



Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority
150 Terrace Avenue, Baton Rouge, LA 70802 | coastal@la.gov | www.coastal.la.gov

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Attachment G4: Focus Groups



Report: Final

Date: April 2017

Prepared By: Nick Speyrer and Avery Woodard (Emergent Method)

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Community Focus Group Meeting #1	2
Community Focus Group Meeting #2	5
Community Focus Group Meeting #3	9
Community Focus Group Meeting #4	12
Community Focus Group Meeting #5	14
Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting #1	15
Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting #2	18
Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting #3	20
Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting #4	22
Fisheries Focus Group Meeting #1	24
Fisheries Focus Group Meeting #2	29
Fisheries Focus Group Meeting #3	32
Landowner Focus Group Meeting #1	34
Landowner Focus Group Meeting #2	37
Landowner Focus Group Meeting #3	42
Landowner Focus Group Meeting #4	45
Landowner Focus Group Meeting #5	48
Navigation Focus Group Meeting #1	50
Navigation Focus Group Meeting #2	53
Navigation Focus Group Meeting #3	57
Navigation Focus Group Meeting #4	61
Navigation Focus Group Meeting #5	64
Navigation Focus Group Meeting #6	67
All Focus Groups Meeting	70

Overview

In an effort to capitalize on the specific knowledge and essential partnerships that community focus groups offer, CPRA hosted 24 focus groups with varied constituency groups to discuss the outcomes and implications of the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and provide updates surrounding flood risk and resilience and diversion planning. CPRA also solicited feedback and comments from all focus groups.

The following attachment provides key summaries from all community focus group meetings, as well as next steps and comments from attendees.

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Community Focus Group Meeting

April 25, 2013 (9:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m.)

Houma Public Library, Main Branch - 101 Library Road, Houma, LA

Meeting Participants

Community Focus Group Members: Rebecca Templeton, Theresa Dardar, Bette Billiot, Patty Whitney, Robert Gorman, Sheila Billiot

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Natalie Peyronnin, Mandy Green, Andrea Galinski, Melanie Saucier

Meeting Summary

- **FY 2014 Annual Plan Update:** Melanie welcomed the group and expressed CPRA's interest in getting greater community feedback. CPRA understands both the local knowledge and essential partnerships that community groups offer. Natalie then explained the expenditures and revenues that are listed in the Draft Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Plan for the next three years. She also discussed the oil spill funds and where those funds are being used to move certain master plan projects forward. For more details, please click [HERE](#) to download the 2014 Annual Plan.
- **Funding Sources, Project Implementation, and Projects outside Master Plan:** Many participants had questions about funding sources, how funding sources could be combined, and which projects would be moving forward next. Current oil spill funds are only based on civil fines and criminal fines are being determined in court now. The civil fines distributed to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) are to be used for barrier island restoration and sediment diversions only. There are three main phases to the oil spill trial with the final phase expected to be complete between November - December 2013:
 - Phase 1: To determine the responsible parties
 - Phase 2: To determine the amount of oil spilled
 - Phase 3: To determine gross negligence (potentially)

Other projects like Calcasieu Salinity Control Structure and the Houma Navigation Canal Lock can be funded through the Restore Act which allows for more flexibility. Additional projects in the area are also moving forward, like the dredging projects in Bayou Lafourche.

- It was recommended for CPRA to also include HUD and CDBG funds for community planning and future mitigation projects into the funding mix.

- We are currently working with the Office of Community Development, GOHSEP, and DOTD through the Coastal Community Resiliency Advisory Group on how to best leverage those types of funds.
- **Restore Act Discussion:** The group brought up questions about who designates how the 2.5% of funds for the Center of Excellence works under the Restore Act and how those research priorities will be determined.
 - Those details have not been worked out yet and the state has not yet designated who the Center of Excellence for Louisiana will be.

It was recommended that whatever large consortium forms to work on Restore Act related research and projects; they should develop a policy that will emphasis working with community level NGO's to conduct outreach to coastal communities. The RFP should mention how important it is to work with local NGO's to get community access and research and how those local groups should be properly compensated for their work in the communities. A good source to reference that has developed the appropriate language and policy on working with and respecting local community groups is from UNO-CHART.

It was also suggested that CPRA recommend mitigation and resiliency projects to the Restore Council to fulfill their resilience goals because their project funds are more flexible and can be spent on economic development and community projects instead of just ecosystem restoration projects.

- **Coastal Community Resiliency Program:** One of our main goals is to provide citizens and communities a centralized information source on their flood risk and nonstructural options and to enable state and local officials to leverage every dollar that comes our way to promote effective and efficient flood risk mitigation and resiliency measures.

The four main elements of the program are to:

- 1) Develop Data and Tools: Utilize data from CLARA risk modeling and expand to include higher resolution spatial analysis; determine areas of highest risk; and evaluate mitigation incentive programs.
- 2) Provide Information: Understand past risk reduction successes and challenges and potential funding sources predicted for the future; increase public awareness of current and future flood risks due to climate change; and provide clear maps and other visualization tools for coastal communities.
- 3) Provide Options: Provide communities with a range of risk reduction options and determine a method for prioritizing projects in areas of high risk.
- 4) Create Platforms for Collaboration and Action: Create collaborative partnerships with other agencies, organizations and stakeholders to coordinate resources and conduct outreach to the public.

We anticipate that the Community Focus Group will meet as often as quarterly and follow a similar schedule as the Advisory Group. This group will also collaborate as needed with the CPRA Subcommittee, Advisory Group, and Framework Development Team.

- **Outreach and Data Visualizations:** It was suggested that our maps on flood levels should distinguish color patterns better and use more bright colors to show differences. The group would also like us to look into some of the outreach tools produced by the Gulf of Mexico Alliance and to use local libraries, churches and community dinners as a source of outreach and education to community members. It was also suggested to combine data on elevation, FEMA flood maps, and Severe Repetitive Loss on one data viewing platform and to give community members options to see different data layers online. Most important thing is to show people what the data means to their family.
- **Additional Feedback from Group Members:**
 - Community adaptation planning needs to consider community relocations. With sea level rise projections; barrier island and other restoration projects are not going to solve the problem.
 - Need Regional Community Planning on how to deal with populations that are going to be forced to adapt. This planning needs to include areas where people would relocate to and should consider housing, occupation, etc. People should be relocated to an ecosystem that is similar to where they are coming from (fishermen should be relocated to areas where they could fish). Plan should cross parish boundaries and be comprehensive in nature.
 - Consider adding a tribal representative to the Subcommittee or Advisory Group.
 - Consider putting educational signs on public buildings or churches with the current elevation and Base Flood Elevation of that location.
 - Additional data sets recommended: evacuation routes; evacuation deaths; recovery (how long does it take people and businesses to return to an area).
 - There needs to be an assessment of the real cost of relocation (e.g., education, housing, occupations, insurance). This may show that restoration projects would actually be less costly than relocation for some areas.

Next Steps

- We will discuss the online data viewer and decision support tool in more detail at the next meeting.
- CPRA will include data resources on evacuation routes and recovery times after flood events.
- CPRA will look into obtaining the language produced from UNO-CHART on working with community groups.
- We appreciate suggestions from group members about any additional issues they would like to discuss at our meetings and also on additional members from the Southeast and Southwest coastal parishes.
- Patty will send CPRA suggestions for additional members to join the group from the southeast and southwest coastal areas.
- Next Meeting: July/August 2013 – TBD

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Community Focus Group Meeting Summary

January 27, 2015 (2 p.m. to 4 p.m.)

Griffon Room – LaSalle Building (617 North 3rd Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Community Focus Group Members: Patty Whitney, Maryal Mewherter, Sandy Nguyen, Bette Billiot– representing the United Houma Nation for Chief Thomas Dardar

Master Plan Delivery Team: Bren Haase, Mandy Green, Melanie Saucier, Andrea Galinski, Ashley Claro, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group, recapped previous Community Focus Group members, discussed the objectives of the focus group, and asked for suggestions on how to encourage greater participation in the Community Focus Group by existing members and any recommendations for additional new members.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Mandy Green discussed some of the key updates and changes from the 2012 Coastal Master Plan, gave an update on the recent progress for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, and the restoration and structural protection projects being considered for the 2017 Plan. It was clarified that a Framework Development Team Projects Working Group was created to reconsider evaluation of projects that were analyzed for the 2012 Plan but were not selected. The working group is tasked with developing a rationale/methodology for determining which projects from 2012 would be appropriate to reevaluate.

The group had questions regarding what is considered a “project” versus “programmatic.” A project has elements that can be fed into CPRA’s models, whereas efforts such as outreach, funding for educational materials, and other grants are considered programmatic.

Flood Risk and Resilience Program Update

Melanie Saucier reviewed the goals and objectives of the Flood Risk and Resilience Program and discussed the program updates since the 2012 Master Plan, highlighting the following updated requirements:

- Floodproofing for commercial and non-residential buildings is now recommended for flood depths of 0-3 ft. (Residential floodproofing recommended by the 2012 Coastal Master Plan was removed due to the lack of FEMA's flood insurance credits for the measure.)
- Elevating residential buildings is now recommended for flood depths of 3-14 ft., which was revised from 3-18 ft. in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan.
- Voluntary acquisition is now suggested for flood depths greater than 14 ft. The 2012 Plan's threshold of 18 ft. was determined to be too high to build due to the effects of sustaining wind damages, etc.

Improvements are also being made to the Coastal Louisiana Risk Assessment (CLARA) model such as geospatial improvements to expand the study region further north and into parts of Texas and Mississippi to make sure that projects implemented in Louisiana do not negatively impact flood levels, etc. in neighboring states. Other updates include developing a 1 x 1 km grid for a higher-resolution spatial unit of analysis and updated data on strategic assets, critical infrastructure, individual structures (single family homes and commercial), and the use of updated 2010 Census data. In response to a member's concern that it is important to understand vulnerabilities (e.g., who has the means to survive in an area and who does not), it was confirmed that the Census information includes average income and other similar data.

An overview of the development of the programmatic framework for the Flood Risk and Resilience Program was provided, including a summary of the feedback CPRA received from parish floodplain managers on current federal grant/recovery programs. While discussing the draft CPRA Flood Risk and Resilience Program project evaluation criteria, the group voiced questions and concerns regarding voluntary acquisitions and future development on acquired land. Some members of the group indicated that as mistrust of all government, and local government specifically, is a major issue in Terrebonne and Plaquemines parishes, the potential sale of government acquired property to wealthy developers and the displacement of the less affluent original residents is a large concern. These concerns could impact interest in participating in a voluntary acquisition program. Additional concerns include the immediate loss of mineral rights during voluntary acquisitions (versus 10 years under a normal property sale) and that acquired land could be sold once an area is no longer at risk due to the success of implementing Master Plan projects. CPRA confirmed that these concerns were being factored into the design of the program. The group also expressed the desire for the 2017 Master Plan to start the conversation about where people might move to once their property is voluntarily acquired. This conversation should also include relevant federal agencies (HUD, GOMA) that are able to look into affordable housing options.

Lastly, the Resiliency Technical Advisory Committee (Resiliency TAC) member's expertise was discussed as well as their role to assist CPRA in the development of the program's framework.

Flood Risk and Resilience Data Viewer/Shell Grant Community Meetings Update

Andrea Galinski reviewed the purpose and features of the Flood Risk and Resilience data viewer. The tool is meant to be beneficial not only for local parishes and residents when planning for their futures, but also for assisting with outreach and effective education of Master Plan data and resources. The group suggested that it would be helpful to receive digitized screen shots of the viewer that the focus group members could post on their organization's Facebook page along with the Flood Risk Viewer Community Meeting flyer to help create additional interest. The group also expressed the need for funding for additional and ongoing community education about CPRA and Master Plan topics. CPRA asked the group to help think of creative, cost effective ways to get the Master Plan/land loss/sea level rise message out to communities.

Socio-Economic Analysis Path Forward

Melanie Saucier reviewed the goals of the CPRA Basin-wide Socio-Economic Analysis which are to analyze the potential effects to communities, fisheries, and the economy of continued coastal changes in a future without implementation of additional restoration and protection projects as well as a future with the implementation of sediment diversions. The analysis will incorporate: long-term shifts in population and socio-economic trends from the historic coastal atlas, long-term trends between commercial areas fished and places of business, economic impacts of land loss and flood risk on communities and resources, and the projected effects of sediment diversion projects via diversion modeling. CPRA is working to develop a framework for assessing the impacts of those projects to stakeholders and communities. The framework is being designed to be scalable (from basin- to coast-wide) so it could potentially be applied to other planning efforts. CPRA will continue to keep the group updated and informed as the analysis progresses through the delivery of the final report in Fall 2015.

Additional Feedback from Community Focus Group Members

The focus group recommended CPRA reach out to the Mossville Community group LEAN in Lake Charles, NARCO, Gulf South Rising, and Group 350. Focus group members were encouraged to continue to submit any additional thoughts and ideas for membership to the MPDT. To increase focus group participation and attendance it was suggested to hold regional meetings or utilize video conferences in lieu of in-person meetings as an effective way to continue conversations with communities and to make it easier for more members to attend; it was noted that most libraries have distance learning centers with video conferencing capabilities. Additional suggestions for increasing community participation and education included contacting the directors of the local community Main Street programs or business and tourism organizations, and school's science clubs/science teachers from each coastal parish. As libraries are becoming more like community centers and most libraries generally have a research librarian, it was suggested to reach out to libraries to assist with community education. Lastly, some members of the focus group again encouraged innovative collaborations that might provide small grants to local community organizations to help assist with community outreach and education.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes, list of current/invited Community Focus Groups Members and presentations to the group
- Focus Group Members will review the current list of membership and send any additional suggestions on to CPRA to help increase participation in the focus group for the 2017 Master Plan process
- Patty/BISCO will draft a letter to encourage current members to participate and provide feedback in this important process going forward
- Next Community Focus Group meeting: Summer TBD

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Community Focus Group Meeting

September 21, 2015 (10 a.m. to 12 p.m.)

Roll Call Room – St. Charles Parish Sheriff's Office (Luling, LA)

Meeting Participants

Community Focus Group Members: Mary Biegler (Bayou Grace), Bette Billiot (United Houma Nation), Theresa Dardar (Pointe-au-Chien Indian Tribe), Donald Dardar (Pointe-au-Chien Indian Tribe), Rob Gorman (Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Houma-Thibodaux), Diem Nguyen (Mary Queen of Vietnam Community Development Corporation), Sandy Nguyen (Coastal Communities Consulting), Rachel Pickens (Lower 9th Ward Center for Sustainable Engagement & Development), Cheryl Skolnick (Coastal Communities Consulting), Laurie Stewart (Pointe-au-Chien Indian Tribe), Patty Whitney (Bayou History Center)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Andrea Galinski, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick provided an overview of the focus group's history and the other focus groups involved in the development process for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan. The current roster of focus group members will be shared with the meeting notes and presentation slides; if there are areas/interests of the coast the group feels are not represented please email Ashley Cobb at ashley.cobb@la.gov.

Oil Spill Restoration Planning Update

Bren Haase described the three sources of funding for the state's oil spill restoration planning which are the criminal penalties, natural resources damages, and civil penalties resulting from the BP oil spill. Group discussion/points of clarification included:

- The majority of the oil spill restoration projects, including NRDA, are included in the Coastal Master Plan and built on sound science; these projects have to meet certain criteria in order to receive funding.
- To view projects currently proposed for funding via the various scenarios, please refer to the enclosed presentation.
- Patty Whitney requested a visualization of the dollars spent on engineering and design versus construction over time. It was noted that this information is available in the Annual Plan and Quarterly Reports in a ledger format. CPRA asked Patty to review the information currently available and if needed, CPRA will try to rework the format to enhance its usability.

2017 Coastal Master Plan General Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan including the New Project Development program, modeling updates and improvements, and an overview of the planning framework. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- The funding scenarios for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan are still being developed.
- Reiterated that projects included in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan will be re-evaluated for the 2017 plan as CPRA re-optimizes based on the new information and tools that are available; as projects compete against each other for inclusion in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, it is possible that projects in the 2012 plan will not be included in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.
- Clarified that the nonstructural project areas coincide with the parish boundaries, except for when a levee is present. When this occurs, there is then a project area within and outside of the levee boundary (e.g., Terrebonne has two project areas).

Flood Risk & Resilience Program Update

Melanie Saucier discussed the Flood Risk and Resilience Program and described the updates from the 2012 plan.

