**Governor’s Advisory Commission on Coastal Protection, Restoration and Conservation**

**State of Louisiana**

1051 Capitol Annex, Suite 138 · Baton Rouge, LA 70802 · 225-342-3968

**AGENDA**

**Governor’s Advisory Commission on Coastal Protection, Restoration, and Conservation**

**Thursday, February 26**

**9:30 a.m.**

Galvez Building

Oliver Pollock Room

602 North 5th Street

Baton Rouge, LA 70802

1. **Welcome/Call to Order** **–** *R. King Milling, Chairman*
2. **Roll Call**

King Milling, Channing Hayden, Mark Delesdernier, Nedra Davis (for Sen. Morrish), Rep. Garofalo, Dwayne Bourgois, Alan Front, Michel Claudet, Chip Kline, Tim Cresswell, Tanner Johnson, Simone Maloz, David Cresson, Ted Falgout, Jim Tripp, Rep. St. Germain, Dr. Robert Stewart, Al Sunseri, Joel Landry, Dr. Gerald Galloway, Chris Macaluso, Mayor Piazza, Karen Gautreaux

1. **Approval of Agenda (no quorum)**
2. **Approval of Minutes (no quorum)**
3. **2017 Master Plan Project Selection Process**—*Karim Belhadjali, CPRA*
   * 2012 process: How projects evolved into decisions. Considered $250 billion worth of projects in 2012.
   * Tough decisions were made balancing flood risk reduction and land building alongside funding constraints.
   * Solicited projects for 2017 development.
   * Screening criteria considering size threshold, geographic area, consistency with master plan objectives and principles, and duplicative effects
   * Received projects from agencies, private land owners, elected officials, and more
   * Also considered CWPPRA projects since 2012 and LOSCO’s oil spill projects list
   * Total price tag for new projects was nearly $111 billion.
   * Programmatic measures were considered for projects too small or diffuse to model.
   * New Projects being considered cover the entire coast, a variety of concepts and types, $23 billion.
   * New projects will be evaluated in the same way as the 2012 projects to see if they can compete. Will not increase size of plan to $73 billion. Will need to make choices.
   * Some 2012 projects have been removed because of implementation issues or because they are being handled programmatically.
   * Some 2012 projects are having their footprints revisited
     + Mr. Milling: question regarding the dredging requirements for increase Atchafalaya flow.
     + Simone Maloz: we found out we didn’t need to dredge as much in the GIWW to get the flows we needed.
     + Austin Feldbaum: you have it correct
     + Mr. Milling: just wanted to make sure the project is still on the table. (it is).
   * Some master plan projects are still being studied: the Lake Pontchartrain Barrier and the Upper Barataria Basin Risk Reduction Project.
   * Will model all projects currently in 2012 and the new projects to see how things come out.
   * Moving forward, the engineers are developing the projects further, establishing costs, and they will go through the modeling process and we will come back to the public to let you know where we stand.
   * Rep. Garofalo: there are additional $23 billion in requests. Are we going to reduce the total $50 billion by what has been completed since 2012?
   * Karim: we are still having those discussions. We are looking at our financials.
   * Rep. Garofalo: as you proceed, I want to go on record asking you to reconsider the plans developed by St. Bernard and Plaquemines. If they are outside the master plan again, we need to have a way to seek funding for them outside of that process. CPRA needs to figure out some kind of method whereby parishes can still try to procure funding.
   * Karim: I appreciate the comment and we recognize that there are great ideas out there that parishes and organizations can do to increase their safety and resilience. The master plan just identifies our priorities. We are happy to provide any support we can. If someone needs us to chime in to support those projects and plans we will.
   * Rep. Garofalo: you guys are using computer models strongly to determine what projects are being included. I have heard that the cost of dredging being used to consider projects is drastically off what it actually costs which is artificially lowering the rank of dredging projects. I hope you are continuing to update the models and how you factor things in.
   * Karim: we are updating everything in our models with sediment resources, refill rates, the most recent dredging costs,
   * Mr. Milling: I think we have to keep in mind that we are dealing with a problem that is being handled and analyzed by the scientists and engineers that we have and at the Water Institute. And folks are continually analyzing what we should and should not do. We are trying like the devil to develop a comprehensive plan that will create a sustainable situation. There are going to be some that feel like they aren’t being treated like they ought to but we are seeking the best returns for those down the road. We didn’t cause this problem, it has been 80 years in the making and it is going to take an awful lot to put the system back together again. The people on this commission are realists and pragmatists.
   * Mr. Front: recalling the ratios of protection vs. restoration, and within those categories those ratios. How do the new projects affect those?
   * Karim: we are going through the modeling process using the same tools and we are going to be having lots of conversations about that.
   * Mr. Creswell: the difficult decisions these folks make we have to remain on the realistic side. We can’t be all things for all people. No way are we going to satisfy everybody. There are some things in Vermilion parish that I would like to get done.
4. **Agenda and Minutes approved 10:08 since quorum was achieved.**
5. **CPRA Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Annual Plan—***Kyle Graham, CPRA*
   * Review of progress made since beginnings of CPRA in 2008.
   * Most of the money spent so far has been in historic alignments and levee systems but we are starting to expand into new alignments and systems.
