La Loutre Ridge and Marsh Restoration | NRCS/EPA |
| 1 | Pontchartrain | St. Catherine Island Marsh Creation & Shoreline Protection | USFWS |

| Region | Basin | PPL 26 Nominees | Agency |
|--------|------------------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Pontchartrain | North Shell Beach Marsh Creation | USACE/EPA |
| 2 | Barataria | Barataria Bay Waterway East Marsh Creation | NRCS |
| 2 | Barataria | Elmer's Island Backbarrier Marsh Creation | NMFS |
| 2 | Barataria | East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation | USFWS |
| 2 | Barataria | Grand Pierre Island Restoration | NMFS |
| 3 | Terrebonne | North Terrebonne Marsh Creation | EPA |
| 3 | Terrebonne | West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation and Terracing | NMFS |
| 3 | Terrebonne | Bayou DeCade Bankline and Marsh Restoration | NMFS |
| 3 | Terrebonne | Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion | NRCS |
| 3 | Teche-Vermilion | West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection | EPA/NRCS |
| 3 | Teche-Vermilion | Belle Isle Marsh Creation and Nourishment | NMFS |
| 4 | Calcasieu-Sabine | North Mud Lake Marsh Creation and Nourishment | NMFS |
| 4 | Calcasieu-Sabine | West Cove Bank Stabilization and Marsh Creation | EPA/USACE |
| 4 | Mermentau | East Pecan Island Marsh Creation | EPA/USACE |
| 4 | Mermentau | North Big Marsh Restoration | USFWS |
| | Coastwide | Southwest Louisiana Salvinia Weevil Propagation | USFWS |

| | PPL 26 Demonstration Project Nominees | Agency |
|------|---|--------|
| DEMO | Shore-links | NRCS |
| DEMO | Enhancing Restoration Transplant Survival via Stress Acclimation | TBD |
| DEMO | Sediment Accretion and Marsh Restoration Using Modified Reefblk Design | NRCS |
| DEMO | Ecobale Containment Barrier for Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation | USACE |
| DEMO | Novel Techniques for the Efficient Use of Spoil Material in the Backfilling of Canals | EPA |

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

Mr. Wingate thanked Mr. Roy for the presentation. He recognized that the project evaluations require a significant amount of work from the Environmental and Engineering Work Groups, and thanked everyone that participated in that process. He noted that approximately 80 projects were narrowed down to this list of 23.

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

Ms. Nedra Davis, Chenier Plain Authority, thanked the Technical Committee and Task Force for working with the local parishes throughout the PPL process. The Chenier Plain Authority supports all of the Teche-Vermilion, Mermentau, and Calcasieu-Sabine projects.

Mr. Randy Moertle, Rainey Conservation Alliance, stated that there are 18 projects and one coastwide project. Mr. Moertle stated that coastwide projects should not be grouped with the other, basin-specific projects. The Southwest Louisiana Salvinia Weevil Propagation coastwide project is forecast to cost \$5 million, which is more than the approximately \$1 million cost of demonstration projects, but significantly less than traditional, basin-specific projects, which have costs in the \$20 to 30 million range. Of the traditional projects, 17 of the 18 projects are marsh creation projects. Marsh creation projects have the most easily-quantifiable benefits, but the coastwide project is low-cost and would be useful throughout the state. He proposed that the Technical Committee either vote to recommend approval of eleven projects or to vote upon the coastwide project separately from the traditional projects. If this cannot occur for PPL 26, he requested that the process be changed in the future so that coastwide projects could be voted on

