

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 15 April 2014 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

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

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

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

Mr. Brad Inman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chairman, sitting in for Mr. Tom Holden

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

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

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. Inman introduced himself and announced that he was chairing the Technical Committee meeting in the place of Mr. Tom Holden. He welcomed everyone on behalf of Colonel Ells and Mr. Holden, who could not chair the meeting due to an assignment in Mississippi. Mr. Inman reminded everyone that today is the first anniversary of the Boston Marathon bombing. He asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves and asked for any opening remarks.

Mr. Clark asked Ms. Susan Bergeron to make an announcement about the upcoming CWPPRA dedication event. Ms. Bergeron, CWPPRA Outreach, announced that the CWPPRA Dedication event would be held on April 30 at ConocoPhillips in Houma, Louisiana. She asked that anyone interested in attending RSVP to herself or to Mr. Cole Ruckstuhl. Mr. Inman congratulated Mr. Clark for being recognized as the 2014 Coastal Steward by the Coalition to Restore Louisiana.

Mr. Inman reminded the audience to sign in and to take a meeting agenda. He reviewed the rules for public participation. He asked that anyone who would like to make a public comment use the microphone, introduce themselves, and state their affiliation if they are representing any type of organization.

Mr. Inman opened the floor to discussion from the Technical Committee regarding the agenda. There was no discussion by members of the Technical Committee.

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Ms. McCormick 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. Mr. Inman provided an update on current Trust Fund reauthorization efforts, including the Angling and Boating Alliance's (ABA) proposed change to the funding model for coastal wetlands.

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. The current funding allocation for construction is approximately \$2 billion, leaving a shortfall of approximately \$250 million. The total for currently approved phases is \$1.6 billion, with \$1.5 billion funded for Phases I & II.

Today's agenda includes two projects recommended for de-authorization. If approved, these de-authorizations will reduce the funding gap to \$200 million.

Ms. Mabry noted that the income projections from the Department of the Interior have been trending downward due to the downturn in the economy. Mr. Clark added that, because CWPPRA is funded through the Sport Fish and Boating Safety Trust Fund, which is funded through tax revenue, when taxes fall then the funding for CWPPRA falls. Mr. Inman noted that CWPPRA receives budget projections every six months and that they can and do change.

Ms. Mabry reported that CWPPRA had \$11.2 million in available funding as of January 2014. Three agenda items could impact the budget; if these three items are approved, the available funding will decrease to \$8.4 million.

The FY15 Planning budget is on the agenda for approval. With the carry-in from FY14 and today's budget recommendation for FY15, CWPPRA should have a carry-in of \$170,000 for FY16.

Mr. Inman noted that the CWPPRA Program is authorized through 2019, but appropriations have to be approved separately. Appropriations through September 2014 are currently approved. Mr. Inman informed the audience that a Senate bill is currently being discussed which would extend the Sport Fish and Boating Safety Trust Fund authorization through 2021. The Anglers and Boating Alliance has suggested an amendment to that bill which would reduce the percentage allocated to CWPPRA from 18.5% to 15.3%, which would be an annual reduction of approximately \$11 million, compared to the current annual budget of \$70-80 million. This amendment would have a significant effect on CWPPRA's ability to do work in Louisiana.

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

Mr. Clark added that the Anglers and Boating Alliance is a powerful lobbying group, but their suggested language does not appear to be part of the actual bill at this time. Mr. Hartman stated that funding for CWPPRA goes through 2019 unless the bill is revised or renewed.

Mr. Inman 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 Project Priority List (PPL) 24 (Kevin Roy, USFWS). The

Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits of the 24th Project Priority List project and demonstration project nominees. The Technical Committee selected 10 candidate projects and one demonstration project as PPL 24 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects for Phase I (Planning and Engineering Design).

Mr. Kevin Roy, USFWS, presented the PPL 24 project and demonstration nominees, as chosen by the Regional Planning Team (RPT) votes in February. The projects are listed in the table below.

Region	Basin	PPL 24 Nominees
1	Pontchartrain	New Orleans Landbridge Shoreline Stabilization & Marsh Creation
1	Pontchartrain	Shell Beach South Marsh Creation
1	Pontchartrain	Bayou Bienvenue Marsh Creation
2	Barataria	Bayou Dupont Sediment Delivery – Marsh Creation 4
2	Barataria	Barataria Bay Waterway East Marsh Creation
2	Barataria	East Leeville Marsh Creation & Nourishment
2	Barataria	Grand Bayou Marsh Creation & Terracing
3	Terrebonne	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation & Terracing
3	Terrebonne	West Fouchon Marsh Creation & Marsh Nourishment
3	Terrebonne	Lake Felicity Oyster Reef Shoreline Protection & Marsh Creation
3	Terrebonne	Bayou Dularge Ridge Restoration & Marsh Creation
3	Teche-Vermilion	South & West Vermilion Bay Shoreline Protection – Critical Reaches
3	Teche-Vermilion	South Humble Marsh Creation & Nourishment
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	No Name Bayou Marsh Creation & Nourishment
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	East Holly Beach Gulf Shoreline Protection
4	Mermentau	Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation & Freshwater Enhancement
4	Mermentau	Umbrella Bay Shoreline Protection
	Coastwide	Coastwide Oyster Reef Shoreline Protection

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

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

Mr. Carl Beier, Lake Catherine Civic Association, spoke in support of the New Orleans Landbridge Project. Erosion in this area is increasing exponentially every year, and this impacts not only Lake Catherine residents but also the infrastructure of whole Lake Pontchartrain basin, particularly in St. Tammany Parish. If this area breaches, the increasing water flow would increase exponentially. The residents have tried to do smaller projects in the area, but they have been ineffective and the area needs a larger project. Mr. Beier added that, in regards to the prior discussion of the Sport Fish and Boating Safety Trust Fund, the Federal snapper season has been reduced to 11 days, which decreases the taxes that can be collected from this activity. More funding from commercial fishers and a longer snapper season could increase the funding in the Trust Fund, and thus the funding for CWPPRA.