   * Showed a map of projects completed and under way in Barataria Basin. Although impressive it does not overcome the rate of land loss.
   * Displayed barrier island projects
   * We function on a lot of different funding programs which makes our three year projection a little difficult.
   * 2016 summary includes the small scale physical model, large projects (barrier islands and Caminda phase II). Four projects exceeding $100 million.
   * Diversions: it is becoming clearer and clearer to us that if we are going to sustain a footprint of this state we are going to need to rely on the river resource and not just focus on dredging. We have a whole series of studies that will mature this fall. We anticipate we are losing 30 years of deltaic growth every year. We don’t have time to waste. We need to figure out how to utilize these riverine resources. The importance of this to the coastal program and economy is tremendous. We know enough now to see that we will not be shoaling in the entire river but that we will be able to reduce the dredging costs overall.
   * Mr. Johnson: question about the colors on the decision framework schematic slide
   * Mr. Graham: explained.
   * Master Plan 2017 model improvement plan.
   * Displayed revenues for FY 16 and next three years. The only revenue stream not tied specifically to projects is the mineral revenues. We use that fund to pay for CPRA and to cover CWPPRA matches. That fund is often in the $30 million range and it will be lower we think.
   * Mr. Johnson: question about earlier drafts of the plan and changes shown in GOMESA
   * Rep. St. Germain: DOTD interagency transfer is for what?
   * Mr. Graham: when we were created we took positions from DOTD and DNR. That funding is the cover those positions. It is not associated with projects.
   * Mr. Tripp: what are the proposed RESTORE revenues for 2018 coming from?
   * Mr. Graham: we are anticipating the existing dollars with the projects on the table.
   * Mr. Front: would that number represent just Pot 2?
   * Mr. Graham: No, there is pot 1 and 3 in there as well.
   * Reviewed expenditures.
   * Mr. Graham: Budget is not impacted our ability to do projects. It is having an impact on our ancillary programs.
   * Mrs. Gautreaux: Would you need new budget authority if you found money to reinstate those programs?
   * Mr. Graham: We would have to go through a process with joint budget to do that. particularly if oil spill money comes or other things change. We are going to modify this based on Friday’s budget and based on everything that has changed since November when this was pulled together.
   * Showed pie chart of expenditures with 65% in construction.
   * Dr. Stewart: ownership and public access within the footprint of projects. On Grand Isle I get this question. There are differences in these issues depending on who funds the project. What are the rules right now for public access or ownership within the footprint of a project?
   * Mr. Graham: with the exception of the LCA program we only get the right of use from the land owner. We do not purchase the land. The Corps prefers fee-simple (where land is purchased). State has been working with Corps on a conservation easement for marsh creation. Our preference is to only get right of use.
   * Mr. Milling: the other answer is that it has taken 150 years to develop case law about transferring title in this part of the world.
   * Mr. Graham: since land rights could hold up projects for years we use standard agreements across the coast. Sometimes new things crop up like carbon credit rights, but for the most part the standard agreements let us get out more quickly.
   * Mr. Tripp: if you stay on schedule with the evaluation of diversions do you anticipate funding construction?
   * Mr. Graham: we know it will take at least two years to finish engineering and design. The Corps will have to permit them and it could be a painful process. So we think we have at least three years before we would be able to go to construction (Dec. 2018).
   * Mr. Falgout: Mississippi River long distance sediment pipeline—update the slide to show what is actually planned for Little Lake. Please understand that most people are going to want to see some projects displayed that are in the Master Plan and unless you show the marsh you are going to be impacted they will be less interested in possibly contributing funding.
   * Mr. Macaluso: you showed the costs of these barrier island projects doubling what we used to spend. Is that because the footprint is getting larger or are there other aspects that are being included?
   * Mr. Graham: it would be interesting to see price/yard then vs. now. You would have to compare with similar borrow sites. We used to do local borrowing and we have moved away from that.
   * Mr. Sunseri: I hope you guys include water quality in the modeling and its effects on the estuary and where you will be able to harvest oysters and bring them to market. We need to look at where all the different species are going to move too. You will get more buy in if you are up front with them.
   * Rep. St. Germain: I want to second that.
   * Rep. Garofalo: I know you are doing a salinity study too correct?
   * Mr. Graham: yes, it is within the hydrodynamic and deltaic study. Yes, we are also going to look at where things were and where things are. That is the challenge. If we are going to sustain the basins to as large as an extent then we will have to push some of those activities back out.
   * Mr. Milling: prior to 1930 we were catching a lot of shrimp and fish and oysters in the lower basin and hopefully we will have to learn how to do this again.
   * Mr. Sunseri: the department has a 100+ years of where oyster leases used to be. They weren’t all on the southern end. A lot were up along the river. We just don’t want to suggest that oysters didn’t exist further up in the basin. All we need to do is to try to plan so that they can still exist and thrive. We have to be honest with ourselves.