separately going forward, similar to how demonstration projects are currently handled. Mr. Moertle stressed that Giant Salvinia is a serious issue. Shade from the Giant Salvinia precludes the growth of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV), and south winds deposit large sections of the plant atop marsh, smothering and killing the marsh and resulting in unproductive mudflats and open water. Giant Salvinia are worse than water hyacinths; it cannot easily be killed with an herbicide and the weevil is the only cost-effective solution. The landowners support this project. Mr. Moertle noted that the entire project will cost less than the Phase I E&D of its competitors. Mr. Clark responded that the Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee reviewed the idea of having a separate category for “small projects” and decided against it. He suggested that it could be discussed after the vote if an eleventh project would be appropriate in the case that this project does not make it into the top ten. Mr. Hartman disagreed because the biologists and other staff within the Environmental Work Group have the ability to evaluate the project, regardless of the costs. Although he acknowledged that it is more difficult to determine benefits for certain types of projects, he disagreed with having either a separate category and with the precedent of allowing an extra project.

Mr. Ralph Libersat, Vermilion Parish, thanked CWPPRA for attending the briefing meeting with the Chenier Plain Authority. Vermilion Parish is very lucky to have four project nominees this year, two in the Teche-Vermilion Basin and two in the Mermentau Basin. The Vermilion Parish Police Jury supports all four of these projects. The West Vermilion Shoreline Protection Project is a high priority because it helps support the Vermilion Bay rim, but all of the projects are good and they would appreciate votes on any and all of the projects that support Vermilion Parish. Mr. Libersat echoed Mr. Moertle’s concern regarding the infestation of Giant Salvinia. He noted that when the CWPPRA Program first started, a \$5 million project was a large project; \$5 million projects can produce good results.

Mr. Todd Baker, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF), stated that his agency has evaluated all of the projects based on providing the best wildlife habitat and opportunities for hunting and fishing resources. LDWF’s top ten priorities are: Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion, Elmer’s Island Backbarrier Marsh Creation, West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection, North Terrebonne Marsh Creation, Barataria Bay Waterway East Marsh Creation, Bayou DeCade Bankline and Marsh Restoration, Grand Pierre Island Restoration, West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation and Terracing, East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation, and Southwest Louisiana Salvinia Weevil Propagation. Mr. Baker noted that the Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion Project is a novel idea that uses existing infrastructure, is coordinated with the local government, and is in an area where it would be very difficult to construct a traditional marsh creation project. The Elmer’s Island Project is synergistic with existing projects in that area. The back barrier marsh will create outstanding opportunities for recreational fisheries. The West Vermilion Marsh Creation Project will preserve a lot of shallow water habitat and create nesting habitat for several species of concern.

Ms. Carol Giardina, Lake Catherine Civic Association, announced her agency’s support for the St. Catherine Island Marsh Creation & Shoreline Protection Project. After the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, the Lake Catherine Civic Association has developed a strong passion for coastal wetlands. This project not only helps protect wetland habitat, but also protects a hurricane evacuation route.

Mr. Guy McInnis, St. Bernard Parish President, expressed his support for the Bayou La Loutre Ridge and Marsh Restoration Project. He added that he personally supports every project and wishes there was enough funding to construct them all. The Bayou LaLoutre Project will protect the very existence of St. Bernard Parish and one of the largest producing estuaries in the United States.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, stated that Jefferson Parish's top priority is the Barataria Bay Waterway East Marsh Creation Project. This project would use the Long Distance Mississippi River Sediment Pipeline (BA-43) and will protect Lafitte, Barataria, and Crown Point. Jefferson Parish also supports the Grand Pierre and Elmer's Island projects.

Ms. Amanda Voisin, Lafourche Parish Government, thanked everyone who voted for the two Lafourche Parish projects in the coastwide electronic vote. She emphasized that these two projects, West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation and Terracing and East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation, are priorities for the Parish and that they would protect the unelevated portion of LA 1 between Golden Meadow and Leeville and the only land access route to Port Fouchon.

Mr. Robert Spears, Plaquemines Parish, spoke in support of the Grand Pierre Island Restoration Project. This project would finish the barrier island chain that was started 15 years ago. Plaquemines Parish also supports Bayou La Loutre Ridge and Marsh Restoration to the east and Barataria Bay Waterway East Marsh Creation to the west. Mr. Spears expressed hope that projects could be chosen in the Breton Sound Basin in the next PPL.