Ms. Carol Giardina, Lake Catherine Civic Association, spoke in support of the New Orleans Landbridge Project. Residents in this area experience firsthand the effects of diminished

coastlines. Hurricane Katrina had a great impact on this coastline. She emphasized that this project will also benefit other parishes along the Lake Pontchartrain shoreline.

Mr. Charles Allen, City of New Orleans, expressed support for the Shell Beach South, New Orleans Landbridge, and Bayou Bienvenue projects. He noted that storm surge does not care about parish boundaries and projects in one parish can benefit residents in other parishes.

Mr. Ray Champagne, waterfront property owner in Jefferson Parish, expressed support for the Bayou Dupont and Barataria Bay Waterway East projects. Residents in Lafitte have been dealing with repeated inundations by high water for some time. All of the projects are worthy, but these two projects will have a direct impact on residents and infrastructure such as a high school, supermarket, and post office. Sometimes residents cannot access their homes for days due to high water. The Bayou Dupont project complements other projects. Mr. Champagne recognized that the Barataria Bay Waterway East project will be more costly than other projects because it is further away from the Mississippi River. The Barataria Bay Waterway is 13 feet deep, and it is the main entry for saltwater. The rock wall put in by CWPPRA has subsided, and a strong south wind will overtop it. The residents of this area deserve better than five feet of water in their front yards.

Ms. Amanda Moore, National Wildlife Federation (NWF), stated that NWF has a strong interest in projects within the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet (MRGO) footprint. The New Orleans Landbridge plays a critical role in protecting 1.5 million people in parishes along Lake Pontchartrain. This area has experienced rapid erosion along the shoreline, and this project will decrease storm surge and increase the resiliency of wetlands. NWF also supports the Bayou Bienvenue Project. Placing Mississippi River sediments in this triangle is a critical first step to improving this area. Also, the Bayou Bienvenue area is highly visible and restoration enjoys strong public support. This project has great potential for public involvement efforts. This project is in the USACE MRGO Ecosystem Restoration Plan, which already has a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Arthur Johnson, resident of the Lower 9th Ward in New Orleans, expressed support for all three projects in Region 1. Bayou Bienvenue is the closest to the Lower 9th Ward, but the Shell Beach and New Orleans Landbridge projects will also benefit New Orleans. These projects will create new wetland habitats and reduce wave erosion, which is a significant concern. Deterioration of these areas has increased risk of flooding. The Lower 9th Ward is an underserved community that was devastated by Hurricane Katrina. These projects will help build this community back by improving water quality and increasing flood control. This positive impact on the community is very important.

Mr. Ed Perrin, resident of Lafitte, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont and Barataria Bay Waterway East projects. Years ago, CWPPRA recognized the fact that there was a natural ridge from the Mississippi River to Lafourche Parish. The Barataria and Dupont marsh creation will recreate and refurbish the natural ridge created by Bayou Traverse. Another project, scheduled for construction in September, will restore Bayou Dupont. This project would help establish the natural ridge from the Mississippi River. Further west, the natural ridge is still in existence and in good condition. Further west, there is a project on either side of Harvey Cut that borders

Bayou Perot. CWPPRA has helped recreate the ridge from the Mississippi River to Lafourche Parish. Eventually, the rising waters will have to force their way through Bayou Dupont, Barataria Waterway, and Bayou Perot, which would halt extreme water rising when winds are from the southwest and protect the communities of Barataria, Lafitte, Rosethorn, and Crown Point. The Mississippi River borrow will increase the cost of the Barataria Bay project, and Mr. Perrin suggested that CWPPRA consider using sediment from the Pen or the Barataria Bay Waterway, especially since large fishing vessels have problems with the depth in this area anyway. The projects in the Harvey Cut took sediment from Bayou Rigolettes, and the borrow site is filling in again. Refurbishing this ridge will help keep Lafitte from flooding in the future.

Mr. William McCartney, St. Bernard Parish, expressed support for all three projects in Region 1. St. Bernard's No. 1 project is Shell Beach South. There is a foundation in the area that would help maintain this project, and the infrastructure in St. Bernard Parish could be greatly helped.

Mr. David Brunet, St. Tammany Parish Coastal Zone Management, agreed with Mr. Allen. The Pontchartrain Basin is one entity. He strongly supports all three projects in Region 1. He added that the landbridge provides critical protection for citizens in St. Tammany Parish.

Mr. Bill Comegys, an adjacent landowner for the Umbrella Bay project, stated that this project will stabilize the eastern boundary of Grand Lake. Grand Lake has breached the marsh, including Lake 27, which used to be an interior lake. This project will protect not only the shoreline but also the interior marsh.

