

Browning, Gay B MVN

From: LeBlanc, Julie Z MVN
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2004 5:47 PM
To: 'john.hodnett@la.gov'; 'kend@dnr.state.la.us'; 'davidb@dnr.state.la.us'; 'rickr@dnr.state.la.us'; 'gsteyer@usgs.gov'; 'scott_wilson@usgs.gov'; 'gabrielle_bodin@usgs.gov'; 'quin.kinler@la.usda.gov'; 'loland.broussard@la.usda.gov'; 'andy.tarver@la.usda.gov'; 'bpaul@la.usda.gov'; 'chrisk@dnr.state.la.us'; 'cynthia.duet@gov.state.la.us'; 'deetra.washington@gov.state.la.us'; 'don.gohmert@la.usda.gov'; 'erik.zobrist@noaa.gov'; 'flores.miguel@epa.gov'; 'gautreak@gov.state.la.us'; 'gerryd@dnr.state.la.us'; Saia, John P MVN; 'john_hefner@fws.gov'; 'mcquiddy.david@epa.gov'; 'parrish.sharon@epa.gov'; 'pat.forbes@GOV.STATE.LA.US'; Rowan, Peter J Col MVN; 'randyh@dnr.state.la.us'; 'richard.hartman@noaa.gov'; 'rolland.schmitt@noaa.gov'; 'russell_watson@fws.gov'; 'sam_hamilton@fws.gov'; 'sidney.coffee@gov.state.la.us'; Constance, Troy G MVN; 'britt.paul@la.usda.gov'; 'darryl_clark@fws.gov'; 'john.jurgensen@la.usda.gov'; 'kirkr@dnr.state.la.us'; 'martha_segura@fws.gov'; 'philp@dnr.state.la.us'; 'rachel.sweeney@noaa.gov'; Hawes, Suzanne R MVN; Monnerjahn, Christopher J MVN; 'comvss@lsu.edu'; 'finley_h@wlf.state.la.us'; Rauber, Gary W MVN; Miller, Gregory B MVN; 'jonathanp@dnr.state.la.us'; 'kevin_roy@fws.gov'; 'peckham.jeanene@epa.gov'; 'ruiz_mj@wlf.state.la.us'; Browning, Gay B MVN; Lopez, John A MVN; Goodman, Melanie L MVN; Martinez, Wanda R MVN; Podany, Thomas J MVN
Subject: FINAL Minutes and Transcripts from 13 Oct 04 Task Force Meeting

CWPPRA Task Force, Technical Committee, P&E Subcommittee, PMs:

Attached are the FINAL minutes and transcripts from the subject Task Force meeting. Thanks for all of your comments/revisions. The final agenda (Encl 1) is also attached. With the Thanksgiving holiday week upon us, I am not sure of the status of scanning the sign-in sheets. Therefore, sign-in sheets will be forwarded with the January 2005 binder. If anyone requires a copy before January, please let me know.

Since a majority of the Task Force members (EPA, FWS, NRCS, and NMFS) agreed to the suggested clarification of the motion related to Agenda Item #5, it has been revised as such in the final version of the minutes. In essence, this will limit Phase II AND Phase I amounts for the 12 projects which have been approved for Phase II funding but have not yet moved to construction.



Minutes - Transcripts - post meeting
PPRA Task Force/PPRA Task Force agenda - for bi.

Julie Z. LeBlanc, P.E.
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
(504) 862-1597

-----Original Message-----

From: LeBlanc, Julie Z MVN
Sent: Saturday, November 13, 2004 11:54 AM
To: 'john.hodnett@la.gov'; 'kend@dnr.state.la.us'; 'davidb@dnr.state.la.us'; 'rickr@dnr.state.la.us'; 'gsteyer@usgs.gov'; 'scott_wilson@usgs.gov'; 'gabrielle_bodin@usgs.gov'; 'quin.kinler@la.usda.gov'; 'loland.broussard@la.usda.gov'; 'andy.tarver@la.usda.gov'; 'bpaul@la.usda.gov'; 'chrisk@dnr.state.la.us'; 'cynthia.duet@gov.state.la.us'; 'deetra.washington@gov.state.la.us'; 'don.gohmert@la.usda.gov'; 'erik.zobrist@noaa.gov'; 'flores.miguel@epa.gov'; 'gautreak@gov.state.la.us'; 'gerryd@dnr.state.la.us'; Saia, John P MVN; 'john_hefner@fws.gov'; 'mcquiddy.david@epa.gov'; 'parrish.sharon@epa.gov'; 'pat.forbes@GOV.STATE.LA.US'; Rowan, Peter J Col MVN; 'randyh@dnr.state.la.us'; 'richard.hartman@noaa.gov'; 'rolland.schmitt@noaa.gov'; 'russell_watson@fws.gov'; 'sam_hamilton@fws.gov'; 'sidney.coffee@gov.state.la.us'; Constance, Troy G MVN; 'britt.paul@la.usda.gov'; 'darryl_clark@fws.gov'; 'john.jurgensen@la.usda.gov'; 'kirkr@dnr.state.la.us'; 'martha_segura@fws.gov'; 'philp@dnr.state.la.us'; 'rachel.sweeney@noaa.gov'; Hawes, Suzanne R MVN; Monnerjahn, Christopher J MVN; 'comvss@lsu.edu'; 'finley_h@wlf.state.la.us'; Rauber, Gary W MVN; Miller, Gregory B MVN; 'jonathanp@dnr.state.la.us'; 'kevin_roy@fws.gov'; 'peckham.jeanene@epa.gov'; 'ruiz_mj@wlf.state.la.us'; Browning, Gay B MVN; Lopez, John A MVN; Goodman, Melanie L MVN; Martinez, Wanda R MVN
Subject: RE: DRAFT Minutes and Transcripts from 13 Oct 04 Task Force Meeting

CWPPRA Task Force, Technical Committee, P&E Subcommittee, Agency PMs and Representatives:

1. LAST CALL! Comments and suggested revisions for the subject minutes and transcripts are requested ASAP (comments were requested by COB, Friday, 12 Nov 04). Thanks to all who commented. If additional time is required, please advise by **COB Monday, 15 Nov 04**.

2. Task Force Members: The Corps has been asked to provide clarification regarding the Task Force's action on Agenda Item #5 (Recommendation to Restrict Phase II Budget Requests for Projects Already Approved for Phase II But Not Yet Under Construction to a Cap of 100%, Including Contingency). As currently stated, the motion only applies the 100% cap to Phase II costs (it is silent regarding any cap on Phase I costs). The Technical Committee recommended setting a cap of 100% for Phase II of these 12 projects. As adopted by the Task Force during the meeting, the Phase II costs for these 12 projects are now capped at their "current estimate" amount. Although not explicitly stated in the motion passed by the Task Force, it would seem reasonable that since Phase I is already completed for these projects that there should not be an expectation that additional funds would need to be expended on Phase I. Thus, the application of the 100% to Phase I as well would make sense. The Corps, however, does not want to unilaterally make this decision without the consent of the Task Force. The Corps suggests that this issue be handled in one of two ways (Option a is preferred by the Corps):

(a) By consensus of the Task Force, agree to clarify/modify the motion to include capping Phase I cost to 100%. If agreed to by the Task Force, the final minutes will be revised to reflect the clarification. Suggested reading of the motion in the minutes: *"Mr. Rolland Schmitt made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to restrict Phase II budget requests to 100 percent, and Mr. Miguel Flores seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed. [CLARIFIED DECISION: The motion passed during the Task Force meeting was silent regarding reducing the cap for Phase I of these projects. The Corps, as lead agency, requested clarification from Task Force members via email following the meeting. On ?? Nov 04, the Task Force decision was clarified to recommend reducing the cap from 125% to 100% for both Phase I and Phase II for the list of 12 projects that have been approved for Phase II but have not yet begun construction.]"* If agreed to by the Task Force, the projects would be limited to the column entitled "Current Estimate" for Phase I and Phase II in the attached spreadsheet.

