

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 11 September 2014 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
Mr. Troy Constance, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman
Mr. Bren Haase, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)
Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mr. Rick Hartman, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

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

2. Mr. Constance introduced himself and announced that he is the acting Deputy for Programs and Project Management for the New Orleans USACE. He welcomed everyone and thanked them for their continued interest in coastal restoration in Louisiana. He reminded everyone that today is September 11 and asked everyone to keep the victims of the 2001 terror attacks in their hearts and minds. Mr. Constance asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves and asked for any opening remarks.

Mr. Constance reviewed the rules for public participation. He asked that anyone who would like to make a public comment only comment on the agenda item being discussed, use the microphone, introduce themselves, and state their affiliation if they are representing any type of organization. He asked that everyone sign in to the meeting.

Mr. Constance opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee regarding the agenda. There was no discussion by members of 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 (Susan Mabry, USACE). Ms. Mabry provided an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding in the Planning and Construction Programs.

Ms. Susan Mabry, USACE, presented an overview of the CWPPRA funds. The total estimate for the fully funded costs for PPL 1-23 projects is \$2.3 billion, including both approved and unapproved phases. Funding received to-date totals \$2.1 billion. The total for currently approved phases is \$1.6 billion, with \$1.4 billion funded for Phases I & II.

Ms. Mabry reported that CWPPRA had \$22.9 million in available funding as of September 2014. Today's agenda includes several requests for funding increases, deauthorizations, and inactivations, which could impact the budget; if all agenda items are approved, the available funding will decrease to \$7.6 million.

CWPPRA has 200 projects. The 150 active projects include 101 constructed, 31 in Phase I, and 18 in Phase II. Additionally, CWPPRA has deauthorized 43 projects, transferred four, and placed three in the inactive category.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if there would be funds returned to the Program from projects that are on the agenda for deauthorization or inactivation. Ms. Mabry responded affirmatively.

Mr. Clark asked if the Phase II projects included both those that have received construction funds and those that have just requested them. Ms. Mabry responded that Phase II projects include all projects approved for construction.

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

4. Agenda Item 3. Report/Decision: Status of Unconstructed Projects (Brad Inman, USACE). The Planning & Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee reported on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects as well as projects recommended for deauthorization, inactivation, or transfer.

Mr. Brad Inman reported on the status of unconstructed CWPPRA projects, as well as projects recommended for de-authorization, inactivation, or transfer. The Federal sponsor for each project provided project details. These projects are presented below.

- a. Unconstructed project recommended by the project team to deauthorize:
 - Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection (ME-24), USACE
- b. Unconstructed project requested by the project team to inactivate:
 - Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection (PO-34), NRCS

Mr. Inman reported that the spreadsheets in the Technical Committee's binders show all of the unconstructed projects with their statuses. The USACE is the federal sponsor for the Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection (ME-24) Project. The USACE offered to transfer this project to the EPA, but further discussion and analysis by the Engineering Work Group revealed that the costs have increased significantly. Therefore, the USACE recommends deauthorization of this project.

Mr. Inman reminded the public that the inactivation category was established for projects that have completed 95% design. Mr. Paul reported that the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection (PO-34) Project has been nominated for funding several times and has not

been funded. However, it could be built if funding becomes available. Mr. Inman reported that the P&E Subcommittee recommends inactivation for this project.

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

Mr. Clark asked about the magnitude of the cost increase for ME-24. Ms. McCormick stated that the costs increased due to the EPA's inability to use the USACE Freshwater Bayou Canal maintenance dredging cycles. Additionally, further analysis of the soils called into question the constructability of the project.

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

DECISION: Ms. McCormick made a motion to recommend that the Task Force deauthorize the Southwest Louisiana Gulf Shoreline Nourishment and Protection (ME-24) Project and inactivate the Alligator Bend Marsh Restoration and Shoreline Protection (PO-34) Project. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision: Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) Update (Allison Murry, USACE). In January 2014, the P&E Subcommittee started an intensive clean-up and update of the CWPPRA SOP. The Technical Committee will consider and vote to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the requested changes.

Ms. Allison Murry reported that the P&E Subcommittee has been updating the SOP, which is now complete. The complete version has been sent to the Technical Committee for review, and no comments were received.

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

Mr. Clark congratulated Ms. Murry and said that they did a good job with the update.

Mr. Constance 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 approve the requested changes to the SOP. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

6. Agenda Item 5. Report/Decision: Upcoming 20-Year Life Projects (Britt Paul, NRCS). The project sponsors presented recommended path forwards. The Technical Committee voted on recommendations to the Task Force regarding the CWPPRA projects that are approaching the end of their 20 year life.