Mr. Jason Smith, Jefferson Parish, echoed Ms. Winters' comments. He emphasized the use of the Long Distance Sediment Pipeline for the Barataria Bay Waterway Project and noted that creating land between Bayou Dupont and the Barataria Ridge will work synergistically with other projects. He also supported the Elmer's Island Project because it would protect the hurricane evaluation route from Grand Isle.

The Technical Committee proceeded to vote for the PPL 26 candidate projects.

Mr. Inman announced the voting results. The top ten projects were:

- East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation
- St. Catherine Island Marsh Creation & Shoreline Protection
- Bayou DeCade Bankline and Marsh Restoration
- North Mud Lake Marsh Creation and Nourishment
- Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion
- Bayou La Loutre Ridge and Marsh Restoration
- West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation and Terracing
- Southwest Louisiana Salvinia Weevil Propagation
- Elmer's Island Backbarrier Marsh Creation
- East Pecan Island Marsh Creation

The voting results were:

| Region | Basin | Type | Project | COE | EPA | FWS | NMFS | NRCS | State | No. of votes | Sum of Point Score |
|--------|-------|-------|--|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------------|
| 2 | BA | MC | East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation | 3 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 3 | | 5 | 28 |
| 1 | PO | MC/SP | St. Catherine Island Marsh Creation & Shoreline Protection | 10 | | 10 | | 9 | 4 | 4 | 33 |
| 3 | TE | MC | Bayou DeCade Bankline and Marsh Restoration | | | 8 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 28 |
| 4 | CS | MC | North Mud Lake Marsh Creation and Nourishment | | 1 | 7 | 10 | | 10 | 4 | 28 |
| 3 | TE | FD | Bayou Terrebonne Freshwater Diversion | | 6 | 2 | | 10 | 8 | 4 | 26 |
| 1 | PO | MC | Bayou La Loutre Ridge and Marsh Restoration | 9 | 3 | | | 7 | 6 | 4 | 25 |
| 3 | TE | MC/TR | West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation and Terracing | 8 | | 4 | 9 | | 3 | 4 | 24 |
| 0 | CW | 0 | Southwest Louisiana Salvinia Weevil Propagation | 1 | | 6 | 5 | 6 | | 4 | 18 |
| 2 | BA | MC | Elmer's Island Backbarrier Marsh Creation | | 5 | 5 | 1 | | 5 | 4 | 16 |
| 4 | ME | MC | East Pecan Island Marsh Creation | 2 | 4 | | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| 3 | TV | SP/MC | West Vermilion Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection | 5 | 10 | | | 8 | | 3 | 23 |
| 2 | BA | BI | Grand Pierre Island Restoration | | | 1 | 7 | | 9 | 3 | 17 |
| 2 | BA | MC | Barataria Bay Waterway East Marsh Creation | 4 | | | | 4 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| 4 | CS | MC | West Cove Bank Stabilization and Marsh Creation | 6 | 2 | | | 1 | | 3 | 9 |
| 4 | Me | MC | North Big Marsh Restoration | | | 3 | 3 | 2 | | 3 | 8 |
| 1 | PO | MC | North Shell Beach Marsh Creation | 7 | 8 | | | | | 2 | 15 |
| 3 | TE | MC | North Terrebonne Marsh Creation | | 9 | | | | | 1 | 9 |
| 3 | TV | MC | Belle Isle Marsh Creation and Nourishment | | | | 4 | | | 1 | 4 |

Notes: - Projects are sorted (1) "No. of Votes" (2) "Sum of Point Score"

Mr. Inman noted that some projects ranked eleventh or lower received a higher score but received votes from fewer agencies. Mr. Moertle asked if an eleventh project could be considered but Mr. Hartman was not supportive due to the fixed Planning budget.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the top ten projects listed for Phase 0 analysis. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

The Technical Committee proceeded to vote for the PPL 26 demonstration projects.