- As part of the 2017 data, the model timeline increments will be available in 10-year, the next 20-years (i.e., year 30), and 50-year timeframes.
- The Flood Risk and Resilience Viewer, currently populated with data developed during analysis to support the 2012 plan, is intended to be updated with data being developed to support the 2017 plan once it is available.
- Since the last focus group meeting, information on the socio-economic variables has been added to the viewer.
- The program distinguishes between different types of housing when considering elevations and CPRA will be working directly with the parishes. Accountability regarding funds will be built into the program as well.
- Patty Whitney requested to see the list of 51 nonstructural projects to make sure that all the communities are represented. CPRA clarified that the program identifies the areas in greatest need of mitigation.
- The current intent of the program is to administer projects at the parish level as the parishes already have the structure in place to perform such work as opposed to forming a new bureaucracy at the state level in order to create a statewide program.
- While funding for the program does not currently exist, CPRA is focused on developing the program framework and guidelines so that funds, when they do become available, could be expeditiously administered for projects.
- The purpose of the CPRA Flood Risk and Resilience Subcommittee is to streamline efforts and coordinate resources to make best use of both state and federal programs.

Update on Diversion Planning and Implementation

Due to time limitations, Bren Haase was not able to present his slides on CPRA's diversion planning and implementation efforts and instead provided a brief overview of these efforts. As a reminder, sediment diversions were a cornerstone of the 2012 Coastal Master Plan. Since then CPRA has initiated a stepwise process for four diversions (Mid-Breton, Lower Breton, Mid-Barataria, Lower Barataria) to analyze if the projects are affordable, able to be constructed, and if they will provide benefits. All four diversions were deemed viable and are undergoing further analysis regarding the socio-economics, land building, water quality, and ecological aspects. Results are currently being generated and reviewed. Next month, a recommendation will be made to the CPRA Board on whether or not to advance any, all, or none of the diversions to the next phase of evaluation/Engineering and Design (not construction). Bren confirmed that there

will be many opportunities for public engagement and noted that although this typically occurs when a project reaches 30% of the design phase, CPRA has already engaged in outreach activities with a variety of groups and has accommodated all outreach requests to date. It was confirmed that the socio-economics study will be available in October.

Open Discussion

CPRA will continue to reach out and engage citizens and stakeholders that are affected by the coastal crisis and discuss how they could potentially be impacted by proposed restoration projects. Consistent engagement with individuals and communities will be critical as projects progress from planning to implementation and ultimate operations.

A focus group member expressed that it was encouraging to see a provision included within the Flood Risk and Resilience Program for low-to-moderate income populations and that all four candidates for governor have expressed support for diversions.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes, list of focus group membership, and presentation slides to the group
- CPRA will send the Speakers Bureau presentation to the focus group members
- CPRA will share the link to the Annual Plan with Patty Whitney to review the presentation of the dollars being spent in each project phase
- CPRA will send Patty Whitney the list of 51 nonstructural projects being considered for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan
- Next Community Focus Group meeting: TBD early 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Community Focus Group Meeting

May 26, 2016 (9 a.m. to 11 p.m.)

Multipurpose Room – St. Charles Parish Sheriff's Office (Luling, LA)

Meeting Participants

Community Focus Group Members: Bette Billiot (United Houma Nation), Lanor Curole (United Houma Nation), Theresa Dardar (Pointe-au-Chien Indian Tribe), Rosa Herrin (Oxfam), Simi Kang (Coastal Communities Consulting), Diem Nguyen (Mary Queen of Vietnam Community Development Corporation), Katrina Williams (Coastal Communities Consulting)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Mandy Green, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges.

- Details regarding who helped develop the predictive models used as part of the technical analysis for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan is posted in greater detail on the [Planning and Technical Teams](#) page and the [Modeling](#) section of the [Technical Analysis](#) page on the CPRA
- To view the New Project Development Program process and the complete list of candidate projects being considered for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, please visit: http://coastal.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2017-Coastal-Master-Plan_Developing-the-List-of-Candidate-Projects_8-28-15.pdf.

Flood Risk and Resilience Program Update

Melanie Saucier described the changes from the 2012 approach, the program's goals, objectives, and framework, and explained how the project areas were determined. Melanie provided an overview of the nonstructural mitigation measures being considered and how costs for each project option were determined. The group also discussed the significant challenges regarding communicating to the public the land loss maps for the 2017 plan and how these differ from those shared as part of the release of the 2012 Coastal Master Plan.

Planning Tool Update and Demo

Karim Belhadjali described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through a demonstration of the tool. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects always do well under all scenarios/conditions.
- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see what effect the prioritization has on the project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between short- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.

Communications/Visualization and Outreach & Engagement

Nick provided a summary of the outreach and engagement efforts CPRA has been undergoing and described the challenges of reaching out and engaging the 2.5 million coastal residents across the state. Nick walked through the team's plan for outreach and engagement and provided an overview of the resources currently available on the Learn More section of CPRA's website,

<http://coastal.la.gov/a-common-vision/2017-master-plan-update/learn-more/>, such as a two-page master plan brochure, a recorded overview presentation in English and Vietnamese, as well as Frequently Asked Questions regarding the master plan. Nick also described the Parish and Project factsheets being developed and introduced Appendix H, which is essentially a report to describe the Louisiana landscape and the people who live here.

CPRA would be remiss if the master plan did not communicate the national significance of coastal Louisiana. To do this, CPRA is relying on the focus group to share information that will be included within the master plan and in a new appendix that will focus on people and the landscape. CPRA requested that members share information such as reports, statistics, notes to congressional delegations, and any studies, reports, maps, facts/figures members can share that appropriately capture the importance of Louisiana's culture and communities. The goal is to communicate the implicit fact (that coastal Louisiana is of national importance) as explicitly as possible for a national audience. **Please submit this information before July 31, 2016.**

Open Discussion

- It was expressed that the citizens of Pointe-au-Chien are obviously worried about the projected land loss over the next 50 years because the maps are showing that their land will no longer exist.
- If the focus group members receive funding support from foundations and/or philanthropic organizations, CPRA would like to complement the work they are already doing and leverage those opportunities to make sure their respective constituencies understand CPRA's activities and that they are equipped with the information they need as they will receive questions from their constituents.
- Throughout the plan development process the focus group serves as a forum to receive ongoing feedback; however, the fall timeframe will be critical for input. The feedback and input received from the public during this time will inform the development of the draft master plan.
- At the next focus group meeting, members will be asked for their feedback regarding the community public meetings format and how best to conduct these in order to obtain high participation and engagement.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes, Community Focus Group presentation, Speaker's Bureau presentation, draft Planning Tool link and Planning Tool Readme file.
- Focus group members to become familiar with Planning Tool and let CPRA know if there are any questions about the data.
- Next Community Focus Group meeting: TBD Fall 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Community Focus Group Meeting

October 3, 2016 (1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.)

Webinar or CPRA Offices, Baton Rouge, LA

Meeting Participants

Community Focus Group Members: Bette Billiot (United Houma Nation), Theresa Dardar (Pointe-au-Chien Indian Tribe), Krystal Williams (Oxfam), Diem Nguyen (Mary Queen of Vietnam Community Development Corporation), Stephanie Rodrigue (Cameron), Patty Whitney (Bayou History Center), Rachel Pickens (Lower 9th Ward)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Karim Belhadjali welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges. Karim gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results. Karim also described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through the alternative analysis for groups of projects we are considering.

Flood Risk and Resilience Program Update

Melanie Saucier explained how the project areas were determined and walked through an overview of the nonstructural mitigation measures being considered and how costs for each project option was determined. A clarification was provided to show all the project areas being considered including lower Terrebonne.

Open Discussion

The group also discussed the upcoming Community Meetings being held in 6 coastal locations and the format and timing for these meetings.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes, Community Focus Group presentation, and Flyer for the Community Meetings in October.
- Next Community Focus Group meeting: TBD Early 2017

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting Summary

*Webinar / CPRA 15th Floor Conference Room (450 Laurel Street, Baton Rouge)
May 26, 2015 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)*

Meeting Participants

Energy & Industry Focus Group Members: David Ayers (Cheniere), Dennis Dawsey (Entergy), Felicia Frederick (Chevron), Henry Graham (LCA), Ian Voparil (Shell), Justin Furnace (Hilcorp), Lisa Reed (SPR), Mike Hayes (Sasol), Neil Buckingham (Shell), Phil Precht (Conoco Phillips), Phyllis Holifield (Citgo), Sarah Tsoflias (Chevron), Stephen Carville (LMOGA), Tim Croxdale (SPR), Tyler Gray (LMOGA), Will Nipper (Dow)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Ashley Claro, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer, facilitator, welcomed the group and recapped the history and frequency of the focus group meetings, reviewed the objectives, and shared the list of invited focus group members. If gaps or omissions in representation are noticed in the member list, the group is asked to send their recommendations for additional members to the Master Plan Delivery Team (MPDT) by emailing Ashley Claro at ashley.claro@la.gov.

- Some focus group members suggested potential members from the service providing industry.
- To view the current list of members, see slide 3 of the attached PDF presentation.

CPRA Overview

Karim Belhadjali, Deputy Chief of CPRA's Planning and Research Division and Project Manager for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, discussed the history of land loss in Louisiana, the challenges coastal Louisiana faces as a result, and how CPRA came to be formed.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali gave an overview of the 2012 Coastal Master Plan and highlighted the planning process, key decision points, and stakeholder engagement that was conducted. Building upon the 2012 Plan's achievements and momentum, Karim described the 2017 Plan's recent progress and methodology for the restoration and structural protection projects.

Group feedback and discussion included:

- As structural protection is not a viable option to implement across the entire coast, CPRA developed nonstructural projects to mitigate flood risk for those areas where structural protection is not an option, including floodproofing of commercial properties and elevation or voluntary acquisition for residential structures.

- A question was raised during the discussion on slide 21 regarding what was meant “expected annual damages (EAD)”. EAD is a statistical analysis utilized for comparing protection projects to estimate what the average expected annual damage would be. This is calculated by using Adcirc, the same model that is utilized by USACE and other federal agencies to predict flood depths, which applies 50 years’ worth of storms to the landscape and calculates EAD using depth damage curves. EAD includes direct damages to buildings, infrastructure, and agriculture fields but does not include factors such as loss of productivity.
- The suite of potential projects for 2017 Plan has been determined and modeling will begin later this summer.
- A question was raised about how the budget will change for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan as compared to the \$50 billion budget used to develop the 2012 Coastal Master Plan. CPRA is working through these projections and will provide an update to the focus group at a future meeting.
- The focus group will reconvene in the fall of 2015. Typically, focus groups meet two times a year in the early planning phases and three times per year as decisions start to be made; however, CPRA will meet as often as the group wants to engage.
- It was acknowledged that federal and state regulatory processes associated with implementing the Coastal Master are key considerations and focus group members encouraged CPRA to continue to think outside the box to help expedite project implementation.

Decision Criteria Overview

Melanie Saucier discussed the purpose and use of decision criteria related to the flood protection of strategic assets and support of oil and gas. These were both developed for the 2012 Coastal Master Plan in collaboration with the 2012 Plan’s Oil and Gas Focus Group, including the list of important communities. Updates for the 2017 Plan in terms of these decision criteria include the incorporation of Homeland Security Infrastructure Program Gold data to allow for a better grasp of critical infrastructure’s number and locations. In addition, the structures’ flood depths are being analyzed with and without the Master Plan being implemented and the flooding threshold for structures has been increased to one foot. The 2017 analysis assumes that no protective measures have been taken for these strategic assets facilities.

Three key questions were posed to the group where group feedback was requested:

1. Have we included all of the key Oil and Gas Dependent Communities in our analysis?
2. Are these two variables important to the sustainability of your industry?
3. Is there anything else we should consider?

- Pipelines were not included in the 2012 Critical Infrastructure Decision Criteria because there are so many pipelines in the landscape that the criterion was no longer discriminating.
- It was discussed how pipelines bring significant value to the state and that even when pipelines are hundreds of feet deep, they are affected and move when a storm goes through the Gulf.
- Focus group members were encouraged to share information that could assist CPRA in identifying critical corridors that could be targeted for protection of assets and communities.
- It was suggested that CPRA include Slidell and possibly Lafayette in the list of important oil and gas communities. CPRA asked that the focus group keep in mind the needs of the secondary service and chemical industries when reviewing the list of communities.

Other Topics of Interest

Flood Risk and Resilience Program

Melanie Saucier explained the Flood Risk and Resilience Program goals, objectives, and the updates for the 2017 Plan. For 2017, the Program recommends floodproofing commercial/non-residential structures that experience 0-3 ft. of flooding, elevation of residential structures that experience 3-14 ft. of flooding, and voluntary acquisition of residential structures that experience greater than 14 ft. of flooding. The Flood Risk and Resilience Viewer, which was developed in partnership with Shell, was also described. The Viewer is an important tool that allows CPRA to easily share land loss maps and flood depths data in a visual format with the public. The Viewer includes all Master Plan projects and the corresponding phase and budget details. This information will be updated as new information and modeling results become available for the 2017 Plan.

Workforce and Economic Development

Nick Speyrer explained that the previous feedback received from the Oil and Gas Focus Group was that the priority for their industry is about getting their workforce back to the job after a disaster; the Energy & Industry Focus Group confirmed this is still a priority.

In addition, although not a direct CPRA mandate, workforce shortages have important implications for the state and CPRA continues to have ongoing conversations with the Louisiana Workforce Commission to discuss these issues.

Other Items

The focus group confirmed that providing both in-person meeting and webinar options is the best way to engage and gather feedback for this group. The group expressed that it is of interest to the member's companies to understand what the state has planned in the implementation vs. planning phase for particular geographies. It was suggested to have multiple meetings that focus on specific areas to create deeper engagement.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes, list of current Energy & Industry Focus Group members and presentation to the group.
- Focus group members will review the current list of focus group members and email ashley.claro@la.gov with suggestions.
- Focus group members will review the list of critical oil and gas communities (slide 58 in the attached PDF) and provide suggestions by emailing ashley.claro@la.gov.
- Focus group members to provide additional feedback on the below 3 questions via email to ashley.claro@la.gov:
 1. Have we included all of the key Oil and Gas Dependent Communities in our analysis?
 2. Are these two variables important to the sustainability of your industry?
 3. Is there anything else we should consider?
- Next Energy & Industry Focus Group meeting: TBD Fall 2015. A doodle poll will be sent later in June to select a date.

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting

September 15, 2015 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

Pensacola Room – Galvez Building (602 North 5th Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Energy & Industry Focus Group Members: David Ayers (Cheniere), Stephen Carville (LMOGA), Tim Croxdale (SPR), Dennis Dawsey (Entergy), Rochelle Dugas (LOOP), Felicia Frederick (Chevron), Henry Graham (LCA), Tyler Gray (LMOGA), Thomas McNulty (Spectra), Phil Precht (Conoco Phillips), Ian Voparil (Shell)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Brian Lezina, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick expressed that the last focus group meeting had great participation and was helpful to CPRA in understanding the issues and/or areas that are important to the focus group. Nick stressed the importance of focus group members understanding the process of how the plan is developed and explained that moving forward the meetings will have a greater focus on project outputs and will begin the process of formulating the master plan.

Tyler Gray informed CPRA that he is working on a map to help CPRA identify potential industry priority areas; this map will include high voltage infrastructure in addition to natural gas and crude oil pipelines which may be helpful as a point of reference.

Oil Spill Restoration Planning Update

Bren Haase described the three sources of funding for the state's oil spill restoration planning which are the criminal penalties, natural resources damages, and civil penalties resulting from the BP oil spill. Group discussion/points of clarification included:

- The majority of the oil spill restoration projects, including NRDA, are included in the Coastal Master Plan and built on sound science; these projects have to fit certain criteria in order to receive funding.
- Many of the projects currently proposed for funding are still in the draft phase.
- To view projects currently proposed for funding via the various scenarios, please refer to the enclosed presentation.
- Bren explained that all of the projects will be included in the Annual Plan where projects can be tracked as they move into construction.

2017 Coastal Master Plan General Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan including the New Project Development program, modeling updates and improvements, an overview of the

planning framework, and a Flood Risk and Resilience Program update. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- CPRA worked with the focus group to identify and incorporate into the analysis the communities that support the oil and gas industry.
- Maintaining existing land is a benefit to the industry as exposed pipelines that were once underground causes maintenance issues for the industry.
- The funding scenarios for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan are still being developed.
- The pipeline corridors discussed earlier could be incorporated into the support for oil and gas metric but coast wide data from all sectors is required in order to do so.
- Reiterated that projects included in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan will be re-evaluated for the 2017 plan as CPRA re-optimizes based on the new information and tools that are available; as projects compete against each other for inclusion in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, it is possible that some projects that were in the 2012 plan will not be included in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.
- The Flood Risk and Resilience Viewer, currently populated with data developed during analysis to support the 2012 plan, is intended to be updated with data being developed to support the 2017 plan once available.
- As part of the 2017 data, the model timeline increments will be available in 10-year, the next 20-years (i.e., year 30), and 50-year timeframes. It was explained that the computations are not calculated more frequently due to the cost and complexity of performing the analyses. Positive feedback was received regarding include the year 10 snapshot.