Mr. Archie Chaisson, Lafourche Parish Government, spoke in support of the West Fourchon, East Catfish Lake, and East Leeville projects. The West Fourchon project will build upon other successful projects, including the Caminada Headlands Project, and will help protect Port Fourchon, which supports 90% of deepwater oil & gas activity in the Gulf of Mexico. The East Catfish Lake Project will build upon a successful Coastal Impact Assistance Program (CIAP) project, and he noted that the North Catfish Lake Project is in Engineering and Design (E&D). Finally, the East Leeville project will help protect the community of Leeville and unelevated portions of LA-1 leading to the Port. He noted that he would like for some of the polygons in the East Leeville project to be moved north during the Wetlands Value Assessment (WVA) process.

Mr. Nic Matherne, Terrebonne Parish Government, stated that Terrebonne Parish's two priorities are Lake Felicity and Bayou Dularge. It is difficult to know what projects will be sustainable in the eastern part of the Terrebonne Basin over the long term, but there is another project further west of Lake Felicity that is in E&D, and the incorporation of the oyster reef protection should help the sustainability of this project. Mr. Matherne noted that using the oyster reefs in this project would be the first time that a CWPPRA project uses a demonstration project technology as part of an actual full-scale project. There are 12-15 miles between the barrier islands and this part of the basin, which allows storm surge to redevelop. In the Bayou Dularge project area, Mr. Matherne expressed hope that the TE-66 project would construct a structure in Grand Pass to reduce the current 400-foot width. This proposed Bayou Dularge Project would add support to that structure to reduce saltwater intrusion into the northern part of the basin and protect multiple millions of dollars' worth of previous CWPPRA projects.

Mr. PJ Hahn & Ms. Albertine Kimble, Plaquemines Parish, stated that their No. 1 project is the Grand Bayou Marsh Creation Project. That area is currently all open water. This project would complement projects currently being built by both CWPPRA and the Parish. It will also protect Hwy 23, which is critical to the oil & gas industry in Plaquemines Parish. A nearby siphon will help nourish the marsh creation cells, and existing oaks would be saved from storm surge. Plaquemines Parish's No. 2 project is Bayou Dupont. This project also has a nearby siphon that would complement the marsh creation.

Mr. John Hebert, Westbank resident, stated that the Barataria Bay Waterway and Bayou Dupont projects are critical in keeping storm surge from the Westbank, including Westwego and other communities. He also spoke in support of the Grand Bayou Project. Previous projects in this area are very successful and have vegetation growing on them. When he was younger, there were oaks and deer hunting in this area. The infrastructure is already there to build this project, and it will also protect Hwy 23 and beyond.

Mr. Tom Halko, Lafitte resident, stated that it is important to note that he lives beyond the hurricane protection levee, so marsh creation is his and his neighbors' primary line of defense. He spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont and Barataria Bay Waterway projects. Bayou Dupont has been an ongoing project, and the good incremental work should continue. Also, he noted that the Barataria Bay Waterway is their version of the MRGO. It is shallow draft, but it has essentially created the same problems that the MRGO did in St. Bernard and New Orleans. The Lafitte area is an economic driver for the seafood and oil and gas industries. Tens of billions of dollars have been made from the resources of this area, and it is only fair that something is returned. Mr. Halko complimented the work that CWPPRA is doing in this area and across the State. Finally, Mr. Halko supported the idea of having a coastwide project, and noted that the Ecosystems by Walter Marine project has had success in Florida and should perhaps be studied further to determine whether it would be successful in Louisiana.

Ms. Janet Rhodus, Launch Leeville, stated that the East Leeville project is consistent with the Master Plan and there has not yet been a project of this nature in Leeville. This project is imperative; it impacts residents, businesses, and LA-1, which services Port Fourchon. This area is impacted by flooding with even moderate southerly winds, so this project would impact daily lives of residents. This project would also protect what little remains of a historical cemetery site.

Mr. Jason Smith, Coastal Program Supervisor for Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont and Barataria Bay Waterway East projects. The whole concept of restoration in this area is to connect the landbridge from the Mississippi River west to Lafourche Parish. Several projects have been completed and there are others planned. BA-39 has been very successful and the Bayou Dupont Project should complement that project well. This connection is important to the communities of Lafitte, Barataria, Crown Point, and Rosethorn. It will protect the whole Westbank, including Orleans Parish, and would be a very visible project.

Ms. Marnie Winter, Jefferson Parish, spoke in support of the Bayou Dupont Project. Other projects in this area have been successful in using river sediments. This project may be able to be timed to use the long distance sediment pipeline, which is moving to construction now.

Jefferson Parish also supports the Barataria Bay Waterway East Project. The area north of the Barataria Ridge has completely deteriorated. The restoration proposed by this project would protect the Westbank and reestablish the bankline of Bayou Dupont, a common goal of several projects.

Mr. Perrin added that many graveyards in Lafitte and Barataria are at ground level. Whenever the water rises, these graves are underwater. Some of them stay submerged, but others pop out of the ground. They end up in the highways and in people's yards. Relatives then have to find the crypts and reinter them.

The Technical Committee then considered the demonstration project nominees, shown in the table below.