<< File: TF-13oct04-response-phIIapproved-notyetconstructed-maxneeded.xls >>

(b) Do not modify the motion passed by the Task Force. Instead, include this item on the December 2004 Technical Committee agenda for decision. The Technical Committee would consider a recommendation that the Phase I budgets for these projects be restricted to 100% cap and would present this recommendation to the Task Force at the January 2005 meeting for final decision. It is not anticipated that the current estimate for Phase I would change from the attached spreadsheet.

As previously stated, the Corps prefers Option a. Modifying the motion would greatly assist the Corps in keeping the finances straight for these 12 projects. Task Force members are requested to provide a response with their preference for either Option (a) or (b) by **COB, Friday, 19 Nov 04**, or earlier if possible. If further discussion/explanation is required, please let me know.

Julie Z. LeBlanc, P.E.
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
(504) 862-1597

-----Original Message-----

From: LeBlanc, Julie Z MVN
Sent: Sunday, October 31, 2004 1:16 PM
To: 'john.hodnett@la.gov'; 'kend@dnr.state.la.us'; 'davidb@dnr.state.la.us'; 'rickr@dnr.state.la.us'; 'gsteyer@usgs.gov'; 'scott_wilson@usgs.gov'; 'gabrielle_bodin@usgs.gov'; 'quin.kinler@la.usda.gov'; 'loland.broussard@la.usda.gov'; 'andy.tarver@la.usda.gov'; 'bpaul@la.usda.gov'; 'chrisk@dnr.state.la.us'; 'cynthia.duet@gov.state.la.us'; 'deetra.washington@gov.state.la.us'; 'don.gohmert@la.usda.gov'; 'erik.zobrist@noaa.gov'; 'flores.miguel@epa.gov'; 'gautreak@gov.state.la.us'; 'gerryd@dnr.state.la.us'; 'John Saia'; 'john_hefner@fws.gov'; 'mcquiddy.david@epa.gov'; 'parrish.sharon@epa.gov'; 'pat.forbes@GOV.STATE.LA.US'; 'Peter Rowan'; 'randyh@dnr.state.la.us'; 'richard.hartman@noaa.gov'; 'rolland.schmitt@noaa.gov'; 'russell_watson@fws.gov'; 'sam_hamilton@fws.gov'; 'sidney.coffee@gov.state.la.us'; 'Troy Constance'; 'britt.paul@la.usda.gov'; 'darryl_clark@fws.gov'; 'john.jurgensen@la.usda.gov'; 'kirkr@dnr.state.la.us'; 'martha_segura@fws.gov'; 'philp@dnr.state.la.us'; 'rachel.sweeney@noaa.gov'; 'Suzanne Hawes'; 'Christopher Monnerjahn'; 'comvss@lsu.edu'; 'finley_h@wlf.state.la.us'; 'Gary Rauber'; 'Gregory Miller'; 'jonathanp@dnr.state.la.us'; 'kevin_roy@fws.gov'; 'peckham.jeanene@epa.gov'; 'ruiz_mj@wlf.state.la.us'; 'Gay Browning'; 'John Lopez'; 'Melanie Goodman'; 'Wanda Martinez'

Subject: DRAFT Minutes and Transcripts from 13 Oct 04 Task Force Meeting

CWPPRA Task Force, Technical Committee, P&E Subcommittee, and Selected Agency Project Managers and Representatives:

Attached are the DRAFT minutes and court-reported transcripts from the 13 Oct 04 Task Force meeting, for your review and comment. Enclosures 1 (agenda) and 2 (sign-in sheet) will be forwarded with the final minutes/transcripts. Given the length of the minutes and transcripts, two weeks of review time is provided. Please review and provide comments by **COB Friday, 12 Nov 04**.

The Corps asks that individual PMs review the minutes and transcripts *carefully* for their project's information/discussion and submit comments to the Corps. In reviewing the court-reported transcripts, please recognize that the transcripts should represent a word-for-word version of the meeting and only changes to obvious errors or inaudible segments will be revised. Grammatical errors and incomplete sentences will not be revised. As the minutes ARE the official record and official decisions of the Task Force, the accuracy of these documents is extremely important. The Corps asks that agency Technical Committee members ensure that proper review takes place within their respective agency, including individual PMs as appropriate.

<< File: Minutes - CWPPRA Task Force Meeting - 10-13-04 - DRAFT.doc >> << File: Transcripts - CWPPRA Task Force Meeting - 10-13-04 - DRAFT.doc >>

Julie Z. LeBlanc, P.E.
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
(504) 862-1597

BREAUX ACT
Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act

TASK FORCE MEETING
October 13, 2004

Minutes

I. INTRODUCTION

Colonel Peter Rowan convened the 56th meeting of the Louisiana Coastal Wetlands Conservation and Restoration Act Task Force. The meeting began at 9:45 a.m. on October 13, 2004 at the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Louisiana Room, 2000 Quail Drive, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The agenda is shown as enclosure 1. The Task Force was created by the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (CWPPRA, commonly known as the Breaux Act), which was signed into law (PL 101-646, Title III) by President George Bush on November 29, 1990.

II. ATTENDEES

The attendance record for the Task Force meeting is presented as enclosure 2. Listed below are the six Task Force members:

Mr. Miguel Flores, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
Mr. Russ Watson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (substituting for Mr. Sam Hamilton)
Ms. Sidney Coffee, State of Louisiana
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (substituting for Mr. Donald Gohmert)
Mr. Rolland Schmitten, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (replaced during meeting by Mr. Rick Hartman)
Colonel Peter Rowan, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

III. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 2004 TASK FORCE MEETING

Colonel Peter Rowan called for a motion to adopt the minutes from the 18 August 2004 Task Force meeting.

Mr. Miguel Flores moved to accept the minutes. Mr. Russ Watson seconded, and the motion was passed by the Task Force.

IV. TASK FORCE DECISIONS

A. Request: FY05 Planning Budget and FY05 Public Outreach Committee Budget Approval

Mr. John Saia presented the recommended FY05 Planning Budget while Mr. Scott Wilson presented the Outreach Committee's recommended budget for FY05. The Planning Program funding allocation is limited to \$5 million per year. Currently, there is a surplus of \$688,000 from previous years; therefore \$5.688 million is available for new obligations this FY. The Technical Committee recommended the approval of \$4.7 million for the FY05 Planning Budget.