Project No.	Project Name	Agency	Const. Complete	20YL
ME-04	Freshwater Bayou Wetland Protection	NRCS	Mar-95	Mar-15
ME-13	Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization	NRCS	Feb-98	Mar-18

Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, presented the recommended path forward for the Freshwater Bayou Wetland Protection (ME-04) and Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization (ME-13) Projects. The ME-04 and ME-13 projects are currently in position to begin their paths through the 20-year life decision matrix. The project team evaluated the various options: extension, transfer, and close out with or without removal of project features. The project team would like to pursue project extension for both of these projects. The project team has prepared preliminary assessments of the risks and liabilities of the projects and cost estimates for continuing maintenance versus project removal. At this point, NRCS is requesting approval to proceed through the 20-Year Life Decision Matrix to Boxes C-3 and C-4 for project extension, which would entail presenting the preliminary evaluation to the Task Force and requesting Task Force approval to perform a more detailed analysis of costs and benefits.

Mr. Kinler reported that the ME-04 Project is a shoreline protection project along the west bank of Freshwater Bayou Canal. The goal of the project was to reduce bank erosion. It consists of 28,000 linear feet of foreshore rock dike and was constructed in 1995. The 20-year life includes three maintenance events, in 2002, 2005, and 2015 (planned). Without the project, the area experienced erosion at a rate of 7.5 feet per year. Over 20 years, that would have amounted to a loss of 96 acres. With the project in place, the area has only lost 20 acres; this loss rate includes times when the project had settled and needed maintenance. The total cost of the project, including the planned 2015 maintenance event, is approximately \$6 million, giving it a cost effectiveness of \$80,000 per acre. This is slightly more cost effective than projects that have been approved by CWPPRA over the past five years.

This project will require maintenance for the benefits to continue. In areas where the dike has subsided, monitoring data from 2009 to 2014 shows that the erosion rate increases from 0.6 feet per year to 3.5 feet per year, indicating that the project is successful when it is maintained. Continued maintenance, consisting of two maintenance events, will cost \$3.5 million over 20 years, with a cost effectiveness of \$47,000 per acre. NRCS has not been able to find another entity willing to accept transfer of the project. If the project is removed, the erosion rate will increase and the area will experience greater loss. Project removal would cost \$13.4 million, yielding a total project cost of \$19.4 million. If the project is closed but features are not removed, the erosion rate will start low due to the 2015 maintenance event but will increase over time, and the project will have an estimated loss rate of five to seven feet per year at the end of Year 40. The erosion rates are estimated based on monitoring data for sections of the project that have settled versus those that have not settled, but if the Task Force allows the project team to research project extension then the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups will need to review the assumptions and calculations in detail.

Due to the similarity of the two projects, the Technical Committee agreed to forego a presentation on ME-13. Mr. Kinler noted that ME-13 is further north on the west side of Freshwater Bayou Canal.

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

The Technical Committee and Mr. Kinler discussed the appropriate erosion rates that should be used in this calculation and how long the benefits of the project would continue in the absence of maintenance. Mr. Constance asked if the project would return to the original erosion rates 15 years after the last maintenance event. Mr. Kinler stated that if CWPPRA stopped maintaining the project at Year 20, by Year 40 the project would be in a similar condition compared to when the project was constructed.

Mr. Clark stated that the Program will not be removing the rock because it should not cause a significant navigation or public safety hazard. A realistic comparison would be continued maintenance versus no maintenance but leaving the rock in place. Based on USFWS calculations, project extension will only save 19 acres over the next 20 years, which leads to a cost effectiveness of almost \$200,000 per acre. Mr. Kinler reminded the Committee that when NRCS requested funds for maintenance two years ago, they were questioned about the soundness of maintaining a project that might be removed at the end of its 20-year life anyway. Therefore, the basis of comparing continued maintenance to project removal was from the Committee. Mr. Clark acknowledged that some Committee members have discussed removal of project features.

Mr. Kinler discussed the difference between analyzing project extensions as 40-year projects versus only looking at Years 21-40 in isolation. If ME-04 is analyzed as a 40-year project, the net acres are over 150 and the cost is \$63,000 per acre. If maintenance is not continued, it is still a good project, with net acres of 132 and a cost effectiveness of \$45,000 per acre, but at Year 40 the project would no longer be in good condition and the area would be experiencing land loss. CWPPRA has been approving projects in the \$70,000 to \$100,000 per acre cost effectiveness range.

Mr. Constance clarified that, at some point, land loss will resume. All projects will eventually stop producing benefits. The Program should focus on those projects that are performing well and still providing benefits with good cost effectiveness. With a limited budget, the Program should focus on maximizing investments in dollars per acre. Mr. Kinler noted that, if the project stabilizes, it may not need the \$3 million in maintenance, but the project team does not know if or when the project will stabilize.