   * Dr. Galloway: I am impressed with the idea of the center for river studies. It reflects that there has been a shift in gravity from federal action to state action. You are becoming a center not just for Louisiana but for gulf wide. What would you say the mix is on the diversion work? How much federal support is there?
   * Mr. Graham: it is about 66/33 state federal. The hydro and delta management is 50/50 and then the state is doing a lot of additional work through NFWF which adjusts the percentage more in the state’s favor. We have a program out for bucket 2 RESTORE which would allow us to partner more with the Corps on lower river management.
   * Dr. Stewart: any project we build is going to have positive, neutral, or negative effects on some resource. What is the thinking now on how to make the negative consequences more palatable?
   * Mr. Graham: to be completely honest is that the degrading delta provides great fishing. There might be some changes when we have a healthier delta. …(see tape). We have to get to the point to know what is the size of what we are looking at.
   * Mr. Milling: I suggest that the issue of the $2.2 million reduction from our funding (which I understand may not happen in the bill). We will have a meeting on April 1 where I suggest we decide if we should take a position on that.
6. **Lower Barataria and Lower Breton Sediment Diversion Plan Selection Update—***Kent Bollfrass, CPRA*
   * Attempting to bring the two lower diversions up to speed so that there could be a uniform analysis of all four.
   * Lower Barataria concepts and lower Brenton concepts.
   * Alternative sites correspond with sand bars in the river which are needed for maximum sediment capture.
   * Walked through the screening process on Lower Barataria and Lower Breton.
   * Reviewed next steps for the lower diversions.
   * Mr. Sunseri: you guys need to try to start displaying operating costs (annualized) over the lifespan of these diversions.
   * Mr. Bollfrass: right now those are built into the costs displayed.
   * Mr. Sunseri: so what lifespan are you then displaying?
   * Mr. LeBlanc: the total cost is over the 50 year life of the project.
   * Mr. Tripp: you have as a criteria, “land building,” which makes me think of sand and silt. So, are you looking at trapping efficiency at different locations and how effective they will be at the different locations at preserving wetlands?
   * Mr. Bollfrass: we did look at capture efficiency in the channel, but not on the basin side. But the land built category does include land sustained. One of the reasons Empire and Buras got screened out was because they have little marsh left and their sustaining ability cost them in the land building category.
   * Mr. Tripp: the capture efficiency was higher in some categories, but the land building was lower, why is that?
   * Mr. Bollfrass: it had to do with the land sustaining aspect which is much greater than new land built. It has to do with the surrounding marsh.
   * Mr. Falgout: are you factoring in climate change/sea level rise when you are looking at the lower basin vs. upper basin diversions?
   * Mr. Bollfrass: the models both account for sea level rise at different rates. We also have different subsidence rates as you move down the delta that we are factoring in.
   * Mr. Falgout: I think we heard a presentation showing that higher seas would cause lower river velocity and that sediment would drop out sooner.
   * Mr. Bolfrass: that is not part of our analysis this early on. Hydro will give us a better idea of that. but in our models the higher up in the river there is higher stream power.
   * Mr. Front: those capture efficiencies are based on 50,000 flow?
   * Mr. Bolfrass: we evaluated each of them the same. And the operation scheme was less aggressive than what was in the Master Plan based on costs and other things.
   * Mr. Front: it makes me wonder, mid Barataria modeling was showing substantially different land creation rates based on flow rates. That would then have an impact on return on investment.
   * Mr. Bolfrass: we are still aiming for 50,000. There is a lot of work to be done on operations
   * Dr. Stewart: recent studies are pointing to a more rapid and higher level of sea level rise than what we thought about before. What levels are you using and what does it mean for your modeling?
   * Mr. Bolfrass: we are using 1 meter by 2100. As a follow up we will be doing 1.5 meters as a less optimistic. A diversion in theory will be able to keep up with sea level rise better than marsh creation.
7. **Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control Measures**—*Austin Feldbaum, CPRA*
   * Need and purpose for project
   * Different classes of concepts considered for implementing project
   * Looked at different potential effects of the different concepts: salinity, land loss, fisheries, navigation, O&M, etc.
   * Initial screening results displayed
   * Narrowed down to three project concepts
   * Final evaluation results shown
   * Next steps.
   * Mr. Falgout: are you modeling what will happen on the Cameron Coast when you increase friction on the major relief valve? You have a different situation here than in other locations. I think you will see a sizeable storm surge impact on the Cameron headland if you increase friction in the channel.
   * Mr. Feldbaum: your point is well taken, we have done enough to look at height…
   * Mr. Falgout: the friction a storm encounters determines higher storm surges. You are increasing friction in the only place where the water can go so you need to look into it early on in the process.
   * Mr. Creswell: you have to look at the water coming back out as well.
   * Mr. Feldbaum: we know the AdCirc model is not great at these drainage functions and are discussing how to handle it. We have options such as a one way flap gate.
8. **Public Comment: NRDA, Oil Spill, Response and RESTORE Act**
   * none
9. **Public Comment**

* none

1. **Adjourn**