Mr. Scott Wilson presented the Outreach Budget of \$437,900 to the Task Force, which is an increase of approximately 3 percent over the FY04 budget. The increase was due to the need for additional personnel for agency coordination and participation into outreach activities.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Rolland Schmitten questioned the role of the surplus in the recommended budgets. Mr. John Saia explained that with the surplus, approximately \$512,000 would remain unused if the Task Force approves the Technical Committee-recommended budget and the Outreach Committee-recommended budget. The total recommended budget for planning and outreach is \$5,176,029. The \$512,000 would be used to supplement the budget in FY06, while any remaining funds from FY05 would also be carried over.

Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to approve the recommendation by the Technical Committee for the FY05 Planning Budget in the amount of \$4,738,129 and the FY05 Public Outreach Committee Budget in the amount of \$437,900, and Mr. Russ Watson seconded. All Task Force Members voted in favor and the motion passed.

B. Request: Recommendation to Restrict Phase II Budget Requests for Projects Already Approved for Phase II But Not Yet Under Construction to a Cap of 100 Percent (Including Contingency)

Mr. John Saia presented the Technical Committee's recommendation to lower the funding limit for the ongoing Phase II projects that are not yet under construction from 125 percent to 100 percent. In addition, a review of Phase I projects has not yet been completed, but will be reported at the next Task Force meeting.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Colonel Peter Rowan asked if this cap would still contain a construction contingency within the estimate. Mr. John Saia verified that contingencies have been adjusted and re-applied based on the anticipated 100 percent cap restriction. Historically, the 125 percent that had been set aside has not been used resulting in leftover funds, which could not be used for other projects.

Mr. Randy Hanchey commented that the 25 percent leniency was designed to avoid returning to the Technical Committee/Task Force if the project costs rose above 125 percent. However, he agreed that the projects should be budgeted for 100 percent, including the fully funded cost estimate and an appropriate contingency. He asked if there were any projects that would have a problem with this cap adjustment. Mr. John Saia responded that the Technical Committee re-examined contingency estimates and made appropriate adjustments. Mr. Saia is comfortable with the new project caps and does not believe there will be a problem. Mr. Miguel Flores asked what the total savings of adjusting the cap would be. Ms. LeBlanc noted that the only savings from this adjustment would occur if projects asked for additional money up to that 125 percent cap; however, requests of up to \$18.4 million (not requiring Task Force approval) could occur if the cap were not applied. Mr. Britt Paul noted that this procedure allows the program to have a better handle on available funds. A better estimate, including construction contingency, was developed for these projects since there has been a certain level of design accomplished.

Mr. Rolland Schmitten made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to restrict Phase II budget requests to 100 percent, and Mr. Miguel Flores seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed. [CLARIFIED DECISION: The motion passed during the Task Force meeting was silent regarding reducing the cap for Phase I of these 12 projects. The Corps, as lead agency, requested clarification from Task Force members via email following the meeting. On 23 Nov 04, the Task Force decision was clarified to recommend reducing the cap from 125% to 100% for both Phase I and Phase II for the list of 12 projects that have been approved for Phase II but have not yet begun construction.]

As a result of this motion passing, the following 12 projects are now limited to the amounts shown in the "Current Estimate" columns below.

	Agency	Project Name	Total (Ph I + Ph II Incr 1) Baseline Estimate (100%)	Total (Ph I + Ph II Incr 1) Current Estimate	Percentage
1	COE	MR-11, Periodic Introduction of Sediments and Nutrients DEMO	\$1,502,817	\$1,502,817	100.0%
2	EPA	TE-37, New Cut Dune Restoration	\$7,393,626	\$10,518,139	142.3%
3	FWS	TE-45, Terrebonne Bay SP DEMO	\$2,006,373	\$2,503,768	124.8%
4	FWS	BS-11, Delta Management at Fort St. Phillip	\$2,053,216	\$2,053,216	100.0%
5	NRCS	BA-27c(2), Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph 3 CU4	\$4,825,871	\$6,032,339	125.0%
6	NRCS	LA-05, Freshwater Floating MC DEMO	\$1,080,891	\$1,080,891	100.0%
7	NRCS	CS-29, Black Bayou Bypass Culverts	\$4,308,921	\$5,386,152	125.0%
8	FWS	CS-32(1), East Sabine Lake HR, CU1	\$5,494,843	\$5,494,843	100.0%
9	NMFS	BA-37, Little Lake	\$31,488,685	\$33,990,151	107.9%
10	NMFS	BA-38, Barataria Barrier Island	\$60,452,296	\$66,492,384	110.0%
11	NRCS	BA-27d, Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph4, CU6	\$18,250,647	\$18,250,647	100.0%
12	COE	LA-06, SP Foundation Improvement DEMO	\$1,000,000	\$1,055,000	105.5%
		TOTAL	\$139,858,186	\$154,360,347	110.4%

	Agency	Project Name	Phase I Ph 1 Baseline Estimate (100%)	Phase I Ph 1 Current Estimate	Percentage
1	COE	MR-11, Periodic Introduction of Sediments and Nutrients DEMO	\$109,730	\$109,730	100.0%
2	EPA	TE-37, New Cut Dune Restoration	\$746,274	\$926,637	124.2%
3	FWS	TE-45, Terrebonne Bay SP DEMO	\$528,894	\$528,894	100.0%
4	FWS	BS-11, Delta Management at Fort St. Phillip	\$363,276	\$363,276	100.0%
5	NRCS	BA-27c(2), Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph 3 CU4			
6	NRCS	LA-05, Freshwater Floating MC DEMO	\$338,063	\$338,063	100.0%
7	NRCS	CS-29, Black Bayou Bypass Culverts	\$765,150	\$956,438	125.0%
8	FWS	CS-32(1), East Sabine Lake HR, CU1	\$1,425,447	\$1,425,447	100.0%
9	NMFS	BA-37, Little Lake	\$2,639,536	\$1,139,537	43.2%
10	NMFS	BA-38, Barataria Barrier Island	\$3,083,934	\$3,641,059	118.1%
11	NRCS	BA-27d, Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph4, CU6	\$2,191,808	\$2,191,808	100.0%
12	COE	LA-06, SP Foundation Improvement DEMO	\$362,805	\$339,837	93.7%
		TOTAL	\$12,554,917	\$11,960,726	95.3%

	Agency	Project Name	Phase II, Incr 1 Baseline Estimate (100%)	Phase II, Incr 1 Current Estimate	% incr over baseline
1	COE	MR-11, Periodic Introduction of Sediments and Nutrients DEMO	\$1,393,087	\$1,393,087	100.0%
2	EPA	TE-37, New Cut Dune Restoration	\$6,647,352	\$9,591,502	144.3%
3	FWS	TE-45, Terrebonne Bay SP DEMO	\$1,477,479	\$1,974,874	133.7%
4	FWS	BS-11, Delta Management at Fort St. Phillip	\$1,689,940	\$1,689,940	100.0%
5	NRCS	BA-27c(2), Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph 3 CU4	\$4,825,871	\$6,032,339	125.0%
6	NRCS	LA-05, Freshwater Floating MC DEMO	\$742,828	\$742,828	100.0%
7	NRCS	CS-29, Black Bayou Bypass Culverts	\$3,543,771	\$4,429,714	125.0%
8	FWS	CS-32(1), East Sabine Lake HR, CU1	\$4,069,396	\$4,069,396	100.0%
9	NMFS	BA-37, Little Lake	\$28,849,149	\$32,850,614	113.9%
10	NMFS	BA-38, Barataria Barrier Island	\$57,368,362	\$62,851,325	109.6%
11	NRCS	BA-27d, Barataria Basin Landbridge, Ph4, CU6	\$16,058,839	\$16,058,839	100.0%
12	COE	LA-06, SP Foundation Improvement DEMO	\$637,195	\$715,163	112.2%
			\$127,303,269	\$142,399,621	111.9%