Mr. Constance added that, related to the risks and navigational hazards, actual ownership of the placement of the rock cannot be stated with certainty and CWPPRA does not fully understand all of the impacts to public safety of leaving the rock in place. Mr. Kinler agreed.

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

Mr. Randy Moertle spoke as a representative of the Rainey Conservation Alliance, a consortium of landowners in the Freshwater Bayou area. Mr. Moertle noted that the rocks do not subside so much as they roll over due to bigger, faster traffic in the navigation channel. The project was built with rock from Wax Lake to save money, but that rock was not big enough for this purpose. Maintenance events have replaced the Wax Lake rock with larger, more appropriate rock for this type of project and location. When the rock is placed close to or on the bank, the rock does not move and does not erode. The Parish is planning to spend Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) monies to create marsh directly behind the rock to stabilize it. Additionally, the 2014

Water Resources Reform and Development Act authorized deepening of the Acadiana to the Gulf Access Channel, which would provide an opportunity to place spoil material on the channel banks. With this project providing a good rock containment system, the spoil material will create marsh. Freshwater Bayou is Vermilion Parish's bleeding artery, and it is eating the parish from the inside out. Mr. Constance asked Mr. Moertle if he was suggesting that the erosion rate is higher now than when the project was built. Mr. Moertle clarified that the erosion rate will be higher if the project is not maintained due to the increased wakes of the vessel traffic. The channel was originally 125 feet wide and is now over 1,000 feet wide in some places. Mr. Constance noted that the Engineering Work Group may want to look into this assertion because if it can be proven it would change the benefit calculations. Mr. Moertle added that Ducks Unlimited is also investigating placing spoil material behind the rocks on the lower end of ME-04.

Mr. Ralph Libersat, representing Vermilion Parish, stated that the landowners for both ME-04 and ME-13 are participating in these projects, and for CWPPRA to walk away from these projects with local participation would be a tragedy. The ME-04 Project includes interior structures that the local landowner has maintained and is operating, and the cost share participant for ME-13 is one of the pipeline companies. The cost benefit analyses are very good, and Mr. Libersat encouraged project extension for these projects.

Mr. Kinler added that CWPPRA should acknowledge that material has been deposited naturally behind the rock shoreline protection structures, and CPRA has the exact numbers regarding the amount.

Mr. Hartman reminded the Committee that the Planning budget is static, and this project extension evaluation was not included in the budget.

Project No.	Project Name	Agency	Const. Complete	20YL
TV-09	Boston Canal/Vermilion Bay Bank Protection	NRCS	Nov-95	Nov-15

Mr. Paul presented the recommended path forward for the Boston Canal/Vermilion Bay Bank Protection (TV-09) Project. NRCS recommends performing the last maintenance event and then closing out the project without removal of project features. The last maintenance event will tie the project back into the shore on either side where the area directly adjacent to the project has eroded. Mr. Clark noted that this is an addition of 400 feet of rock on one side and 300 feet of rock on the other side. Approval of this maintenance event is included in Agenda Item Number 11. Mr. Hartman suggested postponing discussion of this project until after Agenda Item 11, and the Committee agreed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force allow the ME-04 and ME-13 Projects to continue through the 20-Year Life Decision Matrix with a formal evaluation. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

7. Agenda Item 6. Report: Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) Report (Dona Weifenbach, USGS). Ms. Dona Weifenbach presented a report on CRMS.

Ms. Dona Weifenbach, CPRA, provided an update on CRMS. Ms. Weifenbach showed two different views of the CRMS design. The first view showed CRMS' 390 sites across the coast, both inside and outside of CWPPRA project area boundaries. The second view delineated the sites by type, such as swamp, fresh, intermediate, brackish, and salt marsh. The CRMS website is updated daily with data submitted by contractors. It is a dynamic entity and frequently has new features. New features this month include data download from the interactive hydro charts, chart depth in flooding, a Landsat TM land change layer, and a Hydrologic Unit Codes layer.

The CRMS website can be used to evaluate CWPPRA projects between the Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring (OM&M) Reports, which are completed every three years. Ms. Weifenbach presented project specific monitoring and CRMS data for the Delta Management at Fort St. Philip as an example of how the website can be used in this way. This project consists of outfall management and sediment trapping near the mouth of the Mississippi River and was constructed in 2006. The 2012 OM&M report showed that the terraces are capturing sediment and the project is building subaerial land. Ms. Weifenbach showed how the CRMS website could be used to see the results of plantings monitoring on project specific vegetation stations. The data shows that emerging mudflats are being colonized. The project specific data has been collected in 2007 and 2011 and will be collected again in 2016 and 2021. CRMS data is collected annually, and can be used to develop the Vegetation Site Scale Assessment; Hydrologic Index Site Scale Assessment; Project, Basin, & Coastwide Assessment; and Overall Project Assessment. These tools allow resource managers to evaluate their projects.