Update on Diversion Planning and Implementation

Bren Haase gave an update presentation on CPRA's diversion planning and implementation efforts, including the process and decision drivers that will lead to a decision regarding whether or not to advance any, all, or none of the diversion projects currently being considered to the engineering and design phase. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- All of the work on sediment diversions, as well as many of the evaluations being conducted (e.g., nutrients, socio-economics) is a result of stakeholder and focus group concerns. A variety of variables are being analyzed to arrive at an October decision point.
- The October decision point reflects the decision to advance diversions to Engineering and Design, not to move forward into construction.
- CPRA is working closing with USACE to either implement or obtain funding for projects. If CPRA does build projects on our own, USACE will have signed off on the tools that led to the decisions to advance the projects which will be helpful for permitting.

Open Discussion

CPRA explained that the Planning Tool will allow CPRA to share specific project information with the focus group and to show the how the use of certain metrics (e.g., support for oil and gas, flood risk to strategic assets) might change the recommended project list. CPRA confirmed that the master plan includes language that highlights the importance of Louisiana, both its national significance due to the oil and gas infrastructure as one example and its international significance as it is an important migratory waterfowl pathway. Tyler Gray encouraged members to send him any questions they have although questions and/or concerns can also be sent directly to CPRA by emailing or calling Ashley Cobb (Ashley.cobb@la.gov or 225-342-3894).

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes and presentation to the group
- CPRA will send Speakers Bureau presentation to the focus group members
- Next Energy & Industry Focus Group meeting: TBD early 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting

May 16, 2016 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

Pensacola Room – Galvez Building (602 North 5th Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Energy & Industry Focus Group Members: Stephen Carville (LMOGA), Christy Flatt (Cheniere), Felicia Frederick (Chevron), Henry Graham (LCA), Tyler Gray (LMOGA), Will Nipper (Dow), Phil Precht (Conoco Phillips)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar.

Nick requested that the focus group share any reports or information the member's companies have on hand that highlights the importance of their business/industry to coastal Louisiana and the nation. A deadline for providing this information is July 31, 2016. This will assist CPRA in developing text for the master plan regarding the industry's importance; a similar request is being made to all focus groups.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges.

Modeling Update

Karim Belhadjali gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results. CPRA is currently reviewing results for all of the 133 restoration projects and the modeling of the protection projects is still in process. One question that was raised and Karim confirmed was that predicted land loss increases 35 years into the future due to accelerating sea level rise and subsidence rates scenarios used as part of the analysis.

Planning Tool Update and Demo

Karim Belhadjali described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through a demonstration of the tool. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- Use of the Planning Tool is an iterative process between CPRA and the Framework Development Team and Focus Groups to compare projects and their effects.
- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects always do well under all

- scenarios/conditions.
- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see what effect the prioritization has on the project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between short- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.
- Information on projects effects on certain types of critical infrastructure, such as oil and gas, will be presented to the focus group in a few months.
- A draft, Planning Tool link will be shared with the focus group but it was caveated **that this version of the Planning Tool is not to be shared with the public/any non-focus group members**. As members have received the contextual education and background from the focus group meetings that are necessary to understand the tool, focus group members are asked to respect this request. In addition to the draft Planning Tool link, a Readme file will be shared to direct focus group members to the modeling report chapters that support the data within the Planning Tool's tabs.
 - [Planning Tool Link](#)

Policy and Programmatic Discussion

CPRA would be remiss if the master plan did not communicate the national significance of coastal Louisiana. To do this, CPRA is relying on the focus group's industries to share information that will be included within the master plan and in a new appendix that will focus on people and the landscape. CPRA requested that members share information such as adaptations the industry has historically faced due to land loss, notes to congressional delegations, and any studies, reports, maps, facts/figures members can share that appropriately capture the industry's importance. The goal is to communicate the implicit fact (that coastal Louisiana is of national importance) as explicitly as possible for a national audience. **Please submit this information before July 31, 2016.**

Additionally, CPRA is considering convening a small subgroup of FDT and focus group members to review the data CPRA receives and assist with the development of this section of the master plan to help balance the communication challenge of simultaneously speaking to Louisiana's coastal residents and the larger nation.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes, presentation, draft Planning Tool link and Planning Tool Readme file.
- Focus group members to become familiar with Planning Tool and let CPRA know if there are any questions about the data.
- Focus group members are to send any available national significance information to Ashley Cobb by July 31, 2016.
- Next Energy & Industry Focus Group meeting: TBD Fall 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Energy & Industry Focus Group Meeting

September 20, 2016 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

CPRA Offices, Baton Rouge

Meeting Participants

Energy & Industry Focus Group Members: Stephen Carville (LMOGA), Dennis Dawsey (Energy), Christy Flatt (Cheniere), Felicia Frederick (Chevron), Henry Graham (LCA), Tyler Gray (LMOGA), Ian Voparil (Shell), Phil Precht (Conoco Phillips)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Zach Rosen, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick mentioned the timeline for the draft plan release, public meetings, and the next round of focus group meetings.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges. Karim gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results. A question was made that if more funding was allocated by Congress, could we adjust the plan and add in new projects and goals to achieve more. The issue of developing a budget to constrain the development of the master plan and whether or not the budget accounted for inflation was discussed. Karim mentioned that the budget as well as project costs are all discounted to present value and we will clearly articulate how the budget is used as a constraint.

Alternative Formulation Update

Karim described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through the alternative analysis for groups of projects. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- Use of the Planning Tool is an iterative process between CPRA and stakeholders, including the Framework Development Team and Focus Groups, to compare projects and their effects.
- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects perform well under a variety of scenarios/conditions.
- We usually do not include terracing projects in the master plan analysis because of the small scale nature of these projects, but in many instances these are an acceptable addition to larger projects and key locations. The public/private partnerships associated with these projects also provide for creative and innovative financing arrangements for coastal restoration projects.

- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see how that impacts the selection of a project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between short- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.
 - We will need to have a detailed conversation once the master plan outlines projects with schedules and timelines. We will continue to use the focus groups to have these more detailed discussions and we can bring in CPRA project managers to discuss the Mid-Breton and Mid-Barataria projects.
 - Group questioned whether or not the Estimated Annual Damage calculations are fully capturing oil and gas assets and all the value of the infrastructure included at key facilities. It would be good to capture this more in the national significance text about the value of these assets and the amount of damage that would be caused if these facilities are inoperable for a period of time.
 - Concern was expressed about large amount of future loss in the southwest coastal area both with plan and future without plan. Karim reminded the group that sea level rise accelerates in year 40 and beyond.
 - Group suggested that the analysis be presented to Louisiana's congressional delegation soon so they are aware of the projections before draft plan is released.
 - Information on draft plan effects on certain types of critical infrastructure, such as oil and gas, will be presented to the focus group in a few months.
 - Group is interested in how the national significance text will be shared beyond the master plan text and how this information will be distributed and to whom to garner more funding and support in the future.
-
- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes and presentation slides.
 - CPRA will also send a link to the RAND report that discusses how damages are calculated and what is including in our estimate of assets.
 - Next Energy & Industry Focus Group meeting: January 2017 (TBD)

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Fisheries Focus Group Meeting Summary

March 30, 2015 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

Griffon Room – LaSalle Building (617 North 3rd Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Fisheries Focus Group Members: David Cresson (CCA Louisiana), Clint Guidry (Louisiana Shrimp Association), Lisa Landry (LDWF), John Tesvich (Oyster Task Force), Glenn Thomas (LDWF), Ben Weber (Louisiana Charter Boat Association)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Ashley Claro, Nick Speyrer, Wes LeBlanc, Austin Feldbaum, Kent Bollfrass, David Lindquist

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and went through introductions. Nick recapped the history and frequency of the focus group meetings, reviewed the Fisheries Focus Group objectives, and requested suggestions for additional members if there were gaps in representation for any areas of Louisiana. Recommendations and feedback for additional members can be sent to the Master Plan Delivery Team (MPDT) by emailing Ashley Claro at ashley.claro@la.gov.

- Suggestion to include the FDT USFWS representation on the Focus Group.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed some of the key updates and changes from the 2012 Coastal Master Plan, gave an update on the recent progress for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, and the restoration and structural protection projects being considered for the 2017 Plan. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- Clarified that the number of diversions in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan was reduced during the development of the Plan. Based on the technical analysis performed, the initial recommendation was to include 14 diversions in the Plan but that was reduced to 10 diversions based on feedback from stakeholders, including the Fisheries Focus Group. These decisions were documented and included in the Plan.
- Confirmed that it is possible for a project that was included in the 2012 Plan to not be included in the 2017 Plan. Those decisions will be made based on technical analysis and public input.
- Regarding funding projections for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, CPRA reported that this forecasting exercise has not yet been conducted. The budget of \$50 billion included in the 2012 Plan was based on realistic projections of available funding from a variety of funding sources.
- Confirmed that CPRA is working with the local levee districts on alternatives to the previously proposed Donaldsonville to the Gulf levee system and will be evaluating it in the next few months. If a project option is developed, it will be analyzed alongside other protection and restoration projects for the 2017 effort.

- Clarified that the results of the New Project Development Program for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan is posted on the CPRA website; an update was provided that the documentation outlining the process for developing the comprehensive list of candidate projects is still under development.
- Regarding a member's doubts on whether focus group input impacts the Plan, CPRA explained that the number of diversions and marsh creation locations are a few examples of evidence that focus group concerns are heard and taken into consideration. Furthermore, members were reminded that the feedback provided is not just relevant to the development of the Master Plan, but also considered as projects move into implementation. Specifically, questions and concerns previously raised by the Fisheries Focus Group regarding fisheries and socio-economic effects has led to a number of studies and other efforts.
- Clarified that the Master Plan aims to achieve both near and long term benefits as outlined in the Plan objectives to balance the needs of the state's current industries and communities as well as those in the future.
- Clint Guidry requested that any communication with him be via email moving forward and that his name as a member of the Fisheries Focus Group not be used as proof of his support or approval of the group's decisions.
- Regarding a member's concern that the expertise of the LDWF and wildlife biologists is not utilized by CPRA, another focus group member explained that LDWF is a member of the CPRA Board. MPDT clarified that the State Master Plan is approved by the CPRA Board and that CPRA serves as the implementation arm for coastal protection and restoration projects. It was further clarified that LDWF data is used in many of CPRA's models and that the two agencies continue to work together on these efforts.

Discussion of Master Plan Projects in Planning/Feasibility

Wes LeBlanc introduced the tentatively selected plans (TSPs) for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project and the Lower Breton and Barataria Diversion projects, explaining that the purpose of this work is to confirm that the projects produce the benefits laid out in the Master Plan and confirm the features that describe the alternatives. The next phase will focus on basin-wide modeling to determine optimal sequencing and operations of diversion projects, with a final decision point to move projects into engineering/design will be reached in Fall 2015. It was emphasized that the TSPs will not be going straight into engineering and design (E&D) as more work needs to be done based on the evaluation of fish/shellfish communities and socio-economics.

Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control – Austin Feldbaum

Austin Feldbaum walked the focus group through the objectives and screening process for evaluating concept alternatives for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project.

There was no target salinity range set for the project as the lowest amount of salinity is not necessarily the most desirable for habitat. The main objective of the projects is land loss prevention, so the goal was to lower salinity enough to create conducive habitat for land preservation.

Channel Isolation is the selected TSP as this concept reduces wetland loss rates and it provides potential benefit to deep draft navigation. Based on feedback from fisheries groups in Cameron, changes were made. In addition, the concepts features are being refined to provide for boating access, fish ingress/egress and drainage.

Additional discussion points included:

- Although USACE is doing a lot of work in this area, it is not duplicative with CPRA's efforts; USACE is not addressing salinity control.

- If funds were available today, the project could be shovel ready in four years. Permitting is not expected to be a lengthy process as the project is not being built in the ship channel.
- A second Cameron focus group meeting will take place on April 13 from 5pm - 7pm in the Cameron Police Jury Annex building and is an open meeting. Austin will send David Cresson and Clint Guidry the meeting information and invitation so they can assist with outreach for the meeting; Clint suggested speaking with David Deere as well.
- Confirmed that the TSP is at the feasibility study level. If the project goes into E&D fecal coliform among other things will be addressed and additional alternatives will need to be evaluated to satisfy NEPA requirements.
- Confirmed that the TSP will improve fisheries as the southern part of lake will be slightly fresher and therefore better habitat for oysters; speckled trout will still be present in the lake.
- Although a target salinity range was not set when evaluating the TSP, the models showed that salinity ranges follow the same type of pattern seasonally. Using data from 2012, there were 4 parts per thousand (ppt) in spring when the river was high and 30 ppt at the end of the year. For the TSP the minimum was about the same, 4-5 ppt, with the maximum in the 10-20 ppt range.
- Maps showing salinity lines (similar to those for Davis Pond/Caernarvon) do exist but are not visually as pleasing; Austin will share these with Clint Guidry.

The next steps for this project are to conduct further modeling including additional storm surge and induced flooding modeling, fisheries modeling, and a new 3-D hydrodynamic model which is being developed by The Water Institute. In addition, further engineering and geotechnical work is needed to make sure that the project and design is constructible in the selected area. The feasibility report will be completed this Spring (2015) and will be made available.

Lower Breton and Lower Barataria Sediment Diversion – Kent Bollfrass

Kent Bollfrass walked the focus group through the objectives and screening process for evaluating the Lower Breton and Lower Barataria Diversion project alternatives.

The Lower Barataria TSP is the Diamond site; the Lower Breton TSP is the Port Sulfur site. The next steps are for the TSPs to then move into the next phase of modeling/evaluation (basin-wide, fisheries, and socio-economics) to determine optimal operation and confirm constructability. In addition, the engineering reports are currently going through a third party independent technical review to check for efficiencies, cost savings, improvements, etc. and should be completed by the end of the summer. Once modeling results are in (hydro, fisheries abundance/distribution, population shifts to general area, local flood impacts, etc.) the project will also be analyzed for its socio-economic impacts. Lastly, outreach will be done in the Grand Bayou area and to Navigation stakeholders once we have outputs.

Additional discussion points included:

- Explained that the Buras and Empire areas were screened out because they do not do as good of a job sustaining land (looking at land sustained, not just land built). The basin is deeper here making it harder to build up and the surrounding marsh the diversion would be discharging into is sparser.
- Feasibility report should be complete by the end of June; the preferred alternatives will then go into higher levels of analysis.
- John Tesvich expressed that the oyster industry will not support these projects as it is already being negatively impacted by Mardi Gras Pass and Caernarvon and expressed an interest in documenting historic oyster reefs.

Diversions Modeling Update for Fisheries

David Lindquist described the fisheries and shellfish modeling that was done for the 2012 Plan which used Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) models, discussed the HSIs pros and cons, and described the modeling objective for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and the models in development for the 2017 Plan and the Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study.

Additional discussion/clarification points included:

- HSIs are a numerical index that represents the capacity of a habitat to support a selected species.
- HSIs quantify habitat, but that does not always correlate with species abundance.
- LDWF provided datasets for the entire coast and collection period.
- Clarified that the standardized index axis on slide 107 was standardized from 0-1, where 0 = salinities absolutely not suitable for speckled trout, 1 = salinities that are most suitable for speckled trout.
- Regarding objections over the data used for the shrimp HSI it was clarified that by law LDWF determines shrimp size, not quantity; the data was never used to determine the quantity of the species in estuary. CPRA further explained that they were advised of the data's limitations, but over the course of 50 years it should tell us something about the relationships between shrimp abundance and salinities and water temperature in an area; HSIs are only one part of the analysis.
- For the 2017 HSIs, chlorophyll is used as a proxy for planktonic prey availability
- It is important point to keep in mind that once the EwE food web is balanced, we are looking at all of the changes off of that starting point; the comparisons are relative.
- Clarified the differences between the EwE and CASM models:
 - EwE model has a monthly temporal resolution which is better for long term decadal simulations.
 - CASM has a daily temporal resolution which is better for short-term intra-annual simulations.
- Explained that the Future Without Action (FWOA) scenario is used as a baseline to compare project effects in order to evaluate project benefits in an apples-to-apples, relative manner. This is a widely used, commonly accepted planning practice and is required by law by NEPA. If "today's" current status is used as the baseline as suggested by a focus group member, all of the projects would be negative when modeled over 50 years because the baseline of "today" is moving.
 - Clarified that "today" is year 0 in the models.
- Confirmed that the reports of the model's development will be available soon and that once model production runs are complete, the model output reports will also be made available.
- Clarified that the Master Plan fisheries models are not set up to evaluate hypoxia. However, the Hydro Delft model does account for this and that output can be incorporated into the fisheries model.