C. Decision/Discussion:

1. Discussion and Decision Regarding Future Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Funding for Non-Cash Flow Projects that have Depleted Their 20-Year O&M Budget

Colonel Peter Rowan said that two projects that were originally fully funded with the 20 year O&M costs are now seeking an increase in costs or funding for O&M. The 20-year O&M funding for these projects have been exhausted. The estimate included is for initial overage and three future years of O&M, in essence changing these projects to a cash-flow basis. Colonel Rowan believes that a discussion is necessary due to potentially changing the operating mode of fully funding PPL 1-8 project costs. He had no objections to this change if done willingly and knowingly to modify the process since it may reflect future project funding.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Rolland Schmittien agreed that this is a process issue and supports the option to consider requests of 3-year incremental O&M funding on a cash-flow basis for projects on PPLs 1-8 that exceed their 20-year budget.

Mr. Rolland Schmittien made a motion for the Task Force to consider requests for 3-year incremental funding of O&M on a cash-flow basis for individual projects on PPLs 1-8 as needed, and Mr. Miguel Flores seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

2. Consider Requests for Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Funding Increased on Priority Project Lists (PPL) 1-8

Based on the actions of the Task Force to approve the previous request, Mr. John Saia announced the Technical Committee's recommendation to approve 2005 – 2007 funding for East Mud Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project O&M in the amount \$720,000 and for 2005 – 2007 funding for Pointe au Fer Hydrologic Restoration Project O&M in the amount of \$215,000.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Miguel Flores asked for the circumstances and a summary as to why the O&M funds for these two projects were exceeded. Mr. Dave Burkholder explained that the East Mud Lake Project, a PPL2 project, was constructed in the late 1990s and incorporated an existing structure that was built in the 1970s, which now needs to be replaced due to settling problems. The Pointe Au Fer Project had experienced breaching around the flood structures in the canal and along the protected shoreline. Mr. Flores asked about the initial construction costs associated with these projects. Mr. Burkholder noted that the East Mud Lake Project and Pointe Au Fer Project construction costs were \$1.5 million and \$2.1 million, respectively. Mr. Flores believes there is a large investment in these projects, which should be protected since these projects are continuing to make a difference.

Colonel Peter Rowan asked if these costs are anticipated to be one-time cost increases. If these are to become recurring costs, then the Task Force could consider not providing funds, allowing the project to fail because of the substantial increase in the fully funded cost. However, if this is a one-time cost, it would be justifiable and the Task Force would be more willing to

provide funding. Mr. Dave Burkholder replied affirming that the costs were one-time and stated that the original design for East Mud Lake did not include replacement of the structure.

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked if the problems in Pointe Au Fer were the result of tropical storms or other extreme events. Mr. Dave Burkholder replied that the problems are not necessarily related to tropical storms, instead non-tropical or normal event storms often have a greater impact.

Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to increase O&M funding (2005 – 2007) for: East Mud Lake Hydrologic Restoration Project (\$720,000) and Point Au Fer Hydrologic Restoration Project (\$215,000). Mr. Miguel Flores seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Rollie Schmitt suggested that in the future, a brief presentation showing the initial cost, requested cost, and reason for cost increase be provided to the Task Force for these types of requests.

D. Request: Request for Funding for Administrative Costs for those Projects beyond Increment 1 Funding

Mr. John Saia announced that the Technical Committee will begin to make annual administrative funding recommendations to the Task Force to maintain a 3-year rolling amount of funding for Corps administrative costs on projects. The Technical Committee recommended the approval of \$21,915 for administrative costs through FY05, which covers several years of previous administrative costs.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked what the requested money would be used for and why it was not included under the Planning Program. Mr. John Saia replied that the money is a rolling amount to be funded each year to maintain the books and reporting for each project. Ms. Julie LeBlanc noted that these administration costs are funded for the first three years of a Phase II project when a project is initially authorized for Phase II by the Task Force; after that, it is similar to the funding of O&M and monitoring throughout the 20-year life of the project. In addition, keeping the cost project-specific and not under the Planning Program will allow the Corps to be funded for these administrative costs after 2009 if the program is not re-authorized. Mr. Hanchey believes that this is not an administration cost and it should be covered in the Planning Budget instead of as a construction item because it is an annual expense. Mr. Saia explained that this cost is project-specific and as the program is continued, the \$5 million will not be available during the O&M phase of these projects. The Technical Committee believes that this is a direct cost to the projects.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked if the accounting for a specific project has a typical percentage associated for this cost. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn noted that each project cost \$665 per year over the life of the project. Ms. Gay Browning added that these funds allow her to do the obligations, estimates, and complete payments for the projects.

Ms. Sidney Coffee asked if the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) would charge the project for similar LDNR administrative costs or ask for additional money. Mr. Gerry Duszynski replied that DNR would charge the money to the project. Mr. Britt Paul added that the cash-flow cost would be funded in a three-year rotating cycle as another project operation cost specific to each project. Mr. Miguel Flores asked if this cost would need an increase every year. Mr. John Saia explained that the requested amount will fund Corps administrative costs through FY05 and would be requested yearly thereafter. Mr. Britt Paul added that it is part of the estimate carried for the life of these projects.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked to consider projecting the costs until 2009 to prevent the Task Force from revisiting this subject. Colonel Peter Rowan replied that future projects would not yet be associated with this cost or this estimate until they are approved for construction.

Mr. Russ Watson made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to fund the Corps administrative costs for individual cash flow projects in the amount of \$21,915. Mr. Britt Paul seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

E. Request: Request for FY08 Coastwide Reference Monitoring System (CRMS) – Wetlands Monitoring Funds and Project Specific Monitoring Funds for Projects on PPLs 9-13

Mr. Rick Raynie presented an updated status on the CRMS Project. Land rights have been secured for 254 of the 612 stations required. The cost-share agreement between USGS (the Federal sponsor) and the state was executed and will cover the Task Force approved project costs between 2003 and 2007 with amendments for each new funding approval. A Standard Operation Procedures manual for CRMS has been developed by DNR for use by contractors supporting CRMS implementation to ensure standard implementation and consistency within the program. Proposals to construct and service the stations for the first 3 years of implementation are currently under review. In the next year, land rights acquisitions will continue, a contract will be selected to begin construction of the stations, the contractor will be trained on the Standard Operating Procedures, and data collection will begin.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Colonel Peter Rowan asked when a baseline would be established. Mr. Rick Raynie noted that 2004 Digital Ortho Quarter Quads (DOQQs) will be used as a baseline for site conditions. In the fall of 2005, land and water analysis will also be used to check the baseline status of the projects. To determine the initial conditions, data will be collected in spring 2005.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked that, in the future, requests include a “visual” of the work done (map, landrights acquired, stations constructed, etc.) and provide a better progress report of finances and expenditures. Mr. Gerry Duszynski noted that a good assessment of CRMS financing would not be available until the proposals are reviewed.