CRMS is working on 15 OM&M reports for this year. Ten have been delivered to the Federal sponsors for comments and the remaining five should be delivered within the next few weeks. Website training will be held in Baton Rouge on October 1. CRMS has given presentation at several workshops and conferences, including the State of the Coast, Conference on Ecological and Ecosystem Restoration, Restore America's Estuaries, Gulf of Mexico Alliance, and the National Academy of Science. Additionally, the Forested Floristic Quality Index publication is in review. Field work for the coastwide elevation survey is ending, and the Technical Committee will be notified as soon as data is available. The 2012 aerial photography land:water products are now available on the CRMS website. Finally, the current CRMS data collection contract expires on July 31, 2015, and preparations for the next contract are in progress.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if there was any way to see whether the mudflats in the Fort St. Philip Project would have been created with just the crevasses and not the terraces. Ms. Weifenbach responded that there is more data available, but it probably does not show what created the mudflats. Mr. Bill Boshart, CPRA, stated that there are reference sites which might be useful in making that type of determination. Mr. Clark stated that the project probably could have used fewer terraces. Ms. Weifenbach noted that every OM&M report has a Lessons Learned section.

Mr. Hartman asked if this presentation could be posted to the CRMS website. Ms. Weifenbach responded that it could be posted in the library section with other presentations.

Mr. Hartman also stated that he would like to hear more about what the Program is learning from the data and less about what data is being collected. He requested that future presentations include information about whether certain types of projects are working or not. Ms. Weifenbach confirmed that Mr. Hartman was asking for project evaluations. Mr. Clark stated that the OM&M reports and surveys are also good information. Mr. Haase asked to hear about how project information and evaluations are incorporated into later projects.

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

Ms. Susan Testroet-Bergeron, CWPPRA Outreach, stated that CWPPRA will be giving a CRMS presentation at the Louisiana Science and Math Teachers Joint Conference.

8. Agenda Item 7. Decision: Annual Request for Incremental Funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 17 Administrative Costs for Cash Flow Projects (Susan Mabry, USACE). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requested funding approval in the amount of \$26,142 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request for funds.

Ms. Mabry requested approval for incremental funding in the amount of \$26,142 for administrative costs on behalf of the USACE.

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

Mr. Constance 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 \$26,142 for administrative costs for cash flow projects beyond Increment 1. Mr. Paul seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

9. Agenda Item 8. Report/Decision: Request for Funding for the CWPPRA Program's Technical Services (Michelle Fischer, USGS). The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and CPRA requested funding for technical services for the CWPPRA program in the amount of \$171,410. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the request for funding for technical services in the amount of \$171,410.

Ms. Michelle Fischer, USGS, requested \$171,410 in funding for FY15 technical services. These funds are used for database and website maintenance and end of project life evaluations.

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

Mr. Clark asked if this is the same amount as last year. Ms. Fischer responded affirmatively. Mr. Clark thanked USGS for keeping the cost the same.

Mr. Constance 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 \$171,410 in funding for USGS and CPRA technical services. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

10. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request for Transfer of Funds from the PPL 2 - West Belle Pass Headland Restoration Project (TE-23) Operations & Maintenance to Monitoring (Brad Inman, USACE; Stuart Brown, CPRA). The USACE and CPRA have determined that a minimum of two land:water analyses for the TE-23 project area, one each for years 2008 and 2012 respectively, are required to assess the impact of a 2007 Port Fourchon Navigation Channel Federal maintenance event in which dredged material was placed within the TE-23 project area. The cost of performing these land:water analyses is \$28,375 and would be undertaken in 2015. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the requested transfer of funds.

Mr. Inman presented the USACE and CPRA request to transfer \$28,375 from the maintenance budget to the monitoring budget for the West Belle Pass Headland Restoration (TE-23) Project. Additional Belle Pass maintenance dredging was performed by the USACE at Port Fourchon and material from that 2007 event was placed in the project area. The project team would like to perform a land:water analysis to ascertain the results from that event.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if these funds were for both the 2008 and 2012 aerial photo events, and if so, why funds are needed for both years. Mr. Glen Curole, CPRA, responded affirmatively and stated that the project team would like to see the change over time. Additionally, this information will be used as part of the project closeout. Mr. Hartman asked if a land:water analysis is necessary for every project closeout. Mr. Clark responded that the final OM&M report will function as the closeout report. However, since it is a small amount of money and it is just being transferred between accounts in the same project, Mr. Clark stated that he feels comfortable taking the recommendation of the monitoring manager and project sponsors. Mr. Hartman stated that if this proceeds to the Task Force, the project team should prepare a better justification. Mr. Clark asked if the land:water analysis would include the whole project. Mr. Curole responded that it would include the whole project area, and Mr. Clark stated that the land:water information for the entire project area would be valuable information.