The next step for the fisheries diversions modeling effort is to have the improved HSIs reviewed and validated by LDWF. Currently, the development of the model is being completed and the results of the production runs should be available during the fall of 2015.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes, list of current Fisheries Focus Group members and presentations to the group
- Focus Group members will review the current list of membership and send any additional suggestions to CPRA to help ensure that all areas and interests of the state are represented in the 2017 Master Plan process

- **Austin Feldbaum to send David Cresson and Clint Guidry the Cameron focus group meeting information and invitation so they can assist with outreach**
- **Next Fisheries Focus Group meeting: Summer/Fall 2015**

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Fisheries Focus Group Meeting Summary

September 2, 2015 (9 a.m. to 11 a.m.)

Pensacola Room – Galvez Building (602 North 5th Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Fisheries Focus Group Members: Twyla Cheatwood (NOAA-NMFS), David Cresson (CCA Louisiana), William Guste (LDWF), Richard Hartman (NOAA-NMFS), Ronald Paille (USFWS), Glenn Thomas (LDWF), Borden Wallace (Menhaden Industry)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Ashley Cobb, Elizabeth Jarrell, Kent Bollfrass, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick recapped the history and frequency of the focus group meetings and explained that today will be the last process focused meeting and that moving forward meetings will have a greater focus on project outputs.

Oil Spill Restoration Planning Update

Bren Haase described the three sources of funding for the state's oil spill restoration planning which are the criminal penalties, natural resources damages, and civil penalties resulting from the BP oil spill. Group discussion/points of clarification included:

- The majority of the oil spill restoration projects, including NRDA, are included in the Coastal Master Plan and are built on sound science. These projects have to fit certain criteria in order to receive funding.
- A member explained that NRDA is made up of trustee organizations; once NRDA approves a project, it is set in stone.
- For reference, a similar presentation to the one provided at the focus group meeting was given by Kyle Graham to the CPRA Board on August 19th and the video of the presentation is available here: http://house.louisiana.gov/H_Video/Hse_Video_OnDemand.aspx.
- Regarding a question of CPRA Board membership, it consists of a number of state agency, levee boards, and parish representatives. For specifics, please see: <http://coastal.la.gov/about/structure/cpra-board/members/>.

2017 Coastal Master Plan General Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed some of the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan including the New Project Development program, modeling updates and improvements, an overview of the planning framework, and a Flood Risk and Resilience Program update. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- It was explained that hydrologic restoration projects move water from one place to another; it is similar to a diversion but on a much smaller scale.
- Reiterated that projects included in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan will be re-evaluated for the 2017 plan as CPRA re-optimizes based on the new information and tools that are available; as projects compete against each other for inclusion in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, it is likely that some projects that were in the 2012 plan will not be included in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.
- Sea level rise numbers for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan will be higher than they were under the less optimistic scenario that was used for the 2012 Coastal Master Plan; an exact rate has not yet been determined.
- CPRA is hosting a webinar to discuss the updates made to the suite of modeling tools for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan on Tuesday, September 22nd that will include Q&A after each section. The webinar will be recorded and posted to the CPRA website.
- Borden Wallace requested that he be notified when the HSI report is posted in September.
- Regarding a question from David Cresson about current and future construction projects, CPRA committed to provide him with the current list.

Update on Diversion Planning and Implementation

Bren Haase gave an update presentation on CPRA's diversion planning and implementation efforts, including the process and decision drivers that will lead to a decision regarding whether or not to advance any, all, or none of the diversion projects currently being considered to the engineering and design phase. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- CPRA makes a recommendation to the CPRA Board in October regarding whether to move forward with diversion(s) or not; a decision will not be codified until the Annual Plan is approved by the Legislature.
- The group was asked how they would like to be engaged in this effort; in the past formal meetings have been the most commonly used format. Bren clarified that CPRA is interested in talking to general citizens and those with a deeper understanding of diversions; CPRA encouraged focus group members to provide public engagement suggestions.
- Borden Wallace expressed that he would like to be involved in understanding how existing/available data is being used to develop models for fish and shellfish.
- It was described how the development of the models used for the Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study have been reviewed by a project delivery team from NOAA. NOAA's fisheries experts have examined how the models work, how they are set up, and how they are performing. CPRA is starting to receive outputs now and the same project delivery team, plus experts from LDWF, will be convened to review the outputs. CPRA is endeavoring to ensure that the interpretations of outputs do not overreach the boundaries of the data.
- Regarding questions from a focus group member regarding the role and current stance of NOAA as it relates to diversions, a NOAA representative affirmed that the state is using state-of-the-art analysis that NOAA thinks will be reflective of what might happen. It is NOAA's opinion that the SWAMP methodology used for monitoring will likely need to be improved moving forward in order to be more robust to provide what is needed for adaptive management of a specific project. CPRA agreed that SWAMP, while a good product and framework, will need to be supplemented to ensure appropriate adaptive management at a project level. Lastly, the NOAA representative clarified that NOAA is not officially supportive of, or opposed to diversions; they are supportive of actions that will improve fisheries habitat.

Open Discussion

The group conveyed positive feedback regarding the ability to participate in the meeting via webinar for general update meetings. A member noted that part of the role of the federal agencies in the focus group is to listen to fisheries interests; they expressed disappointment that the past focus group meetings have not seen greater participation from those that represent fisheries interests. MPDT agreed and will try to re-engage those members that are absent.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes and presentation to the group
- CPRA will send the list of construction ready projects to David Cresson
- CPRA will contact Borden Wallace when the HSI modeling report is posted in September
- CPRA will send the Speakers Bureau Presentation to focus group members
- Next Fisheries Focus Group meeting: TBD early 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Fisheries Focus Group Meeting

May 23, 2016 (10 a.m. to 12 p.m.)

Pensacola Room – Galvez Building (602 North 5th Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Fisheries Focus Group Members: Billy Guste (LDWF), Borden Wallace (Menhaden Industry), David Cresson (Coastal Conservation Association LA), Glenn Thomas (LDWF), Rick Hartman (NOAA-NMFS)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick requested that the focus group share any reports or information the member's organizations/companies have on hand that highlights the importance of their business/industry to coastal Louisiana and the nation. A deadline for providing this information is **July 31, 2016**. This will assist CPRA in developing text for the master plan regarding the industry's importance; a similar request is being made to all focus groups.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges. Points of discussion and clarification included:

- It was confirmed that Gulf Menhaden, Bay Anchovy, and Spotted Seatrout make up the saltwater fisheries environmental metric.
- It was confirmed that the environmental metrics use the Habitat Suitability Indices (HSIs) and Ecopath with Ecosim (EwE) output.

Modeling Update

Karim Belhadjali gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results. CPRA is currently reviewing results for all of the 133 restoration projects and the modeling of the protection projects is still in process. Points of discussion and clarification included:

- It was suggested that it might make more sense to speak in terms of river gauges as opposed to river flow in cubic feet per second when communicating specifically to fisherman about potential operational regimes for sediment diversion projects.
- A focus group member inquired if CPRA has a way to measure areas where the water depths are shallower as a result of diversions.

Planning Tool Update and Demo

Karim Belhadjali described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through a demonstration of the tool. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects always do well under a variety of scenarios/conditions.
- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see what effect the prioritization has on the project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between short- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.

Policy and Programmatic Discussion

CPRA would be remiss if the master plan did not communicate the national significance of coastal Louisiana. To do this, CPRA is relying on the focus group's industries to share information that will be included within the master plan and in a new appendix that will focus on people and the landscape. CPRA requested that members share information such as adaptations the industry has historically faced due to land loss, notes to congressional delegations, and any studies, reports, maps, facts/figures members can share that appropriately capture the industry's importance. The goal is to communicate the implicit fact (that coastal Louisiana is of national importance) as explicitly as possible for a national audience. **Please submit this information before July 31, 2016.**

Additionally, CPRA is considering convening a small subgroup of FDT and focus group members to review the data CPRA receives and assist with the development of this section of the master plan to help balance the communication challenge of simultaneously speaking to Louisiana's coastal residents and the larger nation.

Open Discussion

- A focus group member commented that recreational fisheries have an incredible economic impact on Louisiana as a tourism destination and encouraged focus group members to provide supporting information to the CPRA team.
- A focus group member suggested that NOAA has great figures on recreational fisheries impacts in addition to those for commercial fisheries.
- Oftentimes navigation issues impact how fisheries move their product. CPRA was commended for assisting in the beneficial use of sediment from Baptiste Collette in the lower Mississippi River, a critical waterway that USACE does not usually have the funds to keep it dredged. CPRA supports use of using that material beneficially and is currently trying to partner with Plaquemines Parish and LDWF to use sediment from that area.
- It was commented that the Caernarvon Diversion has been beneficial to the Menhaden industry and that many in the industry are in favor of properly developing and planning for river diversions in order to support the industry, but even more importantly, to try and save coastal Louisiana.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes, presentation, draft Planning Tool link and Planning Tool Readme file.
- Focus group members to become familiar with Planning Tool and let CPRA know if there are any questions about the data.
- Focus group members are to send any available national significance information to Ashley Cobb by July 31, 2016.
- Next Fisheries Focus Group meeting: TBD Fall 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Landowner Focus Group Meeting

March 21, 2013 (9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.)

Galvez Building, Pensacola Room, Baton Rouge, LA

Meeting Participants

Landowner Focus Group Members: Tim Allen, Phil Precht, Randy Moertle, David Richard, Jim Caillouet, Glenn Vice, Amanda Phillips, Mike Carloss, Chad Courville, Cynthia Duet, Paul Frey, James Harris, Greg Linscombe, Sherrill Sagrera

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Kyle Graham, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Bren Haase, James Altman

Meeting Summary

- **FY 2014 Annual Plan Update:** Melanie welcomed the group and expressed CPRA's interest in getting greater landowner feedback. CPRA understands both the local knowledge and essential partnerships that landowners offer and we want the Landowner Focus group to offer input on a variety of related topics from policy, public/private partnerships, oil and gas/mineral surface issues, and others. Kyle then explained the expenditures and revenues that are listed in the Draft Annual Plan for the next three years. He also discussed the oil spill funds and where those funds are being used to move certain projects forward. Click [HERE](#) to download the 2014 Annual Plan.
- **Funding Sources, Project Implementation, and Projects outside Master Plan:** Many participants had questions about funding sources, how funding sources could be combined, which projects would be moving forward next, and whether smaller projects not in the plan would be funded. Current oil spill funds are only based on civil fines and criminal fines are being determined in court now. The civil fines distributed to the NFWF are to be used for barrier island restoration and sediment diversions only. There are three main phases to the oil spill trial with the final phase expected to be complete between November - December 2013:
 - To determine the responsible parties
 - To determine the amount of oil spilled
 - To determine gross negligence (potentially)

Other projects like Calcasieu Salinity Control Structure and the Houma Navigation Canal Lock can be funded through the Restore Act which allows for more flexibility. Smaller projects will continue to be funded, as long as they are consistent with the Master Plan

which generally means they must be in line with the typology, geography, and intent of other Master Plan projects.

- **Streamlining Permitting:** The group brought up concerns about permitting and expressed the need to streamline the process. Kyle agreed and notes that permitting is also a big problem for CPRA and we need to find a way to eliminate some of the bureaucracy so we can speed up the process. CPRA will be working over the next 2-3 months to develop a standardized permit package that we can submit to OCM for our own projects which may also help private landowner permitting. As soon as we have those details worked out, we will send the group information on a sample standardized permit package. There was additional discussion on the need to increase coordination with others at OCM and to have our environmental managers participate in some of the permitting meetings at OCM. Kyle has begun discussions with Karl Morgan and Steven Chustz about permit coordination.
- **CWPPRA Projects:** There was some discussion on certain CWPPRA projects that are being de-authorized or have had trouble getting funded through the program. Kyle agreed that there are certain projects that don't necessarily fit within the CWPPRA program but may still be good projects that are better suited to be funded with master plan dollars. There may also be some projects like the Terrebonne Basin Shoreline project that may not have federal or Corps dollars but the state will seek to get credit from the Corps on the project.
- **Best Practices for Landowner Involvement:** Chad brought up the need for more inclusive temporary agreements during the field investigation stage of projects. We need to better manage all the different requests in a more streamlined process. The best method would be to coordinate with all the groups involved (federal, state, local, surveyors, contractors) to approve and allow access to private property. The group would also like to meet with project teams when projects are still in the conceptual phase so landowners can know and prepare for what is planned as early as possible. It would also be helpful to identify cooperating landowners for all of the upcoming prioritized master plan projects.

Another recommendation was to show landowners the reasons why certain projects were selected in the master plan on their land and to discuss the benefits/issues that these projects could provide. Some projects may look really good on paper or in computer models, but may not be applicable "on the ground" and landowners have the best knowledge on the intricacies of their land.

CPRA agrees and we should consider doing this at the regional level going forward by bringing in parish involvement and landowners for each of the large projects that are moving into feasibility. It was suggested to use the Increase Atchafalaya project as a key demonstration on how to work with landowners and obtain feedback early in the conceptual phase of project development.

Next Steps

- CPRA appreciates suggestions from group members about any additional issues they would like to discuss at our meetings. (Melanie will ask the group for meeting topic suggestions 3-4 weeks before the next meeting).

- We will discuss permit coordination and the sample standardized permit package at the next meeting.
- Will discuss Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study and other Master Plan projects moving into feasibility in more detail at next meeting.
- CPRA Land Rights team will give an overview presentation to the group on the land rights process and common issues they face at next meeting.
- **Next Meeting:** June 2013 - TBD

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Landowner Focus Group Meeting Summary

February 3, 2015 (9 a.m. to 11 a.m.)

Griffon Room – LaSalle Building (617 North 3rd Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Landowner Focus Group Members: Tim Allen (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Todd Baker (LDWF), Mike Bengé (Delacroix Corporation), Cynthia Duet (Audubon/Rainey Alliance), Francis Fields (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Paul Frey (LLA), James Harris (USFWS), Quin Kinler (NRCS), Cassidy Lejeune (LDWF), Greg Linscombe (Continental Land and Fur), Randy Moertle (McIlhenny Corp/Biloxi Marsh), Amanda Phillips (Edward Wisner Donation), Phil Precht (Conoco-Phillips), David Richard (Stream Family Ltd), Sherrill Sagera (Sagera Property)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Ashley Claro, Nick Speyrer, Wes LeBlanc, Austin Feldbaum, Kent Bollfrass, Jim Altman, Susan Dunham, Stuart Brown

Others: Keith Lovell (DNR-OCM), Karl Morgan (DNR-OCM)

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group, recapped the schedule of the other Master Plan focus group meetings, discussed the objectives of the Landowner Focus Group, and requested suggestions for additional members if there were gaps in representation for any areas of Louisiana.

Recommendations and feedback for additional members, such as agriculture/rice farmers, can be sent to the Master Plan Delivery Team (MPDT) by emailing Ashley Claro at ashley.claro@la.gov.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed some of the key updates and changes from the 2012 Coastal Master Plan, gave an update on the recent progress for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, and the restoration and structural protection projects being considered for the 2017 Plan. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- Karim Belhadjali confirmed that he is happy to meet with interested landowners to see what the Master Plan can do to better help agriculture.
 - The group expressed that the biggest problem is the intrusion of salt water; they cannot use their land for agriculture because of intrusion.
- Regarding the future socio-economics analysis, the group reminded CPRA that socio-economic studies should not over-concentrate on fisheries related aspects because there are many other factors that are relevant to coastal Louisiana such as alligators, waterfowl, etc.
- CPRA explained that the 2012 Coastal Master Plan's budget of \$50 billion is not an arbitrary number but is based on an analysis of potential sources of funding over the next 50 years. The major purpose of resource constrained plan was to identify priority projects to

focus state funds. Concerns were raised that this budget constrained plan does not include projects in certain areas where landowners in coastal Louisiana could potentially receive funding from other non-state sources but as those projects are not in the state's Master Plan those opportunities are sometimes ignored. Requests were made for CPRA to consider including or reframing language in the 2017 Plan so that included projects are priorities for state funding but that it does not mean if a project is not inconsistent with the plan that it is not a worthy investment of other sources. This will be considered as similar language was included in Chapter 6 of the 2012 Plan, but the state reiterated that it hopes the Master Plan will be seen as the overall vision for coastal Louisiana and that to the extent possible, landowners and others would focus on implementing projects included in the plan.