Mr. John Saia informed the Task Force that the recommendation of the Technical Committee is to approve the funding of \$91,563 for project-specific monitoring for three cash-flow projects (\$2,712 for CS-30, GIWW Bank Stabilization – Perry Ridge to Texas; \$82,586 for TE-40, Timbalier Island Dune/Marsh Restoration; and \$6,265 for ME-19, Grand-White Lake Landbridge Protection) and \$532,000 for FY08 CRMS.

Mr. Rolland Schmitten made a motion to accept the recommendation of the Technical Committee to fund project-specific monitoring in the amount of \$91,563 and FY08 CRMS in the amount of \$532,000. Mr. Russ Watson seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

F. Request: Request for Re-allocation of Funds for Construction Unit 4 for the Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection, Phases 1 and 2 (BA-27)

Mr. John Saia reported that the Technical Committee recommended approving the reallocation of \$1,510,563 of the remaining BA-27 budget to Construction Unit 4.

Mr. Quin Kinler informed the Task Force that the Barataria Landbridge Projects were approved over the course of PPLs 7, 8, 9, and 11 for Phases 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. These projects include a total of six construction units. The estimate for all four phases is \$80.6 million, which is 108% of the combined total original estimate for the four phases. The current Agenda Item 9 request is for Phase 1 and 2 of Construction Unit 4 to protect 21,000 ft of shoreline for the Barataria Basin Landbridge. As currently approved for construction by the Task Force, this portion of the project has a 9 percent contingency, which is not ideal. He requested that \$1,510,563 within the BA-27 budget that has not been allocated to a specific construction contract be approved for use for this portion of the project.

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked if all of the units have been constructed. Mr. Quin Kinler replied that three pieces have been constructed and that the estimates presented are based on actual cost for those three and 95 percent design estimates for the other parts.

Colonel Peter Rowan asked which parts of the project were associated with overages in the construction costs. Mr. Quin Kinler explained that the three units constructed are within budget; however, overages will occur when funding additional units.

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked about the use of a solid concrete or rock wall, preventing access between the marsh and open water. Mr. Quin Kinler explained that maintaining the connectivity between these two systems has been incorporated into the design. Within the 21,000 ft to be protected in the project, there will be 500 ft of openings distributed throughout the area with a minimum gap of 10 ft.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked if there will be marsh creation behind the wall. Mr. Quin Kinler noted that this is the location of the Fish and Wildlife Service Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge Project and both projects will work together once both are implemented. After 20 years, this project will produce 424 net acres without the dredging project.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Colonel Peter Rowan asked if these two projects are independent or would the Task Force be required to commit to both. Mr. Quin Kinler replied that this is a stand-alone project and that the benefits assigned to this project were based solely on the erosion protection. When both projects are combined, there are additional benefits. Mr. Britt Paul replied that the two projects were designed to accrue benefits even if only one is funded. Mr. Kinler noted that both of these projects are individually cost effective.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked how many more phases are contained in this project and what the total estimated cost of the project was. Mr. Quin Kinler replied that all phases would cost approximately \$80 million.

Mr. Rolland Schmitten asked if the reduction in the percent of original budget between the initial phases and Phase 4 was due to a learning curve. Mr. Quin Kinler explained that the savings were due to a learning curve in how much it cost to build shoreline protection on poor soils as well as savings from there being better soils within the during Phase 4 project area.

Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to reallocate funds from BA-27 in the amount of \$1,510,563 to Construction Unit 4 of the Barataria Basin Shoreline Protection (Phases 1 and 2), and Mr. Russ Watson seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

G: Request: Request for Construction Approval and Phase II Authorization for Projects on all PPL's

Before the agenda item was started, Ms. Julie LeBlanc reviewed the interactive funding spreadsheet showing the available funds balance and mentioned that a placeholder for the set aside for PPL14 Phase I was needed. Colonel Rowan asked the Task Force for a decision on the recommendation from the Technical Committee to provide \$9 million for PPL14 Phase I.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Rolland Schmitten asked if \$8 million was used as a place holder instead of \$9 million, what would become of the \$1 million difference. Ms. Julie LeBlanc replied that the \$1 million would be shown as available funds.

Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to provide a \$9 million place holder for PPL14 Phase I funding in the interactive funding spreadsheet. Mr. Miguel Flores seconded the motion. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

Ms. Julie LeBlanc noted that there was \$51,937,700 in Federal funding (85%) available for construction approval and Phase II authorization, following the Task Force approval of funding in previous agenda items and incorporating the \$9 million set aside for PPL14 Phase I funding. This spreadsheet is included below.

Available Program Funds (Construction Program)	Total Amount	Federal Portion 85%	13-Oct-04
			Fed Balance
Available "Unencumbered" Balance (as of 13 Oct 04)		\$3,510,112.00	\$3,510,112.00
Anticipated Funding into Construction Program, FY05		\$57,421,000.00	\$60,931,112.00
PPL14, Phase I Setaside	\$9,000,000.00	\$7,650,000.00	\$53,281,112.00
Agenda Item #6: O&M Funding Increases on PPLs 1-8	\$935,000.00	\$794,750.00	\$52,486,362.00
Agenda Item #7: Corps Administrative Costs	\$21,915.00	\$18,627.75	\$52,467,734.25
Agenda Item #8: Project-Specific Monitoring Funds for PPLs 9-13	\$91,563.00	\$77,828.55	\$52,389,905.70
Agenda Item #8: CRMS-Wetlands FY08 Monitoring Request	\$532,000.00	\$452,200.00	\$51,937,705.70
Total Available "Unencumbered" Balance assuming all above Technical Committee recommendations are approved by the Task Force			\$51,937,705.70

Colonel Rowan outlined how this agenda item would be handled. Each project up for consideration by the Task Force would be briefly presented by the sponsoring agency. After each project presentation, the Task Force would briefly make comments and then the floor would be opened to the public for comments.

Mr. John Saia said that the Technical Committee has reviewed 11 projects and 1 demo project for construction approval or Phase II authorization. Each agency represented in the Technical Committee was asked to rank the projects. At the time of the Technical Committee meeting, there was not sufficient funds to recommend the fifth highest-ranking project, North Lake Mechant, therefore the USFWS was tasked with reconsidering the cost estimate for the project. It was also suggested to skip the North Lake Mechant Project to fund lower ranked projects that would fit within the available funds. The Technical Committee determined that a Task Force recommendation should be made for the top four ranking projects, including the demonstration.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked for clarification on how the votes were cast to rank the projects. Mr. John Saia explained that prior to the Technical Committee meeting, all agencies agreed to a voting procedure via email. After all of the project presentations at the Technical Committee meeting, each agency ranked the projects (using a weighted score – 11 to highest ranked project, 1 to lowest ranked project). It was previously decided that a ranked vote of 6 or more would be considered as a "yes" vote for that project. The projects were then ranked by number of agency "yes" votes and then by weighted point scores. Mr. Flores asked about the factors considered by the members in making their vote. Mr. Saia replied that it varied by agency, with what they felt to be the most critical projects along with some consideration toward the prioritization score.