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

DECISION: Mr. Haase made a motion to recommend that the Task Force. Mr. Clark seconded. Mr. Haase, Mr. Clark, Mr. Paul, and Ms. McCormick voted in favor. Mr. Hartman voted against. The motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for Monitoring Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (Stuart Brown, CPRA). The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a

recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY17 incremental funding in the amount of \$9,712,695 and monitoring budget increases totaling \$35,032.

Mr. Stuart Brown, CPRA, presented the requests for monitoring incremental funding and budget increases in sections.

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$204,451 for the following projects:
 - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection (BA-27c), PPL 9, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$4,539
 - Delta Management at Fort St. Philip (BS-11), PPL 10, USFWS
Incremental Funding amount: \$17,271
 - Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b) PPL 11 NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$91,019
 - Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39), PPL 20, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$91,622

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

Mr. Hartman asked if the funding for the Nutria Control Program goes to the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) for the annual report. Mr. Kinler responded that it is for the flight, analysis, and the report.

Mr. Hartman stated that the amount for Vegetative Plantings seems high and asked about the purpose of those funds. Ms. Leigh Anne Sharp, CPRA, explained that three new areas are selected every year. The monitoring is intensive soon after planting and trails off as plants are established. Each cell is monitored as a separate project. Since this project is in the third year, there are currently nine areas being monitored.

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

- b. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$33,946:
 - Naomi Outfall Project (BA-03c), PPL 5, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$5,571
 - West Belle Pass Headland Restoration (TE-23), PPL 2, USACE
Incremental Funding amount: \$28,375

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

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

- c. Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) requesting approval for FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$9,439,266:
 - Incremental funding (FY13 – FY15): \$9,439,266

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

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

- d. PPL 1-8 Projects requesting approval for a budget increase in the amount of \$35,032 and FY17 incremental funding in the amount of \$35,032 for the following project:
 - Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration (CS-21), PPL 2, NRCS
Budget increase amount: \$35,032
Incremental Funding amount: \$35,032

Mr. Brown reported that this budget increase would cover vegetation and submerged aquatic vegetation monitoring in 2015 and 2018 and the final monitoring and closeout report in 2019 at the end of the project life.

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

Mr. Hartman stated that the Program already has data that has established that the project is working and questioned the need for additional data points. Mr. Kinler responded that the project team anticipates a discussion about project disposition at the end of its 20-year life, and the Technical Committee may need additional data to make that decision.

Mr. Constance 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 approve FY17 incremental funding for PPL 9+ projects in the total amount of \$204,451. Mr. Paul seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve FY17 incremental funding for PPL 1-8 projects in the total amount of \$33,946. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve FY17 incremental CRMS funding in the total amount of \$9,439,266. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve a budget increase in the amount of \$35,032 and FY17 incremental funding in the amount of \$35,032 for the Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration (CS-21) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

12. Agenda Item 11. Decision: Request for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Incremental Funding and Budget Increases (Stuart Brown, CPRA). *The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force to approve requests for total FY17*

incremental funding in the amount of \$6,574,691 and O&M budget increases totaling \$1,067,094.

Mr. Brown presented the requests for O&M incremental funding and budget increases in blocks.

- a. PPL 9+ Projects requesting approval for FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$5,259,404 for the following projects:
 - GIWW - Perry Ridge West Bank Stabilization (CS-30), PPL 9, NRCS
Incremental funding amount: \$6,330
 - Four Mile Canal Terracing and Sediment Trapping (TV-18), PPL 9, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$16,557
 - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection, Phase 3, (BA-27c), PPL 9, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$4,582
 - Lake Borgne Shoreline Protection (PO-30), PPL 10, EPA
Incremental Funding amount: \$6,486
 - North Lake Mechant Landbridge Restoration, (TE-44), PPL 10, USFWS
Incremental Funding amount: \$86,791
 - Delta Management at Ft. St, Phillip (BS-11), PPL 10, USFWS
Incremental Funding amount: \$5,511
 - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection Phase 4, (BA-27d), PPL 11, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$4,624
 - Little Lake Shoreline Protection/ Dedicated Dredging Near Round Lake, (BA-37), PPL 11, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$75,872
 - Barataria Barrier Island Complex: Pelican Island and Pass La Mer to Chalant Pass Restoration (BA-38), PPL 11, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$22,327
 - Pass Chalant to Grand Bayou Pass Barrier Shoreline Restoration (BA-35), PPL 11, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$6,357
 - Coastwide Nutria Control Program (LA-03b), PPL 11, NRCS
Incremental funding amount (FY16): \$2,324,019
 - West Lake Boudreaux Shoreline Protection and Marsh Creation, (TE-46), PPL 11, USFWS
Incremental Funding amount: \$5,602
 - Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation, (TE-48), PPL 11, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$3,439
 - South White Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-22), PPL 12, USACE
Incremental funding amount: \$8,152
 - Mississippi River Sediment Delivery System - Bayou Dupont (BA-39), PPL 12, EPA
Incremental Funding amount: \$7,058