- Additionally, members suggested that the 2017 Master Plan clearly/explicitly state that the state also supports consistent projects that are not included in the Plan. LDWF stated that they have missed out on funding opportunities because the Master Plan was interpreted in an exclusionary way (project was not on the Master Plan map so it was decided that it was inconsistent with the Plan).
- CPRA confirmed that the only new project concept submitted for consideration for 2017 that CPRA considers a federal responsibility is a bankline stabilization project that includes a segment of the GIWW going west from Lake Charles. As the GIWW from Lake Charles going continuously east was modeled for the 2012 Plan, CPRA does not intend to model the additional western piece as the state's policy remains that this is a priority project that should be funded by the federal government
 - Members of the focus group requested an update on historic and current activities regarding progress to implementing this policy.
- Members suggested that CPRA create a map showing federal navigation channels and include text in the Master Plan that explicitly shows ongoing support for these projects but that it is a federal responsibility. CPRA will work with the focus group over the coming years to draft this language.
- Concern was expressed that there might have been beneficial components of projects that were eliminated because they are a federal responsibility. CPRA confirmed that projects outside of the state's jurisdiction will not be modeled but that the Master Plan will include language that CPRA will consider the entire length on a case by case basis.
- Suggested the 2017 Master Plan caveat that things such as feral hogs and Giant Salvinia really do contribute to coastal land loss and/or affect restoration projects by CPRA/landowners. Would like to see a footnote/discussion point included to call out that there are other issues that need to be resolved. While CPRA cannot model these things, we do think that there are things that need to be done and will consider including language in the plan.
- Suggested the 2017 Master Plan take into consideration the different types of marsh and their benefits. While different marsh types are difficult to model over 50 years (due to the changes and effects of fresh water habitat), the group would like to see the Plan speak to the varying benefits of the different marsh types so that other agencies can pick it up and do something about it.
- CPRA clarified that its sediment principle regarding not using in-system borrow to build large scale marsh creation projects will remain in-tact. Members expressed a desire to see some flexibility to this principle on a case by case basis, namely the Terrebonne Basin which is so far removed from external borrow sources.
 - It was suggested that Vermillion Bay is one place that could be used for borrow material for nearby southwest coastal projects and we should consider this as an external source.
- CPRA confirmed that the results of the New Project Development Program would be posted to the [CPRA website](#).

- Nick Speyrer explained the Framework Development Team's (FDT) concern that projects that did not make the 2012 Plan were not being reconsidered for the 2017 Plan. As CPRA is committed to working with the FDT and other stakeholders, a workgroup was created to reconsider evaluation of projects that were analyzed for the 2012 Plan but were not selected. The workgroup is tasked with developing a rationale/methodology for determining which projects from 2012 would be appropriate to reevaluate and CPRA will keep the group updated on the outcomes of the workgroup.

Discussion of Master Plan Projects in Planning/Feasibility

Wes LeBlanc introduced the tentatively selected plans (TSPs) for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project and the Lower Breton and Barataria Diversion projects, explaining that a great deal of work has been done to bring the Lower Diversion projects to a level where they can be compared with other diversion projects. The next phase will focus on basin-wide modeling to determine optimal sequencing and operations of diversion projects, with a final decision point to be reached in Fall 2015. CPRA will also be doing more evaluation on fish/shellfish communities and socio-economics.

Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control – Austin Feldbaum

Austin Feldbaum walked the focus group through the objectives and screening process for evaluating concept alternatives for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project.

There was no target salinity range set for the project as the lowest amount of salinity is not necessarily the most desirable for habitat. The main objective of the projects is land loss prevention, so the goal was to lower salinity enough to create conducive habitat for land preservation.

Channel Isolation is the selected TSP as this concept reduces wetland loss rates and it provides a potential benefit to deep draft navigation. In addition, the concepts features are being refined to provide for boating access, fish ingress/egress and drainage.

The next steps for this project are to conduct further modeling including additional storm surge and induced flooding modeling, fisheries modeling, and a new 3-D hydrodynamic model which is being developed by The Water Institute. In addition, further engineering and geotechnical work is needed to make sure that the project and design is constructible in the selected area. The feasibility report will be completed this Spring and will be made available.

Lower Breton and Lower Barataria Sediment Diversion – Kent Bollfrass

Kent Bollfrass walked the focus group through the objectives and screening process for evaluating the Lower Breton and Lower Barataria Diversion project alternatives.

The Lower Barataria TSP is the Diamond site; the Lower Breton TSP is the Port Sulfur site. The next steps are for the TSPs to then move into the next phase of modeling/evaluation (basin-wide, fisheries, socio-economics) to determine optimal operation and confirm constructability. In addition, the engineering reports are going through a third party independent technical review to check for efficiencies, cost savings, etc. Once modeling results are in (hydro, fisheries abundance/distribution, population shifts to general area, local flood impacts, etc.) the project will also be analyzed for its socio-economic impacts. Lastly, outreach will be done in the Grand Bayou area and to Navigation stakeholders.

There were no comments or questions from the focus group regarding the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control, Lower Breton, or Lower Barataria Diversion TSPs.

Permitting Discussion

Karl Morgan and Keith Lovell from the Office of Coastal Management (OCM) updated the group on permitting issues of interest to the focus group members and answered member questions.

Karl Morgan explained that all objections by landowners have to be resolved before permitting can go through on a project and that a new general permit was established that allows landowners to repair breaches in spoil banks. The group expressed issues with pipeline(s) removal; Karl Morgan explained that this is going to continue to be an issue in the future. The current status is that once a line is abandoned, the policy is for the owner to remove it. However, if removal is infeasible, OCM allows it to remain.

Keith Lovell gave an overview of the revised/promulgated new regulations for mitigation that went into effect January 2014 which incorporated things like the updated use of mitigation evaluation tools, language to use other tools, and language for mitigation projects consistent with the Master Plan. Keith gave a programmatic update explaining that the federal rules were revised in 2007.

Regarding questions about MCM (Modified Charleston Method), it was explained that USACE is making a decision on what to do with permits almost ready to be issued, which are using an MCM. USACE is giving new applicants the option to use MCM or to wait until another plan is ready; an interim plan should be ready in approximately one year. The group discussed how it does not make sense how the federal agencies are moving forward with permitting that is more consistent with other districts, even though those districts are not representative of coastal Louisiana environments. Keith advised the group to let their USACE analyst know if they have small projects pending that do qualify for a PGP (programmatic general permit). Lastly, it was explained that if the group has a pending permit, they have 10 days to decide if they want to use what has already been calculated by MCM or to wait until there is a future option available.

Conversation with CPRA Land Rights

Jim Altman and Susan Dunham from CPRA Land Rights led a conversation about land rights and answered member questions. The group discussed the issue of abandoned infrastructure where points of discussion/clarification included:

- Landowners were asked to let CPRA Land Rights know where abandoned pipelines are; it is a real issue as these are not in their database/they do not know who owns them.
- The group suggested the database needs to be worked on so pipelines never constructed are not included or are a different color on the map; permits/work is complicated by lines that were never installed.
- Keith Lovell explained OCM has a staff member who contacts companies to find out if pipelines were built or construction has commenced. OCM works very hard to contact companies to address and rectify this and only have about a dozen left.
- Group requested that when CPRA is made aware of a project being considered on a landowner's property that the owners are contacted before surveyors, etc. go out on their land. CPRA Land Rights explained this is a process they are trying to evolve. Group suggested it would be helpful to have a contact list of who to call/contact if surveyors are out on their land.

Project Funding and Deauthorizing Discussion

Stuart Brown spoke to the group about projects that have been deauthorized in CWPPRA.

Highlights from this conversation include:

- Recently CWPPRA projects have typically been in the \$20-30 million range. Sometimes, during the engineering and design projects become not viable for CWPPRA.

- Group suggested another designation other than “deauthorized” would be good for projects, as this word choice may give the wrong impression.
- Explained that “inactive status” means that a project reached 95% design review but has not been constructed due to a programmatic issue (funding limitations, program goals not a fit with CWPPRA, etc.)
- Explained that projects that have been proposed for deauthorization are being transferred to parishes; there are no requirements or funding associated with these. Hand-off meetings are taking place to transfer all data from the E&D phase to interested parties.
- In response to the question, have CPRA and the federal sponsors made any decisions on constructed projects reaching the end of their 20-year project life, Stuart explained, CWPPRA planning and evaluation sub-committee is meeting in April to evaluate projects on a case-by-case basis. The next batch of projects will be evaluated at the spring technical committee meeting; the next task force meeting is in May.
- In response to the question if anything is being done to make sure this does not happen again should CWPPRA get reauthorized, Stuart explained that yes, it is being talked about but it has not had to be put into practice because recently CWPPRA has been constructing mostly marsh creation projects (which have little long-term O&M).

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes, list of current/invited Landowner Focus Group Members and presentations to the group
- Focus Group Members will review the current list of membership and send any additional suggestions on to CPRA to help ensure that all areas and interests of the state are represented in the 2017 Master Plan process
- Next Landowner Focus Group meeting: Mid-Late Summer TBD

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Landowner Focus Group Meeting Summary

September 29, 2015 (9 a.m. to 11 a.m.)

Pensacola Room – Galvez Building (602 North 5th Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Landowner Focus Group Members: Chad Courville (Miami Corporation), Cynthia Duet (Audubon/Rainey Alliance), David Richard (Stream Family Ltd.), Glenn Vice (The J.M. Burguires Co.), Greg Linscombe (Continental Land and Fur), Francis Fields (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), James Caillouet (Caillouet Land Corporation), James Harris (USFWS), Paul Frey (Louisiana Landowners Association), Ordis Smith (Conoco-Phillips), Quin Kinler (NRCS), Randy Moertle (McIlhenny Corp/Biloxi Marsh), Sherrill Sagrera (Sagrera Property), Spencer Robinson (State Land Office), Tim Allen (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Todd Baker (LDWF)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Ashley Cobb, Zach Rosen, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions. Nick recapped the history and frequency of the focus group meetings and explained that today will be the last process focused meeting; moving forward meetings will have a greater focus on project outputs.

Oil Spill Restoration Planning Update

Bren Haase described the three sources of funding for the state's oil spill restoration planning which are the criminal penalties, natural resources damages, and civil penalties resulting from the BP oil spill. Group discussion/points of clarification included:

- The oil spill restoration projects have to meet certain criteria in order to receive funding; the majority of these projects are included in the Coastal Master Plan and all are built on sound science.
- To view projects currently proposed for funding via the various scenarios, please refer to the enclosed presentation.
- While the focus group noted some agencies' apparent lack of conviction for reauthorization, CPRA confirmed the state's support of reauthorization for the CWPPRA program and pointed to CPRA's record that shows CPRA intends to operate under CWPPRA. CPRA recognizes that CWPPRA is an important part of the coastal protection effort and will be involved in the push for its reauthorization.
- Cynthia Duet described an initiative where NGOs and other interested stakeholders meet to discuss the progress, updates, and future needs of the CWPPRA program; Cynthia offered to keep interested focus group members informed of the next meeting.

2017 Coastal Master Plan General Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed some of the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan including the New Project Development Program, modeling updates and improvements, an overview of the planning framework, and an update on the Flood Risk and Resilience Program. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- The funding scenarios for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan are being developed.
- Reiterated that projects included in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan will be re-evaluated for the 2017 plan as CPRA re-optimizes based on the new information and tools that are available; as projects compete against each other for inclusion in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, it is possible that projects in the 2012 plan will not be included in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.
- CPRA hosted a webinar to discuss the updates made to the suite of modeling tools for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan on Tuesday, September 22nd. The recorded webinar which includes Q&A after each presentation topic is posted to the CPRA website [here](#).
- CPRA is working with a diverse team of partners, including The Water Institute, to develop a suite of modeling tools to support development of the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.
- In terms of estimating potential damages from storm surge, the models analyze the crops that are lost and the economic value of the loss. In addition, the Governor's Office has commissioned a study that is being conducted by LSU/RAND that will analyze the long term impact of the loss of the use of agricultural land in coastal Louisiana.
- The 2012 Coastal Master Plan utilized two environmental scenarios to describe future coastal conditions as part of the modeling effort; the 2017 plan will explore three scenarios in order to test projects against a greater range of environmental uncertainty.
- Based on the most recent literature, the 2017 Coastal Master Plan will employ updated rates for sea level rise. These rates do not incorporate subsidence; a uniform sea level rise rate for each scenario will be applied across the coast.
- The 2017 Coastal Master Plan will use the same ranges for subsidence as the 2012 plan as that information is still considered state-of-the-art science. Subsidence projects are a spatially orientated variable where each future coastal condition scenario will use a different point within the subsidence ranges. The 2012 subsidence ranges were determined by a panel of experts on the topic.
- CPRA confirmed that although not currently listed on some of the slides, barrier headlands are incorporated in the analysis; CPRA will update the slides to reflect this.
- Karim will follow up with the internal team to determine what data sets were used as part of the waterfowl HSI calculation.
- Compared to the 2012 plan's implementation periods of 20- and 30-years, the 2017 plan's first implementation period is 10-years followed by 20-years for each of the second and third implementation periods.
- A forum for parishes to communicate their priorities is during the public comment period of the Annual Plan's development process. During this period and at in-person meetings, requests/comments can be submitted on the Annual Plan which details CPRA's approved project spending for the upcoming year and projections for the following two years.
- The focus group was reminded that the New Project Development Program (NPDP) document was shared with the group and is posted on the CPRA website. The process and any decisions are well documented within the NPDP. If any questions remain after reviewing the NPDP regarding a specific decision, please let CPRA know by emailing ashley.cobb@la.gov.
- As requested, CPRA restated the state's position on hydrologic restoration projects in Cameron; hydrologic restoration projects will be included in the master plan programmatically and the plan will include language of support for these types of projects.

- CPRA will request additional feedback from Floodplain Managers in southwest Louisiana regarding contractual language in past home elevation programs.

Update on Diversion Planning and Implementation

Bren Haase gave an update presentation on CPRA's diversion planning and implementation efforts, including the process and decision drivers that will lead to a decision regarding whether or not to advance any, all, or none of the diversion projects currently being considered to the engineering and design phase. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- CPRA will make a recommendation to the CPRA Board in October regarding whether or not to advance diversion(s) to the next phase of engineering and design; a decision will not be codified until the Annual Plan is approved by the Legislature.
- CPRA is working closely with USACE to either implement or obtain funding for projects and are partners in developing a number of tools to evaluate diversions. If CPRA does build projects on our own, USACE will have signed off on the tools that led to the decisions to advance the projects which will assist with permitting.
- The focus group expressed that invasive species are a significant problem. CPRA clarified that these are not included in the modeling efforts but are being considered in potential management efforts. If diversions do move forward, the group requested that the operations address noxious weeds.
- USFWS confirmed that they are tracking/modeling noxious weeds for fisheries but not for waterfowl. Concern was expressed about the impact this could have on recreation.
- A member expressed that while the 2017 plan might not be the appropriate venue they would like to see efforts prioritized to address the salvinia issue that they perceive is becoming more pervasive.

Open Discussion

Nick Speyrer recapped the meeting's discussion; the next meeting will be held in early spring of 2016 to review model and project outputs for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan. Due to the next meeting's material, the focus group was encouraged to attend the meeting in-person. The group expressed their appreciation for CPRA incorporating their feedback from the 2012 plan process and is looking forward to seeing the modeling results. Other focus group feedback included:

- Only sediment is needed in South Lake Maurepas, not more water.
- More potential restoration projects are needed in southwest Louisiana.
- Maintaining outflows of the Sabine River is important.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes and presentation to the focus group
- CPRA will send the Speakers Bureau Presentation to focus group members
- CPRA will update the presentation slides to reflect that barrier headlands are incorporated in the analysis
- CPRA will request additional feedback from Floodplain Managers in southwest Louisiana regarding contractual language in past home elevation programs
- Karim will follow up with the internal team to determine what data sets were used as part of the waterfowl HSI calculation
- Next Landowner Focus Group meeting: TBD early 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Landowner Focus Group Meeting

May 24, 2016 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

Pensacola Room – Galvez Building (602 North 5th Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Landowner Focus Group Members: Tim Allen (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Chad Courville (Miami Corporation), Francis Fields (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Paul Frey (Louisiana Landowners Association), James Harris (USFWS), Greg Linscombe (Continental Land and Fur), Randy Moertle (McIlhenny Corp/Biloxi Marsh), Amanda Phillips (Edward Wisner Donation), Buddy Smith (Conoco-Phillips), Glenn Vice (The J.M. Burguires Co.)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar.