Mr. John Saia opened the floor for agencies to make presentations on individual projects.

1. Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection Project Phases 1 and 2 (BA-27)

Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, explained that this project would protect 13,780 ft of shoreline for an area that is eroding at 114 ft/yr for 77 percent of the area and 30 ft/yr for 23 percent of the

area. This project will result in 721 net acres at year 20 and has a prioritization score of 77.25. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$11.7 million with a funding request of \$7.4 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Miguel Flores asked about the ecological significance in preserving this portion. Mr. Quin Kinler responded that this area has a more significant erosion rate than other portions of Louisiana. This project contributes to maintaining an important landmass that separates the marine tidal processes of the lower Barataria Basin from the freshwater dominated upper basin.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments. There were no public comments on the Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection Project.

2. Barataria Basin Landbridge Shoreline Protection Project Phase 3 (BA-27c)

Mr. Quin Kinler, NRCS, explained that this project would protect 22,800 ft of shoreline for an area that is eroding at 30 ft/yr for 40 percent of the area, 15 ft/yr for 46 percent of the area, and 5 ft/yr for 5 percent of the area. This project will create 180 net acres and has a prioritization score of 45.55. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$14.1 million with a funding request of \$12.1 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked what the difference was between the two Barataria Basin projects to have one rated lower than the other (regarding their prioritization scores). Mr. Quin Kinler noted that the biggest difference is the rate of erosion and the fact that this project is not going to protect as many acres as the first. Mr. Hanchey commented that it seems that this project envisions protecting the entire Barataria Basin Landbridge. Mr. Kinler agreed that this area is very important and that the peninsula is already being cut with oil and gas access canals. He added that if this phase is not funded this year, funding will be requested next year for this last piece of the project. Mr. Hanchey is interested in a complete solution for the Barataria Basin Landbridge, which needs to be kept in mind to protect this area.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, noted that the landbridge project is crucial for Jefferson Parish even though it is primarily located in Lafourche Parish.

3. Freshwater Bayou Bank Stabilization – Belle Isle Bayou to the Lock (TV-11b)

Dr. Ken Duffy, LDNR, explained that this project would protect 40,000 ft of shoreline for an area that is eroding at 12.5 ft/yr. This project will create 241 net acres and has a prioritization score of 42.50. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$15.7 million with a funding request of \$13.8 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked how the fact that a project is on either the east or the west bank of Freshwater Bayou Canal could impact the prioritization score. Dr. Ken Duffy noted that one side is in the Chenier Plain, while the other side is on the Deltaic Plain. The marshes in these areas are different enough to make a distinction between the two.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Corporation and landowner, is in favor of the project and noted that once the hydrologic restoration portion was removed from this project, the benefits were greatly reduced. Approximately 7,000 acres of marsh were under management prior to the levees being managed. The private sector has tried to mimic this project, but has been prevented by the cost of mitigation.

4. Freshwater Introduction South of LA Highway 82 (ME-16)

Mr. Darryl Clark, USFWS, explained that this project would introduce freshwater into the Mermentau Basin through channel enlargement, new freshwater inflow structures, plug removal, modifying a gate structure, and construction of 26,000 feet of earthen terraces to reduce salinity levels and land loss. This project will create 296 net acres and has a prioritization score of 57.35. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$5.4 million with a funding request of \$4.3 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Colonel Peter Rowan noted that there was one area on the salinity gradient map that indicated an increase in salinity. Mr. Darryl Clark replied that there was a structure to introduce freshwater near that location, but that area consists primarily of brackish and saline marshes, therefore that area probably would not have indicated a salinity increase as depicted in the model. Colonel Rowan asked if the hydrologic model was completed in high rain and drought years because rainfall has a large impact on salinity. Mr. Clark replied that the model year was a normal year and that resources and time were not available to model different rainfall years.

Mr. Randy Hanchey commented that when anomalies occur, it questions the creditability of the results. He also asked how this project compares to a previous priority list project with structures up to the Mermentau Basin. Mr. Darryl Clark explained that the State has a project to introduce freshwater at Pecan Island as well as two other CWPPRA projects in engineering and design, both of which are to the west of the Rockefeller Refuge. Mr. Hanchey has seen similar projects where terraces contribute 70 to 80 percent of the benefits and asked how much of the benefits are associated with terraces as opposed to the introduction of freshwater. Mr. Darryl Clark replied that the terraces would restore 14 net acres of marsh, while the freshwater introduction would protect 282 net acres.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. Parke Moore, Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries, stated that his department supports this project. He noted that Freshwater Introduction South of Highway 82 would enhance approximately 24,000 acres of marsh in Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge and allow a

more natural, historic flow pattern of freshwater into now brackish marshes. In time, this will allow the wetlands to become a more diverse and productive fresh and intermediate marsh.

5. South Lake Decade Freshwater Introduction – Construction Unit 1 (TE-39)

Mr. Loland Broussard, NRCS, explained that the intent of this project is to introduce freshwater from Lake Decade into interior marshes and provide armored protection to the southern shoreline of Lake Decade. The project has been separated into 2 construction units with Construction Unit 1 involving shoreline protection and Construction Unit 2 encompassing the freshwater introduction components. The project features included in Construction Unit 1 are 8,700 ft of shoreline protection, 2,900 ft of embankment restoration, and installation of a low level weir to reduce erosion (15-20 ft/yr) and salinity levels. This project will create 207 net acres and has a prioritization score of 73.45. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$3.4 million with a funding request of \$2.5 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Randy Hanchey asked about the benefits in placing a rock dike to protect a very narrow piece of land and about the condition of the water in Lake Decade. Mr. Loland Broussard replied that the lake is basically fresh, and there were two monitoring stations previously installed to observe lake and interior marsh conditions. Mr. Hanchey noted that it seems as if this area has already been lost and that a dike will not provide much benefit to the southern area. Mr. Broussard responded that the largest benefit from this project would be to maintain the hydrologic barrier between the lake and marsh area to prevent high salinity water from further encroachment into the fresh/intermediate marsh.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee in Terrebonne Parish, supports this project.

Mr. James Miller, Coastal Zone Management Administrator for Terrebonne Parish, noted that this project is in one of the most critical areas of Terrebonne and asked for its support.

6. Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) Bank Restoration of Critical Areas (TE-43)

Mr. Andy Tarver, NRCS, explained that this project would protect 41,000 ft of shoreline, enabling the GIWW to direct freshwater to the east, protect connected marshes, and prevent an erosion rate of 15 ft/yr along the bank. This project will create 366 net acres and has a prioritization score of 43.25, which does not account for protection of floating marsh. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$23.6 million with a funding request of \$20.4 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion; however, there were no comments on the GIWW project.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. James Miller, Coastal Zone Management Administrator for Terrebonne Parish, noted that this project will help many critical areas and that vessel traffic is destroying the marshes.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee in Terrebonne Parish, also supports this project.