Mr. Brad Inman announced the voting results. The top three projects were:

- Shore-links
- Ecobale Containment Barrier for Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation

- Enhancing Restoration Transplant Survival via Stress Acclimation

The voting results were:

| Project | COE | EPA | FWS | NMFS | NRCS | State | No. of votes | Sum of Point Score |
|---|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------------|
| Shore-links | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 14 |
| Ecobale Shoreline Protection | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 4 | 8 |
| Enhancing Restoration Transplant Survival via Stress Acclimation | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Novel Techniques for the Efficient Use of Spoil Material in the Backfilling of Canals | | 2 | | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Sediment Accretion and Marsh Restoration Using Modified Reefblk Design | 2 | | | | 2 | | 2 | 4 |
| <i>Notes: - Projects are sorted (1) "No. of Votes" (2) "Sum of Point Score"</i> | | | | | | | | |

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to approve the top three demonstration projects listed for Phase 0 analysis. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

5. Agenda Item 4. Report/Decision: Upcoming 20-Year Life Projects (Brad Inman, USACE). The project sponsors presented recommended paths forward for projects nearing the end of their 20-year lives. The Technical Committee voted on recommendations to the Task Force regarding these projects.

Mr. Inman announced that the CWPPRA Program has several projects that are approaching the end of their 20-year project life. The P&E Subcommittee has evaluated these projects against the end-of-life decision matrix and grouped them into three categories for consideration by the Technical Committee and Task Force.

- a. Projects requesting approval for project closeout with no additional cost increase:

| | | | |
|-------|--|------|-----------|
| CS-24 | Perry Ridge Shore Protection | NRCS | Feb 2019 |
| TE-26 | Lake Chapeau Sediment Input & Hydrologic Restoration | NMFS | May 2019 |
| TE-20 | Isles Dernieres East Island | EPA | June 2019 |
| TE-24 | Isles Dernieres Trinity Island | EPA | June 2019 |
| TV-12 | Little Vermilion Bay Sediment Trapping | NFMS | Aug 2019 |
| TE-27 | Whiskey Island Restoration | EPA | June 2020 |

Mr. Inman announced that the first category includes projects that are within five years of completion and are recommended for project closeout with no additional costs. This process is used to better manage Program funds.

Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, presented information on the Perry Ridge Shore Protection (CS-24) Project. The 20-year project life will end on February 15, 2019, which is in less than three years.

The project is located north of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) between the Vinton Drainage Canal and Perry Ridge in Calcasieu Parish. The project consisted of 23,000 linear feet of rock dike on the north bank of the GIWW and has resulted in a gain of approximately 2.3 feet per year. In comparison, the reference area experienced loss of 3.2 feet per year. The project has been stable and has not required any maintenance events, although there may be a minor O&M event as a result of barge damage to a dike. There is \$398,894 remaining in the budget, which will be spent on the maintenance event and final reporting. Any unspent funds will be returned to the Program.

Mr. Brad Crawford, EPA, presented information on three barrier island restoration projects: PPL 1 Isle Dernieres East Island (TE-20), PPL 2 Isles Dernieres Trinity Island (TE-24), and PPL 3 Whiskey Island Restoration (TE-27). TE-20 was completed in June 1999 and cost \$8.7 million. TE-24 was completed in 1999, cost \$10.7 million, and has required no maintenance events. TE-27 was completed in 1999, cost \$7 million, and will reach the end of its project life on June 15, 2020.