PPL 24 Demonstration Project Nominees	
DEMO	Sediment Capture Tide Pump
DEMO	Stabilized Shorelines for Shoreline Protection
DEMO	Innovative Bedload Sediment Collector
DEMO	Ecosystems by Walter Marine

Mr. Inman asked Mr. Roy if there was a recommendation from the Engineering and Environmental Work Groups on the demonstration projects. Mr. Roy informed the audience that over the last few years, the Technical Committee has asked the work groups to provide input on the demonstration projects. This evaluation is based on the need for the information that the project would provide, the viability of the technology, and if it is a technology that would benefit the program. This year, the work groups believe that only one demonstration project has sufficient merit to move forward: the Innovative Bedload Sediment Collector. The USACE has indicated a willingness to support this project. The other three nominees did not have support from agencies to proceed.

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

Mr. Paul noted that the Ecosystems by Walter Marine project was submitted for the LA-16 Non-Rock Demonstration Project and ranked 5th out of 17 options, but did not proceed forward. A lot of work has been done for this option under the LA-16 Project that would be applicable to studying this technology as a standalone demonstration project. NRCS would support that demonstration project moving forward.

Mr. Hartman stated that since the work groups recommended that only one project move forward, he supported moving forward with their recommendation. Mr. Clark noted that the work groups did not know that NRCS would be willing to sponsor the Ecosystems project when they made their recommendation. Mr. Roy responded that the work group recommendations are based on several factors. There were questions about the stability of the pilings in soft Louisiana soils. Because the pilings are topheavy, they may have to be drilled so deep that it is no longer a cost-effective solution. Additionally, since the technology was considered for LA-16 but not selected, the work groups recommend waiting to see the results for the structures that are being investigated under that project before proceeding with other alternatives.

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

The Technical Committee proceeded to vote for the ten PPL 24 candidate projects. The projects that will move forward into Phase 0 are:

- New Orleans Landbridge Shoreline Stabilization & Marsh Creation
- Grand Bayou Marsh Creation & Terracing
- West Fourchon Marsh Creation & Marsh Nourishment
- East Leeville Marsh Creation & Nourishment
- Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation & Freshwater Enhancement
- Shell Beach South Marsh Creation
- No Name Bayou Marsh Creation & Nourishment
- Bayou Dularge Ridge Restoration & Marsh Creation
- Bayou Bienvenue Marsh Creation
- South Humble Marsh Creation & Nourishment

DECISION: Mr. Hartman made a motion to recommend to the Task Force that the Innovative Bedload Sediment Collector Demonstration Project move forward for further consideration with the USACE as the Federal sponsor. Ms. McCormick 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 four projects ending their 20-year lives in 2015 and 2016 and the Technical Committee voted on recommendations regarding these projects.

Mr. Inman reminded the audience of the path that CWPPRA takes at the end of each project life. Four projects are being presented at this time.

Project No.	Project Name	Agency	Const. Complete	20YL
CS-18	Sabine National Wildlife Refuge Erosion Protection	FWS	1-Mar-95	1-Mar-15
TV-03	Vermilion River Cutoff Bank Protection	COE	11-Feb-96	11-Feb-16
PO-16	Bayou Sauvage Refuge Restoration Phase 1	FWS	30-May-96	30-May-16
BA-19	Barataria Bay Waterway Wetland Creation	COE	15-Oct-96	15-Oct-16

Mr. Clark presented the proposed path forward for the two USFWS projects.

Features of the Sabine National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) Erosion Protection Project include 20,000 linear feet of foreshore rock dike along the east bank of the Burton-Sutton Canal, 500 feet of rock revetment on North Canal, rock armored wing-walls at three control structures, and three alligator crossings. The 20-year project life ends in March 2015. The project has approximately \$265,000 remaining in its Operations and Maintenance (O&M) budget. There is no justification to extend the project life. There has been no maintenance on the project in the past 19 years and it does not require maintenance. The project is performing well according to the monitoring report. There has been no erosion on the levee and no saltwater intrusion, and the 2010 inspection report indicated that the project is in excellent condition. This project is on USFWS

property, and the NWR will accept project closeout but not a formal transfer. After the project is closed out, it will continue to be a feature of the Refuge. The cost of a closeout report is about \$25,000, which is within the existing budget. The benefits of the project will continue unless there is a failure in the future. CWPPRA will maintain the current liability, with slightly increased risks due to the lack of maintenance. The cost of removal would be \$8.5-15 million, and the land loss rate would resume. USFWS and CRPA recommend close out without removal, with remaining funds being returned to the program.

The goal of the Bayou Sauvage Refuge Restoration Phase I Project was to regulate water levels using two pump stations. Features include two 30" diameter pumps and pipes and one weir. The project WVA calculated that it would benefit 1,550 net acres. The project has approximately \$211,000 remaining in its O&M budget, and a smaller amount in its monitoring budget. The project life will end in May 2016. This project was impacted by levee work in New Orleans East following Hurricane Katrina. The USACE requested \$100,000 from CWPPRA to remove discharge pipes, and in return the USACE replaced the pump stations. Due to the construction of the New Orleans East levee, the pumps were inoperable for six years. The project is believed to have been successful but complete monitoring data is not available. There are monitoring reports from 1996 to 1998. The CRMS station began collecting data in 2007. USFWS has complete water level data from 2009 to 2014. Water levels were reduced after 1996, but conclusions are difficult to determine. The project requires preventative pump maintenance, replacement parts, and diesel fuel. For the first 12 years, annual maintenance costs were \$11,000/year, mostly for fuel. The project is located on public property. USFWS requests continued O&M for six years from May 2016 to May 2022 to make up for the time that the project was inoperable due to USACE construction. The project extension would use the current budget, and after that time USFWS will assume O&M of the pumps.