- West Belle Pass Barrier Headland Restoration, (TE-52), PPL 16, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$354,548
- South Lake Lery Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection (BS-16), PPL 17, USFWS
Incremental Funding amount: \$6,534
- Coastwide Vegetative Planting (LA-39), PPL 20, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$2,314,615

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

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

- b. PPL 1-8 Project requesting approval for FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$585,859:
- GIWW to Clovelly Hydrologic Restoration (BA-02), PPL 1, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$25,438
 - Highway 384 Hydrologic Restoration (CS-21), PPL 2, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$22,656
 - Point au Fer Canal Plugs (TE-22), PPL 2, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$9,925
 - West Belle Pass Headland Restoration, (TE-23), PPL 2, USACE
Incremental Funding amount: \$9,453
 - Cameron Creole Maintenance (CS-04a), PPL 3, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$133,407
 - Lake Chapeau Sediment Input and Hydrologic Restoration, Point Au Fer Island (TE-26), PPL 3, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$9,800
 - Brady Canal Hydrologic Rest, (TE-28), PPL 3, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$100,695
 - Black Bayou Hydrologic Restoration (CS-27), PPL 6, NMFS
Incremental Funding amount: \$269,904
 - Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection, Phases 1 and 2, (BA-27), PPL 7, NRCS
Incremental Funding amount: \$4,581

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

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

- c. PPL 1-8 Projects requesting approval for a budget increase in the amount of \$1,067,094 and FY17 incremental funding in the amount of \$729,428 for the following projects:
- Boston Canal/Vermilion Bay Bank Protection (TV-09), PPL 2, NRCS
Budget increase amount: \$630,891

Incremental Funding amount: \$630,891

- Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully (CS-23), PPL 3, USFWS

Budget increase amount: \$436,203

Incremental Funding amount: \$98,537

Mr. Brown reported that NRCS and CPRA are requesting a budget increase of \$630,891 for Boston Canal to conduct the last maintenance event before project closeout. The goal of the project was to prevent further regression of the banks at the mouth of the Boston Canal. The project was constructed in 1995. A 2002 maintenance event modified the sediment fences at no cost to the Program. The proposed maintenance event is to extend the rock dike on both sides to reconnect the structures to the existing shoreline, which has eroded away from the structure. The design surveys would be conducted in FY 14/15 and the construction would occur in FY 15/16. The project has remaining O&M funds of approximately \$115,000 and therefore requires approximately \$630,000 in additional funds to complete this event.

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

Mr. Clark stated that the Boston Canal event is an extension of an existing project, not maintenance. Based on USFWS calculations, this will protect 1.3 acres over 20 years, with a cost effectiveness of over half a million dollars per acre. At current shoreline erosion rates the proposed additional “maintenance” areas would take from 70 to 100 years to erode to Boston Canal. Mr. Hartman agreed and added that everywhere that rocks are placed along the shoreline, this type of escarpment occurs. He does not think that this is a wise investment, especially since CWPPRA can only fund one construction project per year now anyway. Mr. Clark indicated that he is open to a less costly maintenance event using the remaining O&M funds, but acknowledged that rock foreshore dike is the methodology that works in this area. Mr. Paul responded that the original structure is still there and in good condition, and NRCS just wants to ensure that it is in good repair when the project life ends. Mr. Constance stated that on the surface this looks like an enlargement of the project, but it could also be considered the next logical step in maintaining it. He asked for confirmation that this would be the last maintenance event before project closeout. Mr. Paul responded that this is the last event and would leave the project in good shape for at least another 20 years. He added that all of the activity would still be in the project area.

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

Mr. Libersat encouraged the Technical Committee to approve the Boston Canal budget increase and maintenance event. This has been a worthwhile project and material started accumulating behind the structure almost immediately following construction. Natural processes will create acreage immediately behind the new rock as soon as it is placed. Vermilion Parish is very interested in the whole northern shore of Vermilion Bay and has proposed an expansion of this project for the 2017 State Master Plan Update. Mr. Libersat also noted that this project has provided good public relations and has been a showcase project for CWPPRA over the last 20 years, and that he has personally been on multiple field trips to view and praise this project.