Mr. George Strain, Vice President of Continental Land and Fur and majority land owner, commented that when the GIWW was initially built, it had a width of 125 feet but has since expanded to over 1,000 ft wide in some places. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service documented this problem in 1989 and proposed bank stabilization along this same area, but nothing was done. He stated that a structural retainer, and not dredged material alone, is required to have a lasting impact on bank stabilization.

7. North Lake Mechant Landbridge Restoration Project – Construction Unit 2 (TE-44(2))

Ms. Martha Segura, USFWS, explained that the revised version of this project would restore marsh along the north shore of Lake Mechant and the Small Bayou La Pointe Ridge through dedicated dredging and construction of several plugs. This project will create 519 net acres and has a prioritization score of 57.90. She informed the Task Force that the budget was extensively examined as well as other CWPPRA projects to return money to the program to fit into the remaining available funds. The updated fully funded estimate for this project is \$31.0 million with a funding request of \$27.4 million. This project was revised since the original version was presented to the Technical Committee. Changes include reducing the placement height in some of the cells by 0.5' based upon soil conditions (this was discussed at the 95% design review meeting) and eliminating a 40-acre marsh creation cell.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Miguel Flores asked for information on the interrelationship between this project and the South Lake Decade Project. Ms. Martha Segura explained that this project area adjoins the South Lake Decade Project area. Mr. Flores questioned the advantage of approving one project over the other or combining projects. Ms. Segura noted that the advantage of this project is to remove the saltwater source for a large area. There is a synergy between the projects that help retain freshwater in the area.

Colonel Peter Rowan asked if the project has been optimized. Ms. Martha Segura replied in the affirmative and stated that the goals and integrity of this landbridge project cannot be kept if the features are further reduced.

Ms. Sidney Coffee noted that this is a positive move to indicate that all projects could be further optimized. She was concerned that the integrity of the process would be jeopardized by changing projects to fit within a given budget. Ms. Martha Segura noted that half of the savings for this project came from something that was not new; the changes made were ones that had already been discussed.

Mr. Randy Hanchey shared some of Ms. Sidney Coffee's concerns. He was surprised we have routinely provided S&A costs from a formula that doesn't necessarily reflect the true S&A

costs of the project. There might be a lot of money out there that could finance this project by itself if everyone did what was accomplished on this project. Mr. Hanchey's concerns for this project have been alleviated and he believes it is now a good project. The reduction of the elevation of the fill was a good move. He does not share the same concern as the other members to carry over a large surplus in the Construction Program. He noted that a surplus would provide a cushion for any cost overages and high priority opportunities that might develop.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. James Miller, Costal Zone Management Administrator for Terrebonne Parish, pointed out that the landbridge is a critical barrier between easily eroded marshes in the north and brackish waters in the south. This area will provide habitat for bald eagles and brown pelicans through an increase in the estuarine functional value and wetland area. He asked the Task Force members to reconsider this project for funding. Colonel Peter Rowan asked Mr. James Miller which project is a priority for Terrebonne Parish. Mr. Miller believes that the Lake Mechant project enhances South Lake Decade, and that it is a tough decision.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee in Terrebonne Parish, strongly supports this project and believes it to be the top priority. It is important to protect the freshwater marsh to reduce the impact of hurricanes and tidal surges.

Mr. Mark Rogers, resident of Terrebonne Parish, also strongly supports this project and believes this is the most critical project for Terrebonne. He also likes the South Lake Decade and GIWW Projects, but this project has the most benefits. He has seen the benefits from the shoreline protection of north Bayou Decade as well as benefits from this Lake Mechant Project.

8. Dedicated Dredging on the Barataria Basin Landbridge (BA-36)

Mr. Kevin Roy, USFWS, explained that this project would compliment the Barataria Basin Landbridge Project (Phase 1 and 2) by creating marsh in the area behind the protection wall, which faces a 2 percent per year erosion rate. This project will create 605 net acres and has a prioritization score of 61.00. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$36.2 million with a funding request of \$33.7 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Miguel Flores asked for verification as to how there would still be land loss in this area with the BA-27 project in place which would protect over 400 acres. Mr. Kevin Roy replied that the BA-27 project would protect marshes from shoreline erosion but that interior marsh loss would continue to occur from subsidence and ponding.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Ms. Marnie Winter, representing Jefferson Parish, noted that this project is another priority for Jefferson as this area is experiencing some of the worst erosion rates in Louisiana. It has always been planned to fill in behind the shoreline protection. She understands that funds

should not be tied up for this project until the shoreline protection is in place, but this project does have a high ranking score and hopes it will be at the top of list next year. Colonel Peter Rowan asked what project would be considered a priority for Jefferson Parish. Ms. Marnie Winter replied that it would be this project. Mr. Miguel Flores believes that fill is needed behind the dike and should wait until it has been completed. He believes this is a worthy project, just not the right time to fund it.

Mr. Randy Hanchey thinks that the optimal schedule is to fill in behind wall sections as they are built and not to wait until the entire area is completed. He believes that under extraordinary circumstances, a project could be authorized next summer for construction instead of waiting until the next year. Colonel Peter Rowan agreed that the Task Force could approve projects outside of the schedule if there are additional benefits to this action.

9. Grand Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-21)

Mr. Chris Monnerjahn, USACE, explained that this project would protect 43,500 ft of shoreline for an area that is eroding at 25 ft/yr. This project will create 540 net acres and has a prioritization score of 66.25. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$15.2 million with a funding request of \$14.1 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Russ Watson noted that the comparison between Grand Lake and GIWW is not a good one because the Terrebonne marshes are deteriorating faster, but he believes that Lake Mechant is more important.

Mr. Miguel Flores asked about the ecological significance of this project. Mr. Chris Monnerjahn replied that the ecological benefit would be the prevention of shoreline erosion, which results in 540 net acres over the 20-year project life.

Colonel Peter Rowan noted that there are no near-term features in Sub-basin 4 under the Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) study. It is important to ensure that both the CWPPRA and LCA programs are compatible and compliment each other. This may be one of those projects that is needed in an area the LCA would not be reaching. Mr. Randy Hanchey agreed with the Colonel and pointed out that there are no significant projects in the Chenier Plain.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments. There were no public comments on the Grand Lake Shoreline Protection Project, other than those submitted prior to the meeting.

10. Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection Project (TE-48)

Mr. Mike Carloss, LDWF (formerly with NRCS), explained that this project would protect 4,240 ft of shoreline for one of the most important barrier islands in North America for colonial water birds and species diversity. This project will create 16 net acres and has a prioritization score of 41.93. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$7.8 million with a funding request of \$6.4 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Mr. Miguel Flores commented that the EPA is fully supportive of barrier island restoration projects but asked whether the reformation of these islands is due to natural processes or breakwater structures. Mr. Mike Carlross noted that sand pumped onto the island did not last; something was needed to trap the sand in place. Mr. Flores asked why breakwaters were used instead of building up the island with sediment. Mr. Carlross replied that they would like to do both. Phase B will create marsh on the backside of the island, but Raccoon Island has some unique features that would be destroyed if the island was completely built up with sand.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. Parke Moore, Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries, believes that this island is one of the most important barrier islands and sea bird nesting areas in North America. Raccoon Island is an important island for brown pelicans, roseate spoonbills, sport fishing, and storm surge protection for Terrebonne Parish. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries fully supports this project.