Mr. James Harris, USFWS Southeast Louisiana Refuges Complex, explained the past monitoring issues in more depth. He stated that there have been some misunderstandings about the operation of the pumps and the monitoring requirements. The goals and objectives of the project have always been the protection and restoration of the marsh. The management plan created in the 90's was based on the best available information at that time. However, after implementation, USFWS realized that the project was not working properly, and wetting and drying cycles led to oxidation and structural collapse. Therefore, USFWS used adaptive management techniques to develop new management strategies. This was conveyed to CWPPRA on several occasions. Additionally, in the monitoring plan, the requirement for all project specific monitoring was removed in 2003 when DNR transitioned to CPRA and implemented CRMS. After 2004, water level monitoring was discontinued unless the pumps were operated. USFWS has continued to provide that data to CWPPRA as it is collected, but USFWS does not believe that it is technically required to do so under the existing agreement. USFWS interprets the current monitoring requirements as affirmative reporting requirements; when USFWS operates the pumps, they report what water level gages triggered the operation. Mr. Harris noted that if CWPPRA extends this project for another six years, all parties should agree in advance to the monitoring plan to ensure no further misunderstandings.

Mr. Clark added that USFWS and CPRA staff will have a field trip to this project within a week of the Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Scott Wandell, USACE, presented the proposed path forward for the Vermilion River Cutoff Bank Protection Project. The Vermilion River Cutoff is a navigation connection from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) and Vermilion River to Vermilion Bay. The project is located on the east bank of the cut, and the goal of the project is to reduce wave fetch. This is a PPL 1 project located in the Teche-Vermilion Basin. The project consists of 6,200 feet of foreshore rock dike. The end of the project life is in March 2016. The project was expected to benefit 65 net acres, with a project area total of about 200 acres. The project cost was about \$2 million. There was only one O&M event in 2005; several areas were elevated back to +3.5 at a cost of \$130,000. Monitoring reports have been completed every three years, with the most recent one in 2007. The project appears to be functioning as designed. At four of the five stations, the shoreline is actually accreting towards the rock dike, while the reference area experienced considerably more land loss. The 2011 inspection report found the project to be in very good working condition, and it has not experienced damage from storm events. The USACE and CPRA recommend that the project proceeds to closeout. In fall 2013, the USACE requested \$25,000 in incremental funding for final monitoring and to analyze survey data from 2011. The USACE will include that data in the closeout report. The USACE will notify the public, perform final project accounting, and request Task Force approval.

Mr. Josh Carson, USACE, presented the proposed path forward for the Barataria Bay Waterway Restoration (BA-19) Project. This project was a PPL 1 project and was completed in October 1996. It created nine acres for \$1.1 million. The project includes a shell retainment dike and used material from the Barataria Bay Waterway. Unfortunately, the project could not meet its targets, and the project was never effective. There are no financial resources for the project. The USACE and CPRA recommend proceeding to project closeout.

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

The Technical Committee discussed the Bayou Sauvage Refuge Restoration Phase I Project. Mr. Hartman asked for clarification about the use and disposition of the remaining \$211,000 O&M funds. When the project was operational, O&M costs were about \$11,000/year. Fuel prices have increased, but the pumps will likely be operated less. Mr. Hartman asked why USFWS was requesting the full \$211,000 if it would not be needed for the additional six years of project life. Mr. Clark noted that USFWS will return any unused funds in 2022 but would like to keep the full O&M budget in case there is a larger O&M event. Mr. Clark noted that USFWS would also like to carry over the remaining monitoring funds of \$68,000. A land:water monitoring report was scheduled for 2013, but with the pumps nonoperational for the last six years, a report would not reflect the full condition of the project. Mr. Hartman asked if that \$68,000 should go to CPRA for CRMS monitoring. Mr. John Troutman, CPRA, stated that the monitoring dollars are meant to be used through the project life, not an extension. If this project is extended, then a new monitoring plan would be required. Mr. Hartman stated that it would be inappropriate for monitoring funds to go towards O&M activities. Mr. Troutman added that those funds would likely be expended before May 2016 anyway for the end-of-life monitoring reports. Mr. Clark did not know whether a monitoring plan would need to be extended, but if so then USFWS will need to request more monitoring funds. Mr. Haase stated that if the time period for monitoring is extended, then the agreements need to be restructured. Mr. Clark noted that USFWS will have a field trip shortly and the project closeout will not occur until May 2016, so there is time to work

on new agreements. The current plan for monitoring funds is that they will be used for a final monitoring report, which will be delivered prior to 2016. USFWS will only request to extend the remaining O&M funds. Mr. Hartman noted that the CWPPRA Program is only authorized through 2019, and extending the project to 2022 would be agreeing to extend the project beyond the known life of the program. However, everything authorized since 2000 has had this same issue. Ms. McCormick suggested just extending the project to 2019. Mr. Clark and Mr. Paul noted that even if CWPPRA is not reauthorized, the program will be allowed to spend out funds within the project budgets that have already been dispersed.

Mr. Inman 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 close out CS-18, TV-03, and BA-19. Mr. Hartman seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force extend PO-16 for an additional six years beyond its current life to May 2022 with the remaining O&M balance. Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Haase, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Paul voted in favor. Ms. McCormick and Mr. Hartman voted against. The motion passed.