Mr. Brown also reported that USFWS and CPRA are requesting a budget increase of \$436,203 and incremental funding of \$98,537 for the Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully (CS-23) Project. This project consisted of replacing and operating water control structures at three major waterways to allow water exchange between Calcasieu Lake and interior marshes west of Highway 27. The cross-sectional areas of the water control structures were increased by 370% and allowed the Refuge to manage salinity and water levels. This was a PPL 3 project that completed construction in 2003. Maintenance events occurred in 2005, 2008, and 2011. The proposed budget for 2015 to 2017 includes sonde maintenance, structure repair, and inspections and maintenance totaling approximately \$48,500 per year. With nine years remaining in the project life, the total increase is approximately \$436,000 for the remainder of the project. The project has \$35,122 remaining in its budget. The cost effectiveness of the project is approximately \$6,500 per acre. Mr. Brown noted that sonde maintenance has been higher than expected. All five sondes are providing real time data via satellite transmission. Additionally, Sabine Refuge staff is no longer able to perform data downloads as part of their operations, and the 2011 maintenance event was more expensive than anticipated. As part of an effort to reduce future O&M costs, the project team is considering switching to biannual inspections, removing two of the real-time data sondes, and having USFWS perform some of the monthly checks and operations.

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

In regards to the Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures Project, Mr. Hartman stated that O&M increase requests should include an evaluation of project performance to ensure that the Committee does not continue investing in a project that is performing poorly. Mr. Clark responded that the analysis was sent to the Technical Committee but unfortunately did not get put into the binders. Mr. Hartman suggested that, should this request proceed, the project performance information should be presented at the Task Force meeting.

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

No comments.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$5,259,404 for PPL 9+ projects. Mr. Paul seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve FY17 incremental funding in the total amount of \$585,859 for PPL 1-8 projects. Ms. McCormick seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve a budget increase in the amount of \$630,891 and FY17 incremental funding in the amount of \$630,891 for the Boston Canal/Vermilion Bay Bank Protection (TV-09) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. Mr. Paul and Mr. Haase voted in favor. Mr. Hartman, Ms. McCormick, and Mr. Clark voted against. The motion failed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve a budget increase in the amount of \$436,203 and FY17 incremental funding in the amount of \$98,537 for the Replace Sabine Refuge Water Control Structures at Headquarters Canal, West Cove Canal, and Hog Island Gully (CS-23) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

13. Agenda Item 12. Decision: Request that PPL 5 - Raccoon Island Breakwaters Demonstration Project (TE-29) Be Considered a Component of PPL 11 - Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation Project (TE-48) (Britt Paul, NRCS). *NRCS and CPRA requested that the TE-29 project be considered a component of the TE-48 project so that TE-48 O&M funds can be used towards TE-29 O&M. In 1994, LDWF requested that the CWPPRA program construct 32 rock segmented breakwaters and 60 acres of marsh on Raccoon Island. Due to the concern that rock segmented breakwaters had never been built offshore in Louisiana, permits were issued to build up to 10 breakwaters. Therefore, the Raccoon Island Breakwaters Demonstration Project (TE-29) installed 8 breakwaters with available funding, with the understanding that if the project proved successful LDWF could later request that CWPPRA fund a larger scale project. Due to the success of the TE-29 project, CWPPRA approved funding for the Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation Project (TE-48). The TE-48 breakwaters were completed in 2007 and the marsh creation was completed in 2013. Currently, two of the TE-29 breakwaters have settled below their designed crest elevation and require re-capping to restore their full functionality of protecting the gulf shoreline of Raccoon Island. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to the Task Force on the request to consider the TE-29 project as a component of the TE-48 project and that TE-48 O&M funds be used towards TE-29 O&M.*

Mr. Paul explained that the Raccoon Island Breakwaters Demonstration (TE-29) Project currently does not have funding for monitoring or maintenance because of its status as a demonstration project. If it could be included in the Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation (TE-48) Project, then the demonstration segment could be included in the monitoring and maintenance events. The demonstration project and the full project both consist of rock breakwaters on Raccoon Island, and the demonstration project is still functioning. NRCS would like to monitor and maintain those features.

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

Mr. Hartman asked how the TE-48 budget would change with the inclusion of TE-29 features. Mr. Paul stated that they cannot estimate how the budget would change without surveys, and surveys are not allowed for demonstration projects. Mr. Clark asked for an estimate on whether the existing O&M funds for TE-48 would be sufficient. Mr. Paul responded that it would likely not be sufficient, but that determination cannot yet be made with any certainty. Mr. Constance asked about the incremental costs to do the surveys. Mr. Paul stated that the funding for the surveys is available, but NRCS cannot perform the surveys until the project features are included as part of a non-demonstration project.