Nick requested that the focus group share any reports or information the member's organizations/companies have on hand that highlights the importance of their business/industry to coastal Louisiana and the nation. A deadline for providing this information is July 31, 2016. This will assist CPRA in developing text for the master plan regarding the industry's importance; a similar request is being made to all focus groups.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios being used, and discussed the analytical challenges. Points of discussion and clarification included:

- **Environmental Scenarios:** There was discussion between the master plan team and focus group members regarding how the environmental scenarios were developed. Scenarios for use in planning can be derived in a number of ways. In some cases, they are developed by subject matter experts and in others by using statistical methods to explore the possible range of future circumstances once plausible ranges for individual drivers have been identified.
- Some key takeaways of the discussion include the following:
 - A literature review was performed for the storm frequency and average storm intensity information. Each factor was looked at individually and ranges were determined. It is important to note that each scenario for each factor was individually derived and is not intended to be correlated. To learn more about these factors, please review <http://coastal.la.gov/wp->

[content/uploads/2016/01/Attachment-C2-4-Tropical-Storm-Intensity-Frequency.pdf](http://coastal.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Attachment-C2-4-Tropical-Storm-Intensity-Frequency.pdf).

- Sea level rise and subsidence scenarios were developed independently and both are important factors in the modeling effort. To view the sea level rise and subsidence reports posted to the CPRA website, please visit: <http://coastal.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Attachment-C2-1-Sea-Level-Rise.pdf> and <http://coastal.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Attachment-C2-2-Subsidence-1.pdf>.

Modeling Update

Karim Belhadjali gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results. CPRA is currently reviewing results for all of the 133 restoration projects and the modeling of the protection projects is still in process. Points of discussion and clarification included:

- Clarified that salinity drives the vegetation model, not vice versa; there is no feedback loop. There were questions on preliminary results in the Chenier Plain that showed areas of increased salinity in a location that is currently protected by marsh and a series of locks and weirs. One possible explanation is that the marsh that is there today holding back gulf waters might erode in the future, or that as water elevation increased due to sea level rise, the locks might be overtopped. CPRA will further explore and provide an update at the next focus group meeting.
- The model's marsh type results are in acres, the Planning Tool sums data at the coast wide level at five year intervals.
- CPRA is currently evaluating projects effects at near-term (year 20) and long-term (year 50) intervals but everything that occurs in between these time slices is captured. CPRA might still evaluate projects at more frequent intervals for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.
- Projects are currently being modeled independently; project interactions will be captured when the alternatives (groups of projects) are modeled.

Planning Tool Update and Demo

Karim Belhadjali described the updates to the Planning Tool and walked through a demonstration of the tool. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- Use of the Planning Tool is an iterative process between CPRA and the Framework Development Team and Focus Groups to compare projects and their effects.
- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects always do well under all scenarios/conditions.
- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see what effect the prioritization has on the project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between near- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.

Policy and Programmatic Discussion

CPRA would be remiss if the master plan did not communicate the national significance of coastal Louisiana. To do this, CPRA is relying on the focus group's industries to share information that will be included within the master plan and in a new appendix that will focus on people and the landscape. CPRA requested that members share information such as adaptations the industry has historically faced due to land loss, notes to congressional delegations, and any studies, reports, maps, facts/figures members can share that appropriately capture the industry's importance. The goal is to communicate the implicit fact (that coastal Louisiana is of national importance) as explicitly as possible for a national audience. **Please submit this information before July 31, 2016.**

Additionally, CPRA is considering convening a small subgroup of FDT and focus group members to review the data CPRA receives and assist with the development of this section of the master plan to help balance the communication challenge of simultaneously speaking to Louisiana's coastal residents and the larger nation.

Open Discussion

- A focus group member expressed doubt regarding how project funding decisions were made and encouraged other Landowner Focus Group members to remain engaged in ongoing discussions with CPRA regarding the master plan and future annual plans.
- A focus group member questioned decisions made in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan regarding how bankline stabilization and shoreline protection projects were determined in Region 4. It was explained that modeling treats the projects the same way.
- A focus group member suggested that CPRA use a similar 50 year planning horizon as it does for the master plan when considering and prioritizing projects for CWPPRA.
- A hard copy map was requested that overlaps the Southwest Coastal study and CPRA master plan projects being considered. It was asked if a project is in the Southwest Coastal study if that will affect the project's prioritization in the master plan and it was explained that projects are being independently evaluated for master plan purposes at this point.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes, presentation, draft Planning Tool link and Planning Tool Readme file.
- Focus group members to become familiar with Planning Tool and let CPRA know if there are any questions about the data.
- Focus group members are to send any available national significance information to Ashley Cobb by July 31, 2016.
- Next Landowner Focus Group meeting: TBD Fall 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Landowner Focus Group Meeting

October 12, 2016 (10 a.m. to 12 p.m.)

CPRA Offices, Baton Rouge

Meeting Participants

Landowner Focus Group Members: Tim Allen (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Todd Baker (LDWF), Chad Courville (Miami Corporation), Frances Fields (Apache Louisiana Minerals LLC), Paul Frey (Louisiana Landowners Association), Greg Linscombe (Continental Land and Fur), Quin Kinler (NRCS), Sherrill Sagrera (Sagrera Property), Randy Moertle (McIlhenny Corp/Biloxi Marsh), Amanda Phillips (Edward Wisner Donation), Jay Caillouet (Caillouet Land Corporation)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Bren Haase, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick mentioned the timeline for the draft plan release, public meetings, and the next round of focus group meetings.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, and discussed the analytical challenges. Karim gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results.

Alternative Formulation Update

Karim described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through the alternative analysis for groups of projects. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- Use of the Planning Tool is an iterative process between CPRA and stakeholders, including the Framework Development Team and Focus Groups, to compare projects and their effects.
- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects perform well under a variety of scenarios/conditions.
- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see how that impacts the selection of a project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between short- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.
- A question was raised regarding Expected Annual Damages (EAD), which is defined as the

average damage estimated to occur from a storm surge flood event in any given year, taking into account both the projected chance of a storm occurring and the damage that would result.

- The master plan's modeling is coast wide, but inputs into the system vary across the coast for different areas, such as precipitation, subsidence, etc.
- While subsidence calculations do not take into account organic accumulation, the wetland morphology model accounts for this information.
- Barrier islands are being addressed programmatically in the master plan as CPRA cannot accurately predict the paths of hurricanes. Doing so allows CPRA to effectively manage breaches with funding set aside and evaluate barrier islands as a system versus at an island-by-island project level.
- Master plan project factsheets displaying how projects perform under the different environmental scenarios will be available when the draft plan is released in January.
- Appendix A – Project Definitions includes some project attribute information and full project analysis will be available in project fact sheets when the draft plan is released. Link to Appendix A: http://coastal.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Appendix-A_Project-Definitions_July-2016.pdf. Requests for additional and specific information can be made and the MPDT will do what it can to provide the requested information in a timely fashion.
- The focus group discussed concerns and challenges of the master plan being based on the best available science and the changes that are made to the final plan based on public engagement, review, and comment. CPRA's perspective is that the draft plan is based on science and while projects may change from the draft to final plan, it will be done in a transparent way and the implications of those changes will be communicated.
- The eustatic sea level rise range used in the High environmental scenario is consistent with current NOAA predictions; however, some in the science community predict future reports will cite higher rates.
- Concern was expressed about the sustainability of building new marsh in a location that may eventually be surrounded by water in the future.
- In addition, a concern was raised that scientists involved in developing models and analytical tools are making assumptions about coastal properties that they do not have historical knowledge of. The landowners requested that they be more involved in the future to ground truth assumptions being made and incorporated into predictive models.
- CPRA is planning to release a revised version of the Planning Tool to the Focus Group with the draft plan in January; CPRA will resend the focus group's Planning Tool link that was shared after the May meeting.
- Confirmed the 2017 Coastal Master Plan will make recommendations for nonstructural projects but that there is not a confirmed funding source.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes and presentation slides.
- CPRA will resend the Planning Tool link that was previously shared with the focus group.
- Next Landowners Focus Group meeting: January 2017 (TBD)

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Navigation Focus Group Meeting

June 13, 2013 (9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.)

Griffon Room – LaSalle Building, Baton Rouge, LA

Meeting Participants

Navigation Focus Group Members: Spencer Murphy, Z. David DeLoach, Channing Hayden, Louis Colletta, Jim Stark, Sharon Balfour, Michael Rooney, Sean Duffy

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Natalie Peyronnin, Bren Haase, Renee Bennett, Stephanie Zumo, Molly Bourgoyne, Carol P. Richards, Andrew Beall, Jammie Favorite, Melanie Saucier.

Meeting Summary

- **FY 2014 Annual Plan Update:** Melanie welcomed the group and expressed CPRA's interest in getting greater feedback from the navigation industry. Natalie then explained the expenditures and revenues that are listed in the Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Plan for the next three years. She also discussed the oil spill funds and where those funds are being used to move certain master plan projects forward. For more details, please click [HERE](#) to download the 2014 Annual Plan.
 - Questions were raised regarding what the \$7 million for beneficial use projects would be used for? It was also noted that \$7 million is not very much for the whole coast. The Bayou Dupont Project would be good to analyze as a medium size project for this funding.
 - Funds are for use in 2014 for any projects CPRA would like to participate in as long as funds are consistent with the Master Plan and would use dredged material near marsh creation projects identified in the Master Plan. We agree that \$7 million is not a lot but we are doing a large amount of activity as dedicated dredging for the long distance sediment pipeline.
- **Future Funding Sources and Project Implementation:** Many participants had questions about funding sources, how funding sources could be combined, and which projects would be moving forward next. Current oil spill funds are only based on civil fines and criminal fines are being determined in court now. The civil fines distributed to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) are to be used for barrier island restoration and sediment diversions only.
 - Questions were raised about the amount and timing of the GOMESA funds.
 - The amount of revenue the state would receive has fluctuated greatly with the moratorium. The amounts could be between \$100-300 million annually but the start time has been pushed back to 2020.
 - CPRA will try to get more specific details on the estimated GOMESA funding to share with the group.

- It is possible that with BP funds, we will have enough funding for restoration projects in the master plan for the first ten years, but it strongly depends on the Restore Council, litigation, etc. The goal for CPRA is to have certain projects shovel ready once the money does come.
 - A top concern for the Navigation Industry is to make sure that we clearly explain and remain transparent to the public on the process for distributing BP funds to certain projects.
- **Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study:** Carol explained the project goals, timeline, and current status to the group. It was mentioned that CPRA is waiting on a Corps waiver on the 3x3x3 smart planning guidance to continue moving the Delta Management portion of the study forward. So far, it has not affected the timeline and modeling results should still be available soon. The 1D model will be validated and calibrated and future without action scenarios finished later this month. Project runs will start shortly thereafter and we will have results ready for the group to review in the November timeframe. The 2017 Master Plan will include detailed analysis and model results from the Hydro models.
 - Group members would like to see the model results as soon as possible and would like a separate meeting from the general public to discuss the results.
 - It was mentioned that the Bayou Sorrel area near Pierre Part has many issues with siltation and water flows because it isn't properly managed. It would be helpful to see the affects on this area when you release a draft report.
- **Lower Breton & Barataria Sediment Diversions:** Stephanie and Renee explained the project goals, timeline, and current status to the group.
 - Group recommended being aware of the railroad extension project to river mile 47.
 - Renee/Stephanie will get back with the group on whether the legend descriptions for the anchorages are all included in the one polygon shown on the maps.
 - Group reminded the team to always be careful of flows and impacts to anchorage sites. The Navigation Industry needs more permanent anchorage sites, not less.
 - River pilots like anchor sites in areas of slack water, which also happen to be areas where sediment drops out of the water column and becomes sediment sources for diversion projects.
 - The safety of any structure also needs to be considered in case a tow breaks free near an anchor site or diversion.
 - It was suggested that the best site for a diversion is on a building bank and not a cutting bank.
- **Mid Barataria Sediment Diversion:** Andrew explained the project goals, timeline, and current status to the group. The project cost is between \$500-600 million with a 2 year Engineering and Design process and a 5 year construction timeline.
 - It was suggested to be prepared to adjust flows and understand that large, heavy barges will suck all the water off banks and outtake structures when they pass.
 - Sharon mentioned there are no DOTD funds to move bridges or roads for projects.
- **Calcasieu Salinity Control Measures:** Natalie explained the project goals and current status to the group.
 - Group recommended being careful with terminology of Calcasieu Lake and what exactly that means (both wetlands east and west of lake).
 - It was recommended to have Jim Stark sit in on the Southwest Subgroup for this project because he may also eventually have lock issues on the GIWW.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the slides from the presentations to the group (attached to email)
- CPRA will continue to update the group on any additional details on BP or GOMESA funding and project/modeling timeframes
- CPRA will present more project location details and modeling results to the group at the next meeting in November
- We appreciate suggestions from group members about any additional issues they would like to discuss at our meetings
- Follow up with Z David about a potential field trip on the river
- **Next Meeting:** November 2013 – TBD

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Navigation Focus Group Meeting

June 19, 2014 (8:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.)

Griffon Room – LaSalle Building, Baton Rouge, LA

Meeting Participants

Navigation Focus Group Members: Spencer Murphy, Z. David DeLoach, Channing Hayden, Jim Stark, Sharon Balfour, Sean Duffy, Roy Pontiff, Joe Accardo, Jr., Brett Palmer, Joni Tuck

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Kyle Graham, Karim Belhadjali, Bren Haase, Wes LeBlanc, Melanie Saucier, Austin Feldbaum, Kent Bollfrass, Carol P. Richards, Elizabeth Jarrell

Others: Benjamin Richard – Tetra Tech, Josh Carter – Coast and Harbor, Jonathan Hird – Moffatt and Nichol, David Fulks – Arcadis, Tom Hunter – URS, Ehab Mesehle – TWIG, Denise Reed – TWIG, Kenny Blanke – USACE, Michael Lowe – USACE, Edward Creef – USACE, Jeff Corbino – USACE

Meeting Summary

- **Welcome (Karim, Bren, Kyle):** Karim opened the meeting, summarizing the history of the group and emphasizing the importance of getting engagement from navigation stakeholders early in the planning process. The team was first involved in the 2012 Master Plan effort and will be engaged again for the 2017 Master Plan effort. This meeting is being held to discuss CPRA projects that are currently in the feasibility studies phase of planning. Bren explained that feasibility studies involve choosing projects from the 2012 Master Plan to examine in more detail. Kyle thanked the navigation team for their input and stressed the intention of CPRA to continue working closely with this team.
- **FY 2014 Annual Plan Update (Kyle):** Kyle explained that the annual plan outlines more detail on where we are spending our money, describing restoration projects in planning and in construction. He briefly listed some active projects currently under construction (Bayou DuPoint, Schofield Island and Shell Island, Lake Hermitage, Caminada Headland) and currently in planning and won't go to construction this year (sediment and freshwater diversions). He elaborated that diversions are an important tool for restoration and that their impacts are still being studied. He explained that we anticipate results from new studies (fisheries, nutrients, socio-economics, etc.) within the timeframe of the next 12 months. We also expect to ramp up data management and monitoring. He explained the 3 major sources of funding for these projects (NRDA, RESTORE, and NFWF; Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control structures and the Houma Navigation Lock are tagged for RESTORE funding).