6. Agenda Item 5. Report: Status of CWPPRA Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) Update (Allison Murry, USACE). In January 2014, the Planning and Evaluation (P&E) Subcommittee started an intensive clean-up and update of the CWPPRA SOP. The P&E plans to provide an updated draft to the Technical Committee a month prior to the September meeting to allow sufficient time for review before a vote on proposed changes. Ms. Murry presented the current status of the SOP update.

Mr. Inman announced that the P&E Subcommittee has started an extensive clean-up of the entire SOP. Ms. Allison Murry, USACE, presented some of these changes. Changes include changing references from DNR to CPRA, removing outdated appendices, adding guidance for coastwide projects, adding O&M increase request procedures, updating the monitoring section, and clarifying planning budget language. Appendices A, B, D, and F are being removed. Mr. Inman announced that the P&E Subcommittee will provide an updated document at least one month prior to the September Technical Committee meeting to allow time for review.

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

Mr. Clark thanked Ms. Murry for her work on this task. Mr. Inman added that there are a number of items that need to be updated.

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

7. Agenda Item 6. Decision: FY15 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 25 Process, and Presentation of FY15 Outreach Budget (Brad Inman, USACE). The P&E Subcommittee presented their recommended FY15 Planning Program Budget, including the PPL 25 Process.

Ms. Murry noted that since the P&E Subcommittee recommends removing PPL 25 Process information from the SOP, they also recommend making the PPL Process into a more public-friendly document. It will be redesigned and condensed, with maps, Frequently Asked Questions, and other information to make it more helpful to public participants. This document will be handed out at RPT meetings. There will be no change to the actual process.

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

Mr. Hartman asked if this document would be added to the CWPPRA website. Ms. Bergeron stated that it could be added to the website when it is finished.

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

Mr. Scott Wilson, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), stated that the Outreach budget of \$445,800 is the same that it has been for the past five years. This budget pays for salaries for the Outreach employees (Ms. Susan Bergeron and Mr. Cole Ruckstuhl), an intern, and the various events that they host or attend to engage the public in coastal restoration. These events include the upcoming CWPPRA Dedication, the State of the Coast Conference, art exhibits, other conferences, and the *Watermarks* and *Landmarks* publications. Mr. Wilson noted that this is the last year for the existing *Watermarks* contract. Mr. Ruckstuhl has been working on a new digital publication, *Landmarks*, which is scheduled for publication every two months. The Outreach Committee plans to compare the effectiveness of the two publications. Mr. Wilson noted that these events have good participation and are successful in engaging the public.

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

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

Ms. Mabry presented the total FY15 Planning budget request of \$5,091,819, including the Outreach budget. Several items have been changed compared to previous years, including the removal of two meetings based on Task Force decisions, removal of the budget for the Governor's office, and the addition of funds for the Report to Congress.

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

Mr. Haase noted that there have been problems in the past with the charges from the Governor's Office, so the P&E Subcommittee recommended removing that budget. However, the Governor's Office does participate in and charge some minimal time to various CWPPRA-related activities. He proposed that a minimal amount of \$20,000 be added to CPRA's budget and the State can handle these charges internally.

Mr. Clark agreed with that suggestion. He asked if this would be a line-item in the CPRA budget. Ms. Bergeron stated that she could include a description saying that those funds can be used by CPRA or the Governor's Office.

Mr. Inman 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 accept the PPL 25 Process as presented at the meeting. Ms. McCormick seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

DECISION: Mr. Clark made a motion to recommend that the Task Force approve the CWPPRA Outreach Committee Budget of \$445,800. 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 a FY15 Planning Budget of \$5,111,819. Mr. Clark seconded. All Technical Committee members voted in favor and the motion passed.

8. Agenda Item 7. Report: Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) Report & System-Wide Assessment Monitoring Program (SWAMP) (Dona Weifenbach and Rick Raynie, CPRA). Ms. Weifenbach provided a report on CRMS and Mr. Raynie provided a report on SWAMP.

Ms. Dona Weifenbach, CPRA, reported on CRMS activity since the last meeting. A coastwide helicopter vegetation survey was completed in August 2013 by Mr. Ed Mouton with Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and Dr. Jenneke Vissar and Dr. Charles Sasser of the Academic Work Group. These results are available online and were presented at the State of the Coast Conference. Additionally, results from the 2012 land:water analysis were received from USGS in March 2014. Comments will be incorporated and this information will be used for CWPPRA project reports in August.

The Monitoring Work Group uses CRMS data to prepare project closeout reports at the end of projects' 20-year lives. CRMS data can allow project sponsors to determine if the objectives of the project were met. Ms. Weifenbach presented the closeout information for the Bayou LaBranche Wetland Creation Project, which was presented as a poster at the State of the Coast Conference.

Fifteen Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring (OM&M) reports are in progress for 2014. Roadshows are complete, and website training is scheduled for April 30th in Baton Rouge. The CRMS educational document has been completed and is available. Additionally, a coastwide elevation survey for all 390 CRMS sites is underway and will be surveyed to NAVD88 Geoid 12a.

