

## The 2026 Consistency Guidelines of the 2023 Coastal Master Plan for Restoration Projects Receiving State Funding

To be consistent with the State of Louisiana's 2023 Coastal Master Plan (MP), and to receive state funding support, a project must be included in the MP (i.e., it must have the same general location, project type, features, and borrow source as a project identified in the MP). There are, of course, scenarios where on-the-ground conditions will require adjustments to project configurations.

In an effort to accommodate projects that may not fall directly within a project location identified in the MP, CPRA has avoided making strict guidelines about the distance a proposed project must be from a MP project, or what percentage of the project costs can be allocated outside of the location and scope of the MP projects. Below are general guidelines to help develop restoration projects that are consistent with the MP. These guidelines are applicable to all restoration projects that receive state funding. Projects that are programmatically consistent with the 2023 MP must still be reviewed for consistency in the CWPRA program, Parish Matching Program and Restoration Partnership Fund.

RESTORATION PROJECTS	PROGRAMMATIC RESTORATION PROJECTS
<p>Restoration projects utilize varied approaches to restore, create, and sustain land. Projects using a single approach were considered for selection alongside integrated projects, which combine features from multiple project types into one integrated concept. In the end, a suite of restoration projects is planned and operated together to maximize their effectiveness and benefits over time, and surpass the benefits of any single project or project type.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li> <b>Ridge Restoration</b></li><li> <b>Marsh Creation</b></li><li> <b>Landbridge</b></li><li> <b>Diversion</b></li><li> <b>Hydrologic Restoration</b></li><li> <b>Integrated Projects</b></li></ul>	<p>CPRA implements several types of projects that are not individually identified in the master plan. With the exception of barrier island maintenance, these projects are often smaller scale, designed to address site-specific issues, and typically provide highly localized benefits. While these types of projects are not explicitly listed in the plan, they are consistent with the master plan. More information on programmatic restoration projects can be found on p. 64.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li> <b>Barrier Island Maintenance</b></li><li> <b>Oyster Reef Restoration</b></li><li> <b>Shoreline Protection</b></li><li> <b>Bank Stabilization</b></li><li> <b>Programmatic Restoration</b></li></ul>

## Restoration Projects

**Ridge Restoration** – The goal of ridge restoration is to reestablish historic ridges through local dredging, sediment placement and vegetative plantings that restore natural ridge functions. Many ridge projects will require a complementary marsh creation component to mitigate for marsh lost in the construction of the ridge and to help protect the ridge. Marsh is not a substitute for the habitat or structural value of ridges, but could be considered a component of a ridge restoration project; serving to increase the longevity of a constructed ridge.

**Forested Wetland Restoration** – The technique to restore forested habitat will be evaluated on a case-by-case bases and are generally consistent in principle with CPRA's efforts and the goals of the MP. The MP planning tools prioritize projects that maximize land gain, therefore, the area of benefit from restoring existing forested wetlands could not be adequately measured. As such, forested wetland projects, with the exception of ridge restoration projects, can be classified as programmatically consistent with the MP because the project benefits overall support the goal of the MP.

**Marsh Creation** – If a proposed marsh creation project is largely within a prioritized location in the MP, it is consistent. Many of the marsh creation projects identified in the MP cover thousands of acres and can be implemented incrementally through multiple projects. While large projects remain a priority, smaller marsh creation projects will continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and in generally consistent with the MP. Projects outside the MP polygons require CPRA approval for consistency due to limited borrow sites and source material to construct projects. Projects should be designed with future climate condition in mind, incorporating features that promote resilience and sustainability to ensure lasting value to our investments.

**Landbridge** – The goal of landbridges are to have multiple projects create a continuous tract of constructed marshes oriented across coastal basins which provide habitat and help attenuate waves. They include additional features that constrain channels along with creating marsh. Projects proposed in the prioritized MP Landbridge polygons are considered consistent however, stand-alone 'Landbridge-like' projects will need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

**Diversions** – The integration of freshwater or sediment diversions is a prioritized project type in the MP and will need to adhere to the location and scale identified in the MP to be considered consistent. Diversions using new channels and/or structures to divert sediment and fresh water into adjacent basins can augment benefits of long-term ecosystem restoration. Marsh creation alone in the area of influence is not a substitute for long-term benefits of diversions, and is not consistent unless specifically identified in the MP.

**Hydrologic Restoration** – Projects should benefit the landscape by addressing site-specific needs such as restoring historical flow paths, re-establishing tidal connections, hydrological restoration for wetland restoration. Range of methods from large scale diversions include, locks, spoil bank gapping, culverts, ditches, plugs, and other innovative methods for restoration for that site along with the benefiting the broader hydrologic landscape. Large-scale projects are

identified in the MP, however, small, localized projects will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to address specific issues, features, and methods to restore hydrologic conditions.

**Barrier Islands** – Creation and restoration of dune, beach, and back barrier marsh to restore or augment Louisiana’s barrier islands and headlands is a critical part of the MP. Dredging and placement of sediment, to achieve these goals for the barrier islands identified in the MP will be considered consistent. In cases where engineering and technical analysis show that the inclusion of structural features is beneficial to long-term project performance (e.g., terminal groins, breakwaters, etc.), the feature may be considered.

**Oyster Reef** – Artificial or bioengineered oyster reef projects primary goal is to provide coastal protection by stabilizing shorelines, reducing wave actions, and provide habitat for marine species. The primary goal is not to manage or enhance oyster fisheries but will be a beneficial byproduct. These structures will provide substrate for oyster recruitments, creating habitat for other fauna, while reducing fetch of open water protecting shorelines, and may reduce saltwater exchange in some locations. Oyster reefs should be considered when oyster recruitment and longevity conditions are met as an alternative to where traditional shoreline protection methods will be used. Projects will continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

**Shoreline Protection** – These projects are designed with rock breakwaters to reduce wave energies along shorelines, open bays, lakes, sounds, channels, and bayous. Newer methods of bioengineered material or alternative hard material may be considered for project where traditional rocks are less suitable. Project locations with high shoreline erosion rates are prioritized locations for this project type and are programmatically consistent with the MP.

**Terraces** – Terraces are considered programmatically consistent in the MP as a complementary feature for its role in reducing fetch, supporting habitat, and improving localized hydrological conditions in conjunction with other project types. CPRA recognizes that having terraces as a project component could improve the overall performance of a project and the following considerations will be used to determine consistency:

- Terracing is not a substitute for marsh creation but should be used to enhance restoration efforts such as:
  - Terracing as an outfall management technique:
    - Terraces may be utilized as a tool for outfall management, helping to prevent freshwater and sediment inputs from exiting intended restoration areas.
  - Reducing fetch in open water areas:
    - Terraces may be used in regions with long fetch distances, where excessive wave action is contributing to shoreline erosion. In these cases, terraces can act as a supplementary tool to enhance the performance of other restoration activities.
  - Terracing and project costs:

- To ensure terracing is a component of a larger, more impactful restoration project, and the construction costs of terracing should not exceed 10% of the total project costs.

**Borrow Sources** – Project design should prioritize sourcing borrow material from renewable sources or from outside the coastal system, when possible. In some cases, using internal borrow material is the only feasible or cost-effective option and can be used if the use does not accelerate land loss or increase wave action. In implementing any large marsh creation project, CPRA will conduct appropriate analyses to ensure that efforts do not exacerbate the problem we are working to solve.

For questions and comments, please contact:

Joseph Johnston

225-342-4642

[Joseph.JohnstonIII@la.gov](mailto:Joseph.JohnstonIII@la.gov)