- **2017 Master Plan Development Update (Karim):** Development of the 2017 Master Plan is just getting underway. URS has been selected as the contractor to help with the effort, while TWIG will be responsible for the model development plan. CPRA is soliciting new project ideas and concepts to evaluate with the 2017 models. This navigation focus group will continue to be engaged as the 2017 Master Plan is developed.
- **Lower Breton Diversion (Kent):** Kent described the diversion as outlined in the 2012 Master Plan (50,000 cfs at river discharge of > 600,000 cfs, etc.) and explained that its purpose is to reestablish deltaic processes in the Lower Breton Sound. The function of the feasibility study is to identify an optimal location (constrained by sand bar locations, levees, and anchorage locations) by November 2014 to take to 10% design. 3 locations being considered: 1) Mardi Gras Pass, 2) Port Sulphur, and 3) Bass Enterprises – screened out already because of constructability issues. Mardi Gras Pass location is on a sand bar and is not in a federal anchorage area, but there is concern about crossing a local navigation route. The Port Sulphur location is on a sand bar and adjacent to an anchorage site
 - Questions: Have the alternative locations being considered been circulated to the navigation team yet? Who will choose the location? What is the process for navigation team members to review locations and express concerns? What will happen if there is disagreement about the selected location? How will the diversion be operated? What are the upstream impacts of a diversion on flows? Why can't diversions be located on the other side of the river?
 - Comments: vessel modeling after location selection is not sufficient; there should be more engagement on the front end. Navigation will definitely disagree with any location within an anchorage area. All anchorage areas are utilized, especially during emergencies, and more are needed. There is already concern from landowners in the Mardi Gras Pass area. Vessels in anchorage sites swing with wind and cross currents – could potentially cause harm to a diversion structure. The local navigation channel is a dead end and would not be used for barge transportation other than potentially for construction at well sites, etc. It is probably more of a fisheries concern than a navigation concern. The Port Sulphur location may work but depends on currents and velocities.
 - Suggestions: Reach out to Venice Port complex, fishermen/oyster groups, recreational fishing marinas.
 - CPRA response: Operations are yet to be determined but will be examined/ explored with the models. We intend to identify the optimal location for land building benefits first and then look at specifics of flow rate, operation regimes, and impacts to navigation in more detail. It would be helpful to have input from navigation about the velocity limits that are acceptable for navigation and which model outputs (contours, velocity maps, etc.) are most useful for accessing potential impacts. TWIG did model a diversion on the thalweg side of the river, but it did not efficiently capture sediment.
 - Follow-up: Sean will set up a meeting with area pilots to discuss locations further, with focus on concerns about anchorage areas. CPRA will consider investigating alternative locations for anchorage areas.

- **Lower Barataria Diversion (Kent):** Five locations were considered for this diversion: Magnolia, Diamond, Port Sulphur, Empire, and Buras. The lower locations were screened out because the receiving basin there is too deep to achieve land building goals. The Magnolia location is in a federal anchorage area, avoids revetments, and avoids back levees. The Diamond location is not in a federal anchorage area but involves crossing a back levee.
 - Questions: Why are locations within federal anchorage areas being considered? Have land rights issued been considered?
 - Comments: West Bay agreement included giving up anchorage sites – there are a lot of concerns about entering another similar agreement. Vessels are required by law to have 2 anchors on the bow, so they will swing while anchored – requiring additional anchors would involve changing federal laws
 - CPRA Response: Same locations that are good for diversions are also good for anchorage areas – we’re doing our best to find locations that minimize navigation impacts. Locations have been selected to avoid current infrastructure, and land rights issues are being considered as part of project costs.
- **Increase Atchafalaya Flow to Terrebonne (Austin):** Austin described the project and its need as outlined in the 2012 Master Plan. He explained that planning constraints include avoiding impacts on flood protection and navigation. Potential issues include dredging and water levels in the GIWW, navigation delays from operation of the Bayou Chene floodgate and HNC lock.
 - Questions: Does diversion influence amount of water flowing through GIWW west? Doesn’t Morganza to the Gulf include a gate in the GIWW?
 - Comments: When Atchafalaya is high, water flows north to fill up the area behind Bayou Sorrel Lock before moving East toward Houma. Operations of the HNC structure are more of an offshore supply industry concern than a navigation concern.
 - Suggestions: Reach out to the Port of Terrebonne. Revisit and consider design of old CWPPRA project (Paul Kemp and Z. David) pulling water off at Bayou Sorrel. Use high currents in GIWW at Calcasieu as a comparison for limits on velocities in the channel (don’t want to exceed ~4 feet/second)
 - CPRA response: Diversion decreases flow through GIWW west by about 1%. Operations are TBD, but it is likely that the diversion would not be open during high water events to avoid impacting flood protection.
- **Calcasieu Salinity Control Measures (Austin):** Austin explained some project background and the design options being considered. The target benefit is ~20,000 acres of land built/maintained. The focused array of alternatives includes: 1) a gate at mile 5 with sill and sills at forks, 2) channelization with sills, and 3) combination of gate and channelization features. Moveable parts in design allow for adaptive management and operations strategies.
 - Questions: What will project impacts be on terminals and other developed structures designed for current conditions?
 - Comments: Any money spent on evaluating a gate or lock in the channel is a waste. If these features are included in a recommended plan, navigation will do everything possible to fight it. A storm surge gate would need to be located higher in the

channel (near Lake Charles) and operated only during surge events. Increases in traffic are expected in this area, which will already lead to delay times. Only certain deep draft ships do not move through the channel at high currents; it is open 24/7 for shallower draft ships. The 250 x 40 sill dimensions should be reconsidered; 700 x 60 is more appropriate.

- Suggestion: Ansenco can perform a sensitivity analysis to further examine impacts of a gate structure on navigation (~4 month timeline).
- CPRA response: We are required from a feasibility study perspective to do our due diligence to analyze various alternatives and document decisions regarding screening. We also have to consider factors other than navigation included storm surge benefits, impacts on fisheries, etc. We need to consider a gate and channelization option with refined models. Information about changes in velocities will be provided in time for the upcoming meeting on June 30 at the Port of Lake Charles.
- Follow-up: Revisit and confirm assumptions with navigation group. Austin to email slides to Channing and Brett.

Next Steps

- CPRA will provide group with link to the Annual Plan - <http://coastal.la.gov/annualplan/>
- CPRA will provide stage at Carrollton for discharge of 600,000 cfs (approximately 8-8.8ft)
- CPRA will send the slides from the presentations to the group (attached to email)
- CPRA will work with Sean to set up a smaller meeting with Pilot groups to discuss anchorage issues
- CPRA will consider alternative locations for anchorage sites
- Ansenco will be contacted regarding sensitivity analysis
- **Next Meeting:** TBD ~ Early December 2014

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Navigation Focus Group Meeting Summary

February 5, 2015 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

Griffon Room – LaSalle Building (617 North 3rd Street, Baton Rouge)

Meeting Participants

Navigation Focus Group Members: Joe Accardo (PAL), Sharon Balfour (DOTD Intermodal Transportation), Z. David DeLoach (LAWS/DeLoach Marine), Sean Duffy (Louisiana Maritime Users Association), Channing Hayden (Port of Lake Charles), Spencer Murphy (Canal Barge Co.), Mike Park (USACE)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Wes LeBlanc, Austin Feldbaum, Kent Bollfrass, Carol Parsons Richards, Ashley Claro, Denise Reed, Nick Speyrer

Others: Rick Broussard (USACE), Therrance Chretien (Port of Lake Charles), Cindy Cutrera (Port of Morgan City), Tracy Falk (USACE), Mike Sullivan (USACE)

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group, discussed the objectives of the Navigation Focus Group, and requested suggestions for additional members if there were critical interests not represented. A member suggested that CPRA consider scheduling meetings in New Orleans in order to get better participation from members of the focus group that represent the pilot industry.

Discussion of Master Plan Projects in Planning/Feasibility

Bren Haase introduced the tentatively selected plans (TSPs) for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project and the Lower Breton and Barataria Diversion projects, explaining that work on these projects is still early in the process. As part of the effort to keep everyone involved early and often, CPRA is sharing information on these projects earlier than is typical to have all parties involved. The next phase will focus on basin-wide modeling to determine optimal sequencing and operations of diversion projects, with a final decision point to be reached in Fall 2015. CPRA will also be doing more evaluation on fish/shellfish communities and socio-economics.

Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control

Austin Feldbaum walked the focus group through the objectives and screening process for evaluating concept alternatives for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project.

Presentation highlights/points for clarification include:

- The reason for the project is that multiple sources indicate that salinity is the single cause of wetland loss in the Chenier Plain.
- The goal of the project is to prevent land loss.
- The selected TSP is Channel Isolation - this concept reduces wetland loss rates and provides a potential benefit to deep draft navigation due to effects on velocities. In addition, the

concept features are being refined to provide for boating access, fish ingress/egress and drainage.

- Channel isolation concept did not violate the restraint that the ports need to continue to be able to function.
- CPRA looked at dredging surveys for sedimentation rates and at different sections of the channel; found that there was a less than 1% increase in overall volume sediment accretion. This is within the uncertainty ranges for the model, meaning it has very little or negligible impact.
- In response to a question about how much time will elapse before construction/implementation, CPRA estimated that if funding were available today it would be three years for E&D. While funding is currently being pursued, CPRA does not currently possess it.

The next steps for this project are to conduct further modeling including additional storm surge and induced flooding modeling, fisheries modeling, and a new 3-D hydrodynamic model which is being developed by The Water Institute. In addition, further engineering and geotechnical work is needed to make sure that the project and design is constructible in the selected area. The feasibility report will be completed in late-May and will be made available.

Lower Breton and Lower Barataria Sediment Diversion

Kent Bollfrass walked the focus group through the objectives and screening process for evaluating the Lower Breton and Lower Barataria Diversion project alternatives. Discussion highlights/points for clarification include:

- The Lower Barataria TSP is the Diamond site; the Lower Breton TSP is the Port Sulfur site.
- The group voiced that the least impact to navigation and most cost effective option would be to dredge in Bayou Dupont to create land in real time, addresses issue of material being in close proximity.
 - CPRA clarified that creating marsh with dredged material is good (CPRA does this), but diversions will help to create diverse, sustainable habitat. The Master Plan's purpose is to balance the approach of short-term sustainability with long-term benefits. Once you dredge material and walk away from it, it is susceptible to the forces of subsidence and erosion. Diversions are more sustainable in the long-term because they mimic natural processes and replenish sediment.
- CPRA clarified that some diversion concepts are cutting edge while we have information from some existing diversions already. For example, there will be a gate to control the diversion operation but we do not know right now how it will be operated.
- When asked if CPRA has ever considered a dredging-only alternative, CPRA confirmed that this option is incorporated in the alternatives that were considered for the 2012 Coastal Master Plan as well as in the Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study.
- Group expressed that it is important to consider projects that dredge material down to 90 feet as this has not been looked at before and standards have been updated since the 2012 Plan.
- CPRA confirmed there are no diversion projects currently being considered below the TSP for Lower Breton on the Mississippi River
- Group expressed an interest in seeing more information regarding cost/benefit analysis of diversion projects vs. dredging projects

The next steps are for the TSPs to then move into the next phase of modeling/evaluation (basin-wide, fisheries, socio-economics) to determine optimal operation and confirm constructability. In addition, the engineering reports are going through a third party independent technical review to check for efficiencies, cost savings, etc. Once modeling results are available (hydro, fisheries abundance/distribution, population shifts to general area, local flood impacts, etc.) the project will

also be analyzed for its socio-economic impacts. Lastly, additional outreach will be done in the Grand Bayou area and to Navigation stakeholders.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed some of the key updates and changes from the 2012 Coastal Master Plan, gave an update on the recent progress for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, and the restoration and structural protection projects being considered for the 2017 Plan. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- CPRA explained that 2017 projects being considered (projects that were included in the 2012 plan as well as new projects being considered) will be analyzed and all of the projects will “compete” to be included in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, acknowledging the project list will be constrained by a projection of available funding. Thus, it is conceivable that a project that was in the 2012 Plan could be replaced by a new project that provides more desirable outcomes.
- A question was posed of whether the 2012 Master Plan looked at a project that dredged the river down to 70 feet and used the material beneficially. The Master Plan included projects that utilized several locations within the river as a borrow source to create wetlands, and CPRA has in the past successfully mined the river to -90 ft. for marsh creation projects.
- The group raised the topic of new technology for Deep Ocean dredging which is faster than current dredges, operates at less cost, and has very mobile equipment. Group feels that many issues being discussed could be solved by the new dredging technology. CPRA was not aware of this new development but is interested in receiving information for engineers to assess.
- Regarding the submission of new project concepts, some members express concerns regarding the fact that projects had to be consistent with the Master Plan since the Master Plan doesn’t include projects below mile marker 29.
- The group expressed concerns regarding CPRA’s current policy that bankline stabilization projects on federally navigable waterways is 100% federal responsibility, thus no state dollars would be allocated to such projects. CPRA confirmed that this remains the current policy.

Navigation Decision Criteria Update

Denise Reed provided an overview of the navigation decision criteria, explaining that decision criteria use modeling outputs but are things that are added to the equation to be considered. Points of clarification include:

- Decision criteria allow CPRA to come to a standalone project score; navigation scores are not additive across projects.
- 2017 Plan will only focus on federally authorized navigation channels and will use the same elements as the 2012 Plan. The 4 variables for the navigation decision criteria are:
 - V1: Extent of land in coastal cells
 - Where a project could actually provide a benefit for navigation; preventing land loss includes if project builds land.
 - Adjustment from 2012 in land loss calculations for the 2017 model will focus on non-leveed areas of the Mississippi River.
 - Clarified that “coastal cells” are the narrow band of land next to the river but CPRA is only including this where there is confidence in the amount of land change.
 - V2: Potential for shoaling and steorage – all channels except Mississippi River
 - Projects that decrease the depth or alter the flow rate (which is rare) of the navigation channel receive a negative score.

- Analysis is made after 50 years.
 - V3: Potential for shoaling and steerage – Mississippi River
 - The math is slightly different for the Mississippi River, which is why it is kept separate from the other channels.
 - All projects expected to induce lateral flows or shoaling receive negative scores.
 - The same principle of focusing on lateral flows will still apply, but new tools from modeling and other information not previously available will impact how scaling will be reconsidered for 2017 (but not sure how yet); the improved models might allow for more specific estimates.
 - V4: New structures
 - Reflects the effects of structures on navigation.
 - Each project receives a score based on project characteristics, not on modeling.
- The total score for a project is the arithmetic mean of the variables; again, each project receives a score but the scores cannot be added. Since scores cannot be added, alternatives do not receive scores, only projects.
- The Planning Tool only includes projects that have scores above a certain point or excludes projects with scores below a certain point.
- Group suggested that the Master Plan decision criteria consider benefits to both land building and navigation versus focusing on doing no harm to navigation; it is a mistake to think that doing no harm is as good as we can get.
- In reply to a discussion point that a new structure could also have a positive effect for navigation (e.g. increased reliability when a lock is put in where one did not exist before), CPRA confirmed that rehab of an existing structure could easily be inserted as it would be consistent with the Master Plan objectives, but that it is doubtful that there will be a project that does this.
- It was clarified that any shoaling received a negative score because CPRA did not feel confident saying shoaling will occur but it will not affect/impact navigable depth.
- Clarified that the intent of the navigation decision criteria scoring scale is not to say that all projects have negative implications for navigation, but since scores for navigation are not additive (as they are for fisheries or communities), the scaling does not affect the outcome if it were to go from -1 to 1 versus the current scale of -1 to 0.
- The group expressed that shoaling in an area is not a “no-go”, if there was an agreement with binding maintenance/money included in a project for dredging, navigation would be willing to have that discussion.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes, list of current/invited Navigation Focus Group Members and presentation slides to the group
- Focus Group Members will review the current list of membership and send any additional suggestions on to CPRA to help ensure that all areas and interests of the state are represented in the 2017 Master Plan process
- Next Navigation Focus Group meeting: Mid-Late Summer TBD
 - CPRA will look at timelines for the Master Plan and the diversion projects to see when it makes sense to bring the group together for updates. CPRA will send out a Doodle poll for meeting availabilities and solicit agenda items once this has been determined.

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Navigation Focus Group Meeting Summary

October 9, 2015 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

*CERM Conference Room #438 – CPRA New Orleans Regional Office
(2045 Lakeshore Drive, New Orleans)*

Meeting Participants

Navigation Focus Group Members: Joe Accardo (Ports Association of Louisiana), Chett Chaisson (Greater Lafourche Port Commission), Chris Collins (DOTD), Cindy Cutrera (Port of Morgan City), Sean Duffy (Louisiana Maritime Users Association), Matt Gresham (Port of New Orleans), Merritt Lane (Canal Barge Company), Sharon Balfour (DOTD Intermodal Transportation), Spencer Murphy (Canal Barge Company), Mike Park (USACE), Jim Stark (Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Bren Haase, Karim Belhadjali, Austin Feldbaum, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group, led introductions, and recapped the history and frequency of the focus group meetings. Based on feedback received from the focus group at the February meeting, the meeting was held in New Orleans and offered as a webinar to encourage participation. Nick explained that this meeting would be the last process focused meeting; moving forward meetings will have a greater focus on reviewing model output and discussing project options. The group was reminded that the meeting notes will capture key themes and will be reported out at the next FDT meeting.