Mr. Rick Raynie, CPRA, presented an overview of the System-Wide Assessment and Monitoring Program (SWAMP). SWAMP was originally proposed in 2004, and was intended to be the monitoring component of the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Program. It was originally composed of CRMS and Barrier Island Coastal Monitoring (BICM). Two other phases for inshore and offshore monitoring were not implemented. Although CRMS is cost-shared 85/15 between CWPPRA and the State, the State contributes an additional \$1.5 million per year, making its share closer to 25%. The State also pays about two-thirds of the BICM budget;

USGS and the University of New Orleans (UNO) pay the rest, and the USACE is a non-paying sponsor.

The State would like to incorporate both protection and restoration with a new vision for SWAMP. There is a need to monitor projects across the state for both protection and restoration purposes. The State is also looking for opportunities to leverage partnerships with other agencies and to evaluate collective program performance. The State has developed a framework to identify the key parameters necessary to understand the overall coastal system, both natural and man-made. They are also inventorying ongoing and active monitoring efforts across the coast. The State is working with The Water Institute of the Gulf (TWIG) to identify drivers that cause change to the coastal environment. Issues can include landscapes, biological integrity, socioeconomics, and community resources. They plan to compare the data needs to current data collection efforts by the State, Federal agencies, non-governmental organizations, levee districts, and others to see what data is available to answer questions about various issues. Different agencies are collecting different types of data with different timeframes. Then they can determine whether the current data collection activities are adequate to answer the relevant questions, and whether changes should be made to spatial distribution and temporal availability.

Ultimately, the State wants to develop a coastwide plan with nested basin plans for each basin. They would like to develop a programmatic SWAMP system that allows each agency to put in their piece of data collection but get the benefits of the whole package.

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

Mr. Hartman stated that this is obviously being closely coordinated with CPRA in terms of data needs for the State Master Plan. Mr. Raynie agreed. Mr. Clark asked about the involvement of TWIG. Mr. Raynie stated that TWIG is helping the State with this effort.

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

9. Agenda Item 8. Report/Decision: Request for Funding Increase for Grand Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-21) (Quin Kinler, NRCS). NRCS and CPRA discussed the need for a funding increase for the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection Project. In February 2007, the Task Force passed a motion “to allow CIAP to fund construction of the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-21) without Tebo Point and to have CWPPRA fund the difference between the CIAP and CWPPRA project features (i.e. the Tebo Point segment) plus three years of O&M for the entire project for a total of \$9 million (\$2.7M for construction of the Tebo Point segment and \$6.3M for the first three years of O&M for the entire project).” The CIAP portion of ME-21 was constructed in 2010, and Federal sponsorship of ME-21 was transferred to NRCS in 2011. The revised construction cost estimate for the Tebo Point portion is \$6,242,031. The O&M estimate for the entire project is \$6,371,026, and the USACE Admin estimate for the entire project is \$34,647. Based on these estimates, the project requires a \$3,542,031 increase for construction, a \$66,744 increase for O&M, and a \$32,313 increase for USACE Admin, resulting in a revised total Phase II budget of \$12,647,704 and a fully funded cost of \$13,696,735. The Technical Committee considered this request for a funding increase for Grand Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-21).

Mr. Paul stated that part of this project was constructed under CIAP in 2010, and the remaining portion of Tebo Point was transferred to NRCS. NRCS has decided that they would prefer to reprogram the O&M funds to Construction rather than asking for additional funds. Mr. Paul and Mr. Clark noted that the CIAP portion of the project and other projects in this area have not needed O&M. Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, displayed a map of the project for the Technical Committee.

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

Mr. Hartman expressed concern about reprogramming O&M funds into Construction, because this is not something that is covered by the SOP. The project may need O&M in the future, and under the current SOP, the O&M plan is maintained in case it is necessary. He stated that CWPPRA should follow the SOP guidelines for project cost increases. Mr. Paul disagreed. He stated that reprogramming dollars between accounts is something that has been done before. Mr. Clark added that the cost-share agreement with the State says that, to move funds from one account to another, the State and the Federal sponsor must agree. Mr. Clark added that the soils in this part of the State are good and other nearby projects have not needed O&M. The CIAP portion constructed in 2010 has not needed maintenance and does not appear to need any at this time.

Mr. Hartman expressed grave concerns about the cost effectiveness of this project, and by bypassing the SOP, NRCS would bypass the need for an agency vote to increase construction costs. He stated that this project area will only lose 5-6 acres over the 20-year project life, so the construction cost will be \$1 million per acre. He stated that this is not a wise investment of \$6 million and he would like to have a vote on this budget increase. Ms. McCormick agreed with Mr. Hartman. There is no way to know whether the O&M funds will be needed in the future.

Mr. Paul noted that the area contains a cultural resources site and the project has the necessary funds. Mr. Kinler added that the original WVA indicated a loss rate of 11 feet per year, so Mr. Hartman's estimate of land loss over 20 years is too low. Also, this stretch of the shoreline is more expensive than the piece that CIAP construction because of the existing cultural resources site, which forces the project into deeper waters and increases the cost per linear foot. Mr. Kinler added that there is nothing in the SOP that would prevent moving O&M funds to Construction.

Mr. Paul stated that a motion is not needed for this action, and Mr. Clark agreed. A funding increase would require a decision, but this is not a funding increase. Mr. Hartman stated that this is a loophole in the SOP and using this loophole to justify the \$6.2 million construction cost of this project is wrong. Ms. McCormick agreed.