Mr. Constance 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 include the features of the Raccoon Island Breakwaters Demonstration (TE-29) Project as part of the Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection/Marsh Creation (TE-48) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

14. Agenda Item 13. Report: Use of Surplus Construction Funds for Additional Marsh Restoration for the Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycles 4 and 5 (CS-28-4-5) (Darryl Clark & Robert Dubois, USFWS; Bren Haase, CPRA). *The USFWS and CPRA notified the Technical Committee that approximately \$2 to \$3.5 M in surplus Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Cycles 4 and 5 (CS-28-4-5) construction funds will be used to restore approximately 150 to 200 acres (900,000 to 1,000,000 cubic yards) of additional marsh in Sabine Refuge Unit 1A located south of Brown Lake. Surplus funds are available due to lower bids and because the Corps received funding to dredge the entire 400 foot-wide Calcasieu Ship Channel navigation right-of-way providing additional dredged material within the Federal Standard for project use. Unit 1A is currently managed as an estuarine marsh with tidal flow.*

Mr. Clark reported to the Technical Committee that the Sabine Refuge Marsh Creation Project, Cycles 4 and 5 (CS-28-4-5) had additional construction funds, which will be used to create an additional 200 acres of marsh in Unit 1A for a total of 600 acres. This has previously been reported to the Technical Committee, and the current status is that USFWS has issued a Notice to Proceed to the USACE to work with the contractor to modify the existing contract.

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

Mr. Haase asked if Mr. Clark anticipates some of the funding being returned. Mr. Clark responded that perhaps \$2.6 million will be returned to the Program. However, there is no monitoring budget for this project, so the project team may have to request that funding at a later date. USFWS is currently working with Ms. Sharp and CPRA to estimate that cost.

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

15. Agenda Item 14. Decision: Request for Approval to Initiate Deauthorization of West Pointe a la Hache Outfall Management (BA-04c) (Garvin Pittman, CPRA). *CPRA requested that formal deauthorization procedures be initiated on West Pointe a la Hache Outfall Management (BA-04c). The project team determined that many of the proposed benefits of BA-04c were being met by the current operation of the structure, and the marginal benefits that could be achieved through this project could be achieved more cost-effectively by improving existing operations. The Technical Committee considered and voted to make a recommendation to initiate deauthorization for BA-04c.*

Mr. Haase presented the history of the West Pointe a la Hache Outfall Management (BA-04c) Project. This project was originally envisioned in 1993 as an outfall management project. The initial evaluations suggested that there were benefits to increasing the water flow by perhaps lowering the intakes on the Mississippi River side of the levee. The project morphed over time into automated instrumentation and improvements to the existing structure. In 2007,

Plaquemines Parish changed the operating regime of the structure, and it appears that as operations have improved over the past seven years the structure is closer to reaching its maximum capacity. Based on the improved operations, CPRA feels that the cost of the proposed improvements may not justify the incremental benefits that would be achieved. Therefore, the project team recommends initiating deauthorization.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Haase made a motion to recommend that the Task Force begin deauthorization procedures for the West Pointe a la Hache Outfall Management (BA-04c) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

16. Agenda Item 15. Additional Agenda Items (Troy Constance, USACE).

Mr. Constance noted that the Technical Committee needed to address the recommended path forward for the Boston Canal/Vermilion Bay Bank Protection (TV-09) Project, which was tabled under Agenda Item Number 5. Mr. Paul asked to postpone this decision to a later meeting so that NRCS and CPRA could decide on a recommendation.

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

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

DECISION: Mr. Paul made a motion to postpone a decision on the recommended path forward for the Boston Canal/Vermilion Bay Bank Protection (TV-09) Project. Mr. Haase seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

17. Agenda Item 16. Request for Public Comments (Troy Constance, USACE). There were no public comments.

18. Agenda Item 17. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE).

The Task Force meeting will be held October 23, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 7400 Leake Ave., New Orleans, Louisiana.

Mr. Inman added that the CWPPRA agencies were still submitting information for the binders on Monday of the week of the meeting. He requested that agencies try to submit their information in a timelier manner so that Ms. Murry could get everything together for the meetings.

16. Agenda Item 15. Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE).

October 23	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
December 11	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
January 22	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
January 27	11:00 a.m.	Region IV Planning Team	Lafayette
January 28	9:00 a.m.	Region III Planning Team	Houma
January 29	8:00 a.m.	Region I & II Planning Team	Lacombe

Mr. Inman noted that there may be a location change for the January Task Force meeting.

17. Agenda Item 16. Decision: Adjourn. Mr. Clark made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Haase seconded. Mr. Constance adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:40 a.m.