Ms. Cecelia Linder, NMFS, presented information on the Little Vermilion Bay Sediment Trapping (TV-12) and Lake Chapeau Sediment Input & Hydrologic Restoration (TE-26) projects. TV-12 was completed in September 1999, with project closeout anticipated on September 20, 2019. It consists of 68 acres of terracing with plantings at the confluence of Little Vermilion Bay and Freshwater Bayou Canal and cost slightly under \$1 million. The project has been successful at trapping sediments. There have been no significant O&M events and there is \$154,899 remaining in the budget. The landowners, including Mr. Moertle, have performed some plantings on the mudflats that developed. NMFS expects that the remaining funding will not be spent and that it will be returned to the Program. TE-26 is located on Point au Fer Island at the base of the Atchafalaya Bay. It was also completed in 1999. It consisted of several components, including marsh creation and rock weirs. The project has met most of its goals, although documenting the hydrologic benefits of the weirs has been difficult. The project has required several maintenance events. The O&M budget has \$853,318 remaining, and it is currently unclear if this will need to be spent on additional maintenance prior to closeout.

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

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

Mr. Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, thanked Ms. Linder for showing photographs of the mudflats that have developed as a result of terracing on the Little Vermilion Bay Sediment Trapping Project. He asked if there would be an evaluation of individual project features prior to project closeout to determine how well each feature worked prior to removing something due to liability concerns. He requested transparency throughout the process so that the public and landowners could understand what information goes into making these decisions. Mr. Hartman responded that Federal and State sponsors do not make project closeout decisions without talking to the project landowner. There is a procedure to document project benefits and determine if a project should be extended beyond 20 years. The Environmental and Engineering Work Groups evaluate the benefits and use the Monitoring reports, which are available online, to support the

decision to move a project forward. Mr. Courville stated that other members of the public, including landowners for other projects, would also be interested in knowing whether or not a project was successful. Mr. Hartman and Ms. Linder added that CPRA’s annual inspection reports and incremental O&M reports are published on www.lacoast.gov and show details of project success.

Mr. Ralph Libersat, Vermilion Parish, stated that the Little Vermilion Bay Project is important to Vermilion Parish. In his view, it has been successful and he encouraged the Technical Committee to consider extending it beyond its original 20-year life instead of closing it. The Parish would like to see additional projects in this area that focus on narrowing the opening between Freshwater Bayou and Little Vermilion Bay, and would hate to see the good work that has been achieved with this project disappear in the future without proper maintenance. Mr. Inman noted that these projects have project closeout dates in 2019 and beyond. The public will have opportunities to comment throughout the process. The Federal and State agencies are discussing project disposition with landowners, so they should be aware of the project’s status. Mr. Inman also noted that the CWPPRA Program is currently only authorized until 2019, and, in the event that CWPPRA is not reauthorized, extending a project another 20 years into the future would be moot. Mr. Libersat stated that he is optimistic about the future of the CWPPRA Program and that Vermilion Parish Police Jury will provide letters of support for project extension.

Mr. Clark asked Ms. Linder about maintenance events for the Little Vermilion Bay Project. Ms. Linder responded that the total project cost has been less than \$1 million and that has included little to no O&M. Most of the cost was for bucket dredges to create the terraces. She added that boat traffic and wakes on Freshwater Bayou have caused erosion to the terraces closest to that opening. The State considered placing rock along Freshwater Bayou to prevent damage to the project, but ultimately this was not implemented because it was outside of the project’s original scope. Ms. Linder and Mr. Hartman agreed to arrange discussions between the project team, the State, and Vermilion Parish to discuss the path forward. Mr. Clark reiterated that this is a very early path forward and a final decision will not be made for approximately three years. Mr. Hartman clarified that the State and NMFS are recommending project closeout at this time, but, even if the Technical Committee agrees and votes on this recommendation to the Task Force, the decision has the potential to be reversed. Mr. Paul confirmed that the projects will be moving forward towards project closeout in 2019.

b. Projects requesting approval for early project closeout with no additional cost increase:

| | | | |
|-------|--|------|-----------|
| TE-30 | East Timbalier Island, Ph 2 | NMFS | Jan 2020 |
| TE-25 | East Timbalier Island, Ph 1 | NMFS | May 2021 |
| BA-28 | Vegetative Plantings on Grand Terre Island | NMFS | July 2021 |
| PO-27 | Chandeleur Islands Marsh Restoration | NMFS | July 2021 |

Mr. Inman explained the process of early closeout with no additional costs.