Oil Spill Restoration Planning Update

Bren Haase described the three sources of funding for the state's oil spill restoration planning which are the criminal penalties, natural resources damages, and civil penalties resulting from the BP oil spill. Group discussion/points of clarification included:

- The oil spill restoration projects have to meet certain criteria that were statutorily set by the Department of Justice in order to receive funding; the majority of these projects are included in the Coastal Master Plan and all are built on sound science.
- To view projects currently proposed for funding via the various scenarios, please refer to the enclosed presentation slides.
- The criminal penalties are being administered by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF).
- The focus group discussed the impacts of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and the benefits of dredging projects to the navigation industry.
- Per Sean Duffy's request, Bren Haase will follow up with him to share available project information on Pass a Loutre.

- Concerns were raised regarding the lack of funding of projects in the Mississippi River (deepening of the river channel, beneficial use of dredged material) that could support the navigation industry and make the ports of south Louisiana more competitive in the global market.

2017 Coastal Master Plan General Update

Karim Belhadjali discussed some of the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan including the New Project Development Program, modeling updates and improvements, an overview of the planning framework, and an update on the Flood Risk and Resilience Program. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- The funding scenarios for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan are currently being developed.
- Reiterated that projects included in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan will be re-evaluated for the 2017 plan as CPRA re-optimizes based on the new information and tools that are available; as projects compete against each other for inclusion in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan, it is possible that projects in the 2012 plan will not be included in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan.

Update on Diversion Planning and Implementation

Bren Haase gave an update on CPRA's diversion planning and implementation efforts, including the process and decision drivers that will lead to a decision regarding whether or not to advance any, all, or none of the diversion projects currently being considered to the engineering and design phase. Group feedback and points of discussion/clarification included:

- CPRA will make a recommendation to the CPRA Board on October 21st regarding whether or not to advance diversion(s) to the next phase of engineering and design; a decision will not be codified until the Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Plan is approved by the Legislature.
- Confirmed that although USACE declined the Delta Management Study's request to analyze dredging the river channel deeper than 70 feet, CPRA does have permits in some areas for 80, 90 feet.

Update on Other Project Implementation

Austin Feldbaum gave an update on the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control and Increase Atchafalaya projects. Points of clarification included:

- The Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control feasibility study report is available online on the CIMS server, cims.coastal.la.gov/. To find the report, go to the Document Library and search for "CS-0065".
- The Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project and an alternative were plugged into the Port of Lake Charles' traffic model; as a result of this project the port is projected to experience a benefit of several million dollars due to the increased amount of hours each day that the project allows ships to pass.
- Preliminary analysis shows that net flow towards the Gulf will be increased by the project, suggesting that the project could be beneficial to navigation channel maintenance.
- Additional modeling needs to be developed and further evaluation around drainage issues needs to occur for the Calcasieu Ship Channel Salinity Control project.
- The Increase Atchafalaya project is nearing the end of its feasibility study.
- Clarified that although the project is not designed to move sediment, it does pull finer material such as silts and clays because it pulls water from the GIWW at a depth of 12-18 feet.
- Bottom grab samples have been collected on both sides of the lock; the next step is to model how this material would move around to make sure it does not result in shoaling.

- Before Increase Atchafalaya is built, CPRA needs to understand the impact to vessel traffic when the diversion is open and flowing.

Open Discussion

Nick Speyrer recapped the meeting's discussion; the next meeting will be held in early spring of 2016 to review model and project outputs for the 2017 Coastal Master Plan. Due to the next meeting's material, the focus group was encouraged to attend the meeting in-person.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes and presentation to the focus group
- CPRA will send the Speakers Bureau Presentation to focus group members
- Bren Haase will follow up with Sean Duffy to share available project information on Pass a Loutre
- Next Navigation Focus Group meeting: TBD early spring 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Navigation Focus Group Meeting

May 19, 2016 (1 p.m. to 3 p.m.)

Conference Room #438 – CPRA New Orleans Regional Office (2045 Lakeshore Drive, New Orleans)

Meeting Participants

Navigation Focus Group Members: Joe Accardo (Ports Association of Louisiana), Sharon Balfour (DOTD Intermodal Transportation), Reagan Brown (Port of Lake Charles), Chris Collins (DOTD), Cindy Cutrera (Port of Morgan City), Sean Duffy (Louisiana Maritime Users Association), Merritt Lane (Canal Barge Company), Michael Miller (Associated Branch Pilots), Spencer Murphy (Canal Barge Company), Mike Park (USACE MVN), Mac Wade (Port of Morgan City)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Melanie Saucier, Ashley Cobb, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick requested that the focus group share any reports or information the member's companies have on hand that highlights the importance of their business/industry to coastal Louisiana and the nation. A deadline for providing this information is **July 31, 2016**. This will assist CPRA in developing text for the master plan regarding the industry's importance; a similar request is being made to all focus groups.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges.

Modeling Update

Karim gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and discussed example project results. CPRA is currently reviewing results for all of the 133 restoration projects and the modeling of the protection projects is still in process. Points of discussion and clarification included:

- Future Without Action (FWOA) includes those projects previously constructed up until 2014; projects that had construction dollars or were being constructed at that time were manually entered into the model based on the engineers' project plans. Diversion projects are not included in FWOA because they do not currently have construction dollars. To view the complete list of candidate projects, please visit: <http://coastal.la.gov/wp->

[content/uploads/2015/08/2017-Coastal-Master-Plan_Developing-the-List-of-Candidate-Projects_8-28-15.pdf](#).

- The 2017 Coastal Master Plan funding constraint used for plan formulation is still under development but will be based on what CPRA optimistically but reasonably expects as feasible over the next 50 years.
- There are no restoration projects under consideration for inclusion in the 2017 Coastal Master Plan for the Bird's Foot Delta.

Planning Tool Update and Demo

Karim described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through a demonstration of the tool. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- The Planning Tool helps identify how project perform considering a number of key outputs and metrics under a variety of scenarios/conditions.
- The Planning Tool can be used to prioritize different metrics to see what effect the prioritization has on the project list. The Planning Tool allows for comparisons and displays the choices between short- and long-term goals as well as selecting one set of metrics over another.
- Information on projects effects on certain types of critical infrastructure or industries, such as navigation, will be presented to the focus group in a few months.

Policy and Programmatic Discussion

CPRA would be remiss if the master plan did not communicate the national significance of coastal Louisiana. To do this, CPRA is relying on the focus group's industries to share information that will be included within the master plan and in a new appendix that will focus on people and the landscape. CPRA requested that members share information such as adaptations the industry has historically faced due to land loss, notes to congressional delegations, and any studies, reports, maps, facts/figures members can share that appropriately capture the industry's importance. The goal is to communicate the implicit fact (that coastal Louisiana is of national importance) as explicitly as possible for a national audience. **Please submit this information before July 31, 2016.**

Additionally, CPRA is considering convening a small subgroup of FDT and focus group members to review the data CPRA receives and assist with the development of this section of the master plan to help balance the communication challenge of simultaneously speaking to Louisiana's coastal residents and the larger nation.

Open Discussion

- The focus group requested an update on the timeline of the Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study (MRHDMS) at the fall meeting and how that study influenced the decisions by CPRA to advance the Mid-Breton and Mid-Barataria diversions as well as what information was available regarding potential induced shoaling due to the diversions. If timing does not coincide with the focus group meeting, a separate briefing on the MRHDMS and overall diversion planning and implementation can be scheduled.
- A focus group member suggested that with dredges, everything changes economically when it is built out over years versus months.
- One member commented that the excess sediment in the Atchafalaya River near Morgan City is very nutrient rich and that they would like to see ways for that material to be used for restoration activities.
- A focus group member suggested that funding needs to be identified for USACE and the Port of Lake Charles to change their disposal areas for the Calcasieu Ship Channel in order to support beneficial use of dredged material in the area and suggested that this be considered as part of the Calcasieu Salinity Control Measures project.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes, presentation, draft Planning Tool link and Planning Tool Readme file.
- Focus group members are to become familiar with Planning Tool and let CPRA know if there are any questions about the data.
- Focus group members are to send any available national significance information to Ashley Cobb by July 31, 2016.
- Next Navigation Focus Group meeting: TBD Fall 2016

2017 Coastal Master Plan

Navigation Focus Group Meeting

September 29, 2016 (2 p.m. to 4 p.m.)

Conference Room #438 – CPRA New Orleans Regional Office (2045 Lakeshore Drive, New Orleans)

Meeting Participants

Navigation Focus Group Members: Joe Accardo (Ports Association of Louisiana), Sharon Balfour (DOTD Intermodal Transportation), Reagan Brown (Port of Lake Charles), Chris Collins (DOTD), Cindy Cutrera (Port of Morgan City), Sean Duffy (Louisiana Maritime Users Association), Channing Hayden (Port of Lake Charles), James Jones (DOTD), Merritt Lane (Canal Barge Company), Kevin Levine (Associated Branch Pilots), Spencer Murphy (Canal Barge Company), Mike Park (USACE MVN)

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Karim Belhadjali, Bren Haase, Melanie Saucier, Nick Speyrer

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Nick mentioned the timeline for the draft plan release, public meetings, and the next round of focus group meetings.

2017 Coastal Master Plan Update

Karim Belhadjali presented the key updates to the 2017 Coastal Master Plan and reviewed the master plan formulation process and planning framework, introduced the three environmental scenarios, and discussed the analytical challenges. A question was raised regarding the time period for the analysis and it was confirmed that the master plan considers a 50-year horizon. Karim gave an update regarding the 2017 Coastal Master Plan's modeling effort and walked through example project results.

Points of discussion/clarification included:

- Questions were raised about recent and existing dredging and beneficial use projects in the Bird's Foot and does the Future Without Action or Future With Action analysis assume similar work will be done in the future. The answer is that this potential work isn't included because there are no dedicated funding sources to do such projects. It was suggested that this assumption be incorporated into future analysis.
- A focus group member ascertained whether or not the greater New Orleans Hurricane & Storm Damage Risk Reduction System was included in the model and it was confirmed that not only was the system included, an assumption was made that the system is maintained to its intended level of protection into the future.

Alternative Formulation Update

Karim described the updates to the 2017 Planning Tool and walked through the alternative analysis for groups of projects. Points of discussion/clarification included:

- Use of the Planning Tool is an iterative process between CPRA and stakeholders, including the Framework Development Team and Focus Groups, to compare projects and their effects.
- The Planning Tool helps identify which projects perform well under a variety of scenarios/conditions.
- Question was raised about how funding scenarios were developed and it was explained that a range of funding scenarios was considered and that ultimately a budget is determined for protection projects and restoration projects separately. At this point, it appears likely that the master plan will consider an overall budget of \$50 million (present value) allocated evenly between protection and restoration
- Concerns were expressed about large amount of future loss in the southwest coastal area both with plan and future without plan. Karim reminded the group that sea level rise accelerates in year 40 and beyond, especially in the medium and high scenarios. As a follow-up to this, a member asked if the scientists involved were more confident in environmental scenario predictions in the first 10-20 years as compared to what might happen 40-50 years from now and it was confirmed that these estimates are based on available science but are predictions that include uncertainty.
- A question was raised regarding the definition of Expected Annual Damages (EAD). The definition is as follows: EAD represents the average damage estimated to occur from a storm surge flood event in any given year, taking into account both the projected chance of a storm occurring and the damage that would result. More on EAD can be found here: http://coastal.la.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/CPRA-Appendix-D-Planning-Tool-Methodology_DRAFT.pdf
- A question was raised regarding the borrow source for the Point Au Fer Island Marsh Creation and CPRA agreed to follow-up and provide a response in the notes. The borrow source for the project for the master plan analysis is an offshore sediment supply.

Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study Update

Bren Haase gave an update on the Mississippi River Hydrodynamic and Delta Management Study (MRHDMS) and mentioned that the focus of CPRA is now on the Mid-Basin Sediment Diversion Program as it seems like the best path to design and construct these projects. He then provided an update on recent activities and provided an overview of the timeline for the Mid-Barataria Sediment Diversion.

- A question was raised about the river mile locations of Mid-Barataria and Mid-Breton. Mid-Barataria is currently planned for river mile 61 and Mid-Breton is planned for river mile 68.
- Concerns were raised regarding the likelihood that these diversion projects will ever get built given the fact that the MRHDMS is no longer active, regulatory concerns have been raised, and current plans call for the first sediment diversion project to begin construction in 2020. It was suggested that CPRA focus primarily on dredging projects. CPRA responded that since 2008 it has utilized more than 112 million cubic yards of fill and benefited more than 30,000 acres of land, while also constructing 52 miles of barrier islands or berms. CPRA views the diversion program and the dredging program as synergistic and believes both are needed. In addition, CPRA is doing all that it can to work with the USACE and other partners to expediting construction of these projects, specifically focused on the permitting processes.
- Concerns were raised regarding limitations that exist today on the elevation that is allowed on beneficial use projects. CPRA concurred with these concerns and reiterated it is in agreement and is working with Sean Duffy and others to address with the USACE and other regulatory agencies.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the focus group the following: the meeting summary notes and presentation slides.

Next Navigation Focus Group meeting: January 2017 (TBD)

2017 Coastal Master Plan

All Focus Groups Meeting

January 6, 2017 (9 a.m. to 11 a.m.)

CPRA, 150 Terrace Ave, 4th Floor Conference Room, Baton Rouge, LA

Meeting Participants

Energy & Industry Focus Group Members: Tyler Gray (LMOGA), Ian Voparil (Shell), Andy Wellbaum (Shell), Fred Palmer (Shell), Stephen Carville (LMOGA), Nina Arvanitidis (Shell), Henry Graham (LCA), Felicia Frederick (Chevron), Jordan Gleason (LOGA)

Navigation Focus Group Members: Chris Collins (DOTD), Cindy Cutrera (Port of Morgan City), Sean Duffy (Louisiana Maritime Users Association), Channing Hayden (Port of Lake Charles), Spencer Murphy (Canal Barge Company), Molly Bourgoyne (DOTD), Ben Weber (LA Charter Boat Association), Sharon Balfour (DOTD), Phil Jones (DOTD)

Landowner Focus Group Members: Chad Courville (Miami Corporation), Greg Linscombe (Continental Land and Fur), Quin Kinler (NRCS), Randy Moertle (McIlhenny Corp/Biloxi Marsh), Amanda Phillips (Edward Wisner Donation), Paul Frey (Louisiana Landowners Association), Daniel Henry (LDWF), Dean Roberts (Stream Properties), Damon Morris (LDWF), Susan Dunham (CPRA), Justin Furnace (Hilcorp), J.P. Hebert (St. Mary SWCD), Julia Lightner (LDWF), Mark Schexnayder (LDWF), Cynthia Duet (Audubon/Rainey Alliance), Rebecca Christensen (Cheniere), Greg Linscombe (LLA), Jay Caillouet (Caillouet Land)

Community Focus Group Members: Diem Nguyen (Mary Queen of Vietnam Community Development Corporation), Patty Whitney (Bayou History Center), Robert Gorman (Catholic Charities), Rosa Herrin (Oxfam), Katrina Williams (CCC), Sandy Nguyen (CCC)

Fisheries Focus Group Members:

Ben Weber (LA Charter Boat Association), Richard Fischer (Louisiana Saltwater), Daryl Carpenter (LCBA), David Tauzin (LCBA)

Others:

Gregory Currier (Adams Hoefler Holwadel, LLC), Gary Rispone (Paradise LA), Nick Gaspard, Alex Lincoln, John Foret

CPRA/Master Plan Team: Mandy Green, Melanie Saucier, Bren Haase, Nick Speyrer, Denise Reed

Meeting Summary Notes

Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this special briefing was to provide the master plan focus groups with an overview of the draft plan and answer any questions they might have prior to the public hearings.

Welcome and Introductions

Nick Speyrer welcomed the group and led introductions for those participating via webinar. Bren Haase thanked all focus group members for their extended participation over the course of the draft plan and acknowledged the strong commitment made by all members.

2017 Draft Coastal Master Plan

Bren Haase presented an overview of the planning process, draft plan projects (maps), outcomes of the draft plan, and upcoming public comment period. Bren also reminded focus group members about the funding constraint of \$50 billion and how that was used to constrain the plan within a certain budget. It was also discussed how we will take public comment until March 26th and will make changes between draft and final based on comments received from citizens and stakeholder groups.

Focus group members had questions on how projects are changed from draft to final plan in 2012 , how public comment/input vs. scientific decisions will be factored in, and voiced support and opposition for some projects. In response, Bren Haase reminded folks that all changes were well document in the 2012 Coastal Master Plan and referenced there were several changes made and reminded focus group members to make sure they provided official public comment for not only things they wish to change, but for those things they would like to remain as is. There was a request to send focus group members estimates on how much dredged material is used in each basin and from each navigation channel.

Next Steps

- CPRA will send the meeting summary notes and slides (attached)
- Next Focus Group meeting: April 2017 (TBD)