Mr. Paul noted that NRCS is not requesting an increase in O&M and is not requesting an overall project budget increase. He stated that this is an appropriate action required to get the project built. Mr. Clark agreed that this is not a cost increase for the overall project. Ms. McCormick asked for a guarantee that NRCS would not request a funding increase for O&M in the future. Mr. Paul stated that they would not request an increase by 2019. Mr. Paul stated that at this stage of the project, since it has already been approved for Phase II funding, the Work Groups are no longer involved and the decision rests with the State and the Federal sponsor.

Mr. Haase noted that there is confusion about what the SOP requires, and he suggested that the group articulate what they think the SOP means.

Mr. Hartman stated that for the Bayou Sale Project, since the construction cost increase changed the cost effectiveness by greater than 20%, the sponsoring agency had to receive Technical Committee approval to move forward. For that project, the approval was not granted. Mr. Clark noted that the Bayou Sale Project was a scope change. He questioned whether this issue for the Grand Lake Project is a scope change. Mr. Kinler added that he believed that the SOP was referring to changes during Phase I, and the Grand Lake Project is in Phase II. It is also past the 95% review and it has construction approval. The SOP does not address changes after the 95% review. Mr. Clark agreed with Mr. Kinler.

Mr. Clark noted that \$9 million has been awarded to this project. The sponsor plans to take \$3.9 million from one category and place it into another category, but does not plan to add to the \$9 million. He stated that he can understand the concern about depleting the O&M budget, but he feels comfortable with the remaining amount of O&M funds because of where the project is located and the past history of other projects in the area.

Mr. Inman asked for the State's position. Mr. Haase stated that they did have some initial concerns. There is the assumption that there will not be as large of a need for O&M funds. He also understands the comments regarding the spirit of the SOP.

Mr. Hartman stated that the spirit of the SOP is that a project needs a vote by the Technical Committee whenever it has a significant increase. He expressed amazement that this discussion was occurring over a project with so little benefits. This area is not critical, it does not provide infrastructure protection, and it is not a special area that would justify investing more funds per acre than other projects. Mr. Paul stated that these issues were discussed for this project years ago and the project was ultimately funded. Ms. McCormick asked whether the program wants to continue along the path of the project just because it was approved. She stated that the program should continuously reevaluate what is or is not a good item on which to expend funds.

Mr. Inman stated that the Technical Committee members should discuss this issue with their agencies' Task Force representatives prior to the Task Force meeting. Mr. Clark noted that at this point it is a reporting issue, not a decision. Based on concerns raised by Mr. Hartman, Mr. Kinler and Mr. Paul stated that this project will not be put out to bid prior to the Task Force meeting. Mr. Paul stated that their proposal will be presented as a report on the Task Force agenda.

Ms. McCormick stated that this is a loophole in the SOP that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Inman 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 follow the SOP regarding construction cost increases for the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection (ME-21) Project and require a vote on whether additional construction funds should be

expended. Ms. McCormick seconded. Ms. McCormick and Mr. Hartman voted in favor. Mr. Haase, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Paul voted against. The motion failed.

10. Agenda Item 9. Decision: Request for Approval for Final De-authorization on the PPL 13 – Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection (TV-20) Project (Britt Paul, NRCS). NRCS and CPRA requested approval for final de-authorization procedures on the Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection (TV-20) Project due to numerous abandoned pipelines in the area that presented site access and project construction problems. After consideration of the costs of pipeline removals, alternative construction methods that avoided pipeline removals, and alternative shoreline protection methods, implementation of the project proved cost-prohibitive, resulting in limited benefits that did not justify construction. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the final de-authorization of the Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection Project.

Mr. Inman reported that the public notice period will end on April 28, 2014. There have been no questions or comments to-date. Mr. Paul noted that the Parish looked at vegetative components, but specialists determined that vegetation alone would not be sufficient to meet project goals.

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

Mr. Inman 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 proceed to final de-authorization on the PPL 13 Bayou Sale Shoreline Protection (TV-20) Project. Ms. McCormick seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

11. Agenda Item 10. Decision: Request for Approval for Final De-authorization on the PPL 18 – Bertrandville Siphon (BS-18) Project (Karen McCormick, EPA). NRCS and CPRA requested approval for final de-authorization procedures on the Bertrandville Siphon (BS-18) Project due to land rights issues that are not likely to be resolved in the near future plus substantial technical implementation issues. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the final de-authorization of the Bertrandville Siphon Project.

Mr. Inman reported that there was one request for information. The public notice ended on March 21, 2014.

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

Mr. Inman 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 proceed to final de-authorization on the PPL 18 Bertrandville Siphon (BS-18) Project. Mr. Clark seconded. All members of the Technical Committee voted in favor and the motion passed.

12. Agenda Item 11. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE). There were no additional agenda items.

13. Agenda Item 12. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE). There were no public comments.

14. Agenda Item 13. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Dedication Event (Brad Inman, USACE).

The CWPPRA Dedication Ceremony will be held on April 30, 2014 to celebrate the progress on CWPPRA projects in southeastern Louisiana. The ceremony will begin at 10:00 a.m. at ConocoPhillips, 806 Bayou Black Drive, Houma, Louisiana.

15. Agenda Item 14. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE).

The Task Force meeting will be held May 22, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Fisheries and Habitat Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana.

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

May 22	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 11	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 6	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
December 11	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge

17. Agenda Item 16. Decision: Adjourn. Ms. McCormick made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Paul seconded. Mr. Inman adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:10 p.m.