Ms. Linder presented information on the four projects recommended for early closeout with no additional costs. The two East Timbalier Projects, TE-25 and TE-30, were constructed at the

same time. Material was pumped to create a dune and marsh environment, which was fronted with 9,250 feet of stone riprap and sand fencing. The project originally did not have an O&M budget and had only a modest Monitoring budget. These projects constituted one of the first barrier island restorations completed in the area. The original fill area and rock features are now underwater. The project has been closed fiscally for over five years, and there are no plans for additional monitoring events. Due to the nature of the project, the 2012 Monitoring Report will suffice as a final monitoring report. The project did not meet its goals and serves as lessons learned for barrier island restoration.

The BA-28 and PO-27 projects were both completed in 2001 and consisted primarily of vegetative plantings. The BA-28 project included the removal of 20 feral goats and 70 feral cows in addition to vegetative plantings. Monitoring was only performed in three years, 2001, 2002, and 2003. The plantings were moderately successful in those years, and, at this point, it would be difficult to distinguish between natural cover and the vegetative plantings. The project did not have any O&M funds, and the total Monitoring cost was under \$100,000. NMFS fiscally closed the project in 2011 using the 2004 Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring (OM&M) report.

The PO-27 project included marsh restoration and cordgrass plantings in multiple overwash fans. The cover was productive in the first growing season; however, it is now an open water area, due in part to the large number of storm events between 2002 and 2005. There were no O&M funds planned for the project, Monitoring funds have all been expended, and the project was fiscally closed in September 2009.

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

Mr. Clark asked Ms. Linder if the rock features built through the TE-25 and TE-30 projects cause a navigation hazard. Ms. Linder responded that the rock features are marked on navigational charts as a breakwater but the average is about eight to nine feet underwater. Mr. Hartman added that at mean low water level, the highest CWPPRA rock structure is approximately 5.3 feet underwater.

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

Mr. Courville thanked Ms. Linder for her presentation and added that this was the type of information he was seeking in the previous category.

c. Projects requesting approval for extension:

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|------|----------|
| TV-04 | Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration | NRCS | Dec 2018 |
|-------|-------------------------------------|------|----------|

Mr. Inman explained the process of project extension.

Ms. Cindy Steyer, NRCS, presented information on the Cote Blanche Hydrologic Restoration (TV-04) Project, which was recommended for extension. The TV-04 project consisted of nine rock and/or steel piling weirs with barge bays, 5,910 linear feet of foreshore wall sections, and 3,500 linear feet of foreshore rock dike. It will reach the end of its 20-year life on December 15, 2018. The project has performed very well but has included multiple maintenance events

between 2001 and 2015. The total cost of the project, including the five O&M events, is approximately \$10 million. There is just under \$100,000 remaining in the project budget. The project is located in interior deep peat marsh in a system with a tremendous amount of sediment available but is susceptible to substantial wave and tidal impact. The goals of the project were to protect the southern shoreline, reduce the channel openings to moderate water level variability in the project area, and restore the historic low-energy hydrologic regime to help reduce the interior loss. Monitoring has shown that the project was successful soon after implementation, but experienced significant losses in 2002 following Hurricane Lili and again in 2005 after Hurricane Rita. Following these tropical events, the project returned to being successful.

Even including the losses from storms, the project has met its goals. Over the first 15 years of the project life, the area has lost a total of 90 acres. Even with the hurricane losses, the average loss has been reduced from 73 acres per year to 6 acres per year. The project cost-efficiency is approximately \$7,533 per net acre, which is very efficient compared to the average of \$89,000 per net acre for similar projects on PPLs 18-25. A project extension would sustain land-building capacity, facilitate recovery after storm events, and continue to protect the shoreline. NRCS recommends a formal evaluation of a 20-year extension for this project. The current cost estimate for another 20 years of maintenance is \$11.5 million.