Mr. Nolan Bergeron, Chairman of the Coastal Zone Management and Coastal Restoration Advisory Committee and on behalf of the Terrebonne Parish Consolidated Government, strongly supports this project as barrier islands are the first line of defense.

11. South White Lake Shoreline Protection Project (ME-22) and Shoreline Protection Foundation Improvement Demonstration (LA-06)

Ms. Melanie Goodman, USACE, explained that this project would protect 61,500 ft of shoreline for an area that is eroding at 15 ft/yr. This project will protect and/or create 844 net acres and has a prioritization score of 66.40. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$19.7 million with a Increment 1 funding request of \$15.7 million. This project will also serve as the host project for the Shoreline Protection Foundation Improvement Demonstration Project. The demonstration project will test different foundation improvement methods that could improve cost effectiveness and feasibility of shoreline protection projects. The fully funded estimate for this project is \$1.1 million.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion; however, there were no comments on this project.

The floor was opened up to the public for comments:

Mr. Randy Moertle, representing M.O. Miller estate property, commented that this area was originally pumped down for cattle use. These marshes are lower than marshes outside of this area and if the levees are breached, the lake will expand to Highway 82, which is a major evacuation route. Mr. Randy Hanchey was not aware of the extent of pumping and subsidence that has occurred. This area is now being managed for water fowl, in which, it is common practice to dry areas for a short period. He has performed similar marsh management practices at Little Pecan Island and did not have problems with marsh converting to open water; the problem was marsh closing in open water.

Mr. Martin Miller, III, representing family members who manage the property, is in support of this project. This area has not been pumped for cattle in 20 years. Pumping restarted two years ago when White Lake breached the levees.

Mr. M.O. Miller, II, an owner of M.O. Miller Estate, supports the project and will do whatever it takes to get it done.

Mr. Judge Edwards, Vermilion Corporation, supports this project and presented pictures to the Task Force supporting its need. He believes that the area separating White Lake from the Gulf of Mexico could be opened up with the right storm event or tidal surge. White Lake is important for rice and crawfish culture in Vermilion and Cameron Parishes.

Mr. John Saia said that the Technical Committee recommended approval of the top four projects: South White Lake Shoreline Protection (including the demonstration project), the Barataria Basin Landbridge – Phases 1 and 2, Raccoon Island Shoreline Protection – Phase A, and Freshwater Introduction South of Highway 82. With these projects approved, \$24.5 million in Federal funds will remain. The remaining funds were not enough at the time to recommend the fifth highest project, Lake Mechant, therefore \$24.5 million would remain unallocated pending a Task Force decision to fund additional projects.

Mr. Britt Paul made a motion to accept the Technical Committee's recommendation to approve construction (for non-cash flow project)/authorize Phase II and approve Phase II Increment 1 funding (for cash flow projects)/approve funding increase (for non-cash flow project) for the top four ranked projects. Mr. Rolland Schmitten seconded. All Task Force members voted in favor and the motion passed.

The floor was opened to the Task Force for discussion:

Ms. Sidney Coffee questioned the Task Force on their feelings of having a balance of \$24 million or \$1 million. Mr. Miguel Flores believes that there will be many projects next year that will have a higher prioritization score than some of the current projects. He is not opposed to keeping a buffer in the budget for next October. Mr. Rolland Schmitten believes that \$1 million would not be enough of a buffer, but \$24 million would be too much. He thinks that the Lake Mechant Project is a good project; it has been supported by the Task Force. Mr. Schmitten asked what it will do to the reserve to fund project overages. Colonel Peter Rowan replied that if the Task Force approved the recommendation, the expected funding available the program through 2009 would be down to \$255 million. Mr. Britt Paul clarified that if a project came in over budget, all that could be spent was \$1.1 million. Ms. Julie LeBlanc agreed, unless the Task Force decided to over-program funds.

Mr. Randy Hanchey believes that there will be projects as good, if not better, than the projects presented and should be anticipated next year. Future projects should be accounted for when looking at the remaining program budget. He also pointed out that the Task Force accepted the full recommendation of the Technical Committee without a discussion on the merits of the remaining projects. From the State's perspective, Lake Mechant would be preferred to other projects just approved by the Task Force. Mr. Hanchey would like to compare the Lake

Mechant and GIWW Projects to the four approved by the Task Force. Colonel Peter Rowan responded that three of the high priority projects for the DNR (based upon the State's vote during the Technical Committee meeting) have been approved and are not necessarily in conflict with the State or the action. Mr. Hanchey added that the responsibility of the Task Force is not to simply endorse the recommendations of the Technical Committee, but to make choices. Colonel Peter Rowan said he is comfortable with the consensus of the Task Force and is comfortable with a \$1.5 million buffer knowing that additional cash will come into the program each successive year and that there is money sitting out there that could be made available. Mr. Miguel Flores agreed with Mr. Hanchey and believed that they were going to vote on the individual projects. Mr. Flores also agreed with Colonel Rowan that there is not a problem in carrying over \$1.5 million given there is money out there that has not been expended.

Mr. Russ Watson noted that at Technical Committee meetings, it was indicated that it would be a semi-crime to leave \$24 million unallocated. The Technical Committee said that the Task Force should look at these things and make these big decisions. He commented that if a project is skipped to fund one that fits the budget, then the question becomes are we adding quality or quantity? Mr. Watson believes it would be wrong to hold back an optimized project because there is a possibility that another project might be ready in the future. He does not believe there is a reason to remand the issue to the Technical Committee for a later recommendation.

Ms. Sidney Coffee believes that the Task Force is setting a precedent that could lead to the manipulation of the process if allowed to continue. She noted that the Task Force likes the Lake Mechant Project, and she was amazed at what was accomplished with the budget. She asked if there were other projects that could be reexamined to find millions of dollars to use. She encouraged all agencies to continue to reexamine their projects.

Colonel Peter Rowan asked Mr. Rolland Schmitten to address Lake Mechant since NMFS voted the project as their highest ranked project at the Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Schmitten stated that he previously commented on the project and restated that their issue relates to the reserve. He would be willing to over-program if necessary when another project requests an overage in funds that exceeds the buffer.

Mr. Russ Watson asked to have the projects approved today to reconcile their Phase I accounts, which could bring a lot of money back to the program. He believes that \$1.5 million would be an adequate buffer and that it would not be right to put a hold on projects that are ready to go for future possibilities.

Mr. Gerry Duszynski pointed out that there are funded projects in Phases I and II that may not be constructed for a variety of reasons.

Mr. Miguel Flores recognized the value of Lake Mechant, but asked why Grand Lake, which has a higher prioritization score, or another project should not be considered instead.

Mr. Randy Hanchey acknowledged that a case could be made for every project listed, but the right thing to do would be to look at the next ranked project unless there are concerns about