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

Mr. Clark stated that the presentation was very good and that the analysis of monitoring results was very informative. He reiterated this is the beginning of the closeout process and the project must still be reviewed by the Environmental and Engineering Work Groups. Ms. Steyer added that the ponds within the project area that have been filling in are approximately 300 to 400 acres.

Mr. Hartman asked if the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups would need to take field trips to evaluate this project for extension. Ms. Steyer answered affirmatively. Mr. Paul added that the Work Groups would evaluate the project in the fall and report back to the Technical Committee with a formal recommendation in one year. Ms. Steyer added that current 20-year project life will be complete in December 2018.

Mr. Wingate asked about the next steps for a project extension. Mr. Inman responded that this project will be evaluated by the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups, and may also receive input from the Academic Advisory Group. There will likely be a field visit to the project site. Once the Work Groups review the project, they will make a recommendation as an agenda item at a Technical Committee Meeting, where there will be a vote to recommend formal extension, assuming that there is value to extending the project for an additional 20 years. If the Task Force approves that recommendation, approximately \$11 million will be added to the 'Current Approved' budget category. Mr. Hartman clarified and only three years' worth of O&M would be subtracted from the Construction budget upon approval. Mr. Paul responded that NRCS feels that project extension would be very cost-effective, but the formal evaluation will determine if extension is warranted. Mr. Wingate asked for clarification about whether the recommendation would move forward to the Task Force prior to formal evaluation. Mr. Clark confirmed that the Task Force would give their approval prior to a formal evaluation.

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

Mr. Ralph Libersat, Vermilion Parish, stated that TV-04 fits well within the Parish's strategy to protect Vermilion Bay. The project features both shoreline protection and structures. If this project were proposed today, Mr. Libersat expressed doubt that it would be approved, but the project has been very successful and Vermilion Parish would like to see similar shoreline protection projects implemented.

Mr. Chad Courville, Miami Corporation, asked if the estimate includes funds for Monitoring. Ms. Steyer responded that the preliminary estimate shows only the O&M costs associated with the structures, as well as some funding for administration and associated costs. Recently, monitoring has been funded through the Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS). This project previously had some project-specific monitoring, but it would need to be discussed if that is still appropriate if the project moves forward with extension.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the path forward for projects requesting project closeout with no additional cost increases. 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 approve the path forward for projects requesting early project closeout with no additional cost increase. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve a formal evaluation for project extension for the Cost Blanche Hydrologic Restoration (TV-04) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

6. Agenda Item 5. Decision: FY16 Planning Budget Revision (Darryl Clark, USFWS). *The CWPPRA Planning budget did not specifically state that planning funds can be used for training purposes, yet CWPPRA-related training is a necessary part of program management. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to add a "Training-Conference-Workshops" task to the FY 2016 CWPPRA Planning budget and future budgets. This task could be listed under the "Project and Program Management Tasks." The new task would be listed as "PM 25150 Program Management - Training, Conferences, and Workshops, in Support of CWPPRA Program Management."*

Mr. Clark explained that the recommendation is to add a budget line item for training, conference, and workshops. He added that CWPPRA has already been funding these events, but the funds were taken from the Program Management budget. The proposal does not add to the FY16 budget, but instead will create a new budget line item that can receive funds transferred from other categories, as appropriate. This would also be continued for FY17 and into the future. Mr. Wingate asked about the size of the allocation for this line item. Mr. Clark responded that it is not a budget increase and individual agencies will be free to transfer funds from other

categories to this new category, as needed. USFWS would likely transfer a few thousand dollars from Program Management. Mr. Clark added that one of the CWPPRA agencies received a budget inspection several years ago and that the inspector general could not find specific language for training, conferences, and workshops in the budget.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the addition of a “Program Management: Training, Conferences, & Workshops” line item to the FY 2016 CWPPRA Planning budget and future budgets. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 6. FY17 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 27 Process, and Presentation of FY17 Outreach Budget (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Brad Inman, USACE). The P&E Subcommittee presented their recommended FY17 Planning Program Budget development, including the PPL 27 Process.

a. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the PPL 27 Process, which will include selecting four nominees in the Barataria and Terrebonne Basins; three nominees in the Breton Sound and Pontchartrain Basins; two nominees in the Mermentau, Calcasieu-Sabine, and Teche-Vermilion Basins; and one nominee in the Atchafalaya Basin and Coastwide. The Technical Committee also voted on adding language to the PPL Process concerning project area overlap at Regional Planning Team (RPT) meetings.

Mr. Inman explained that breakdown of nominees per basin will remain the same during the PPL 27 Coastwide Voting process.

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

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

b. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY17 Outreach Committee Budget in the amount of \$446,113.

Mr. Scott Wilson, CWPPRA Outreach, noted that the request is the same amount as last year’s request. This budget covers Outreach staff, *WaterMarks*, dedications, and special projects. He also announced that there is a new Outreach Coordinator, Mr. Drew Walker. Mr. Walker’s clearances are still pending and there will be an official announcement to introduce him at the May 2016 Task Force Meeting.

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

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

c. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY17 Planning Budget (including the Outreach Committee Budget) in the amount of \$5,002,132.

Ms. Cheavis explained that this recommendation includes both PPL 26 and 27 tasks, including analysis of the candidate projects, as well as project and program management tasks and supplements to the planning and evaluation tasks. This amount also encompasses the previously approved Outreach budget. Mr. Clark noted that it will also include the new, recently approved training category.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the PPL 27 Process as presented. 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 approve the FY17 Outreach Committee Budget in the amount of \$446,113. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the FY17 Planning Budget, which includes the Outreach Committee Budget, in the amount of \$5,002,132. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 7. Decision: Request for Approval to Initiate the Transfer of the PPL 20 – Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation Project (CS-53) to the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority (Britt Paul, NRCS). By letter dated 16 November 2015 from the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority to the Task Force, the Chenier Plain Authority formally requested that the Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation Project be transferred to them in lieu of deauthorization. The Technical Committee voted to recommend that the Task Force approve transfer of Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation (CS-53) Project to the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority.

Mr. Paul explained that the Technical Committee previously voted to move forward with deauthorization of the CS-53 project, but that the Chenier Plain Authority has since requested a formal transfer. NRCS approves of the transfer.

Mr. Inman stated that the transfer of the project has been available for public comment. The public comment period will close on April 11, 2016, and there had not been any comments. Mr.

Inman added that if comments are received, they will be sent to the Technical Committee immediately and that the vote can be rescinded, if necessary.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the final transfer of the Kelso Bayou Marsh Creation (CS-53) Project to the Chenier Plain Coastal Restoration and Protection Authority. Mr. Haase seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 8. Additional Agenda Items (Mark Wingate, USACE).

There were no additional agenda items.

10. Agenda Item 9. Request for Public Comments (Mark Wingate, USACE).

There were no public comments.

11. Agenda Item 10. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE). *The Task Force meeting will be held May 12, 2016 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Habitats and Fisheries Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana.*

Mr. Inman announced that there will be a Task Force meeting on May 12, 2016 in Lafayette, LA. It will be Colonel Richard Hansen's last meeting as the Task Force leader as he will be deployed to Afghanistan.

12. Agenda Item 11. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE).

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|
| May 12, 2016 | 9:30 a.m. | Task Force | Lafayette |
| September 14, 2016 | 9:30 a.m. | Technical Committee | Baton Rouge |
| October 19, 2016 | 9:30 a.m. | Task Force | New Orleans |
| December 7, 2016 | 9:30 a.m. | Technical Committee | Baton Rouge |

13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Hartman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clark seconded. Mr. Wingate adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.