

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Minutes from the 12 April 2018 CWPPRA Technical Committee Meeting

1. Agenda Item 1. Mr. Brad Inman opened the meeting at 9:40 a.m. The following Technical Committee members were in attendance:

Ms. Karen McCormick, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
Mr. Patrick Williams, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)  
Mr. Brad Inman, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Acting Chairman  
Mr. Bren Haase, Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA)  
Mr. Britt Paul, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)  
Mr. Darryl Clark, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

A copy of the agenda is included as **Encl 1**. A copy of the sign-in sheet is included as **Encl 2**.

2. Agenda Item 1. Meeting Initiation

Mr. Inman introduced himself. He asked the Technical Committee members to introduce themselves and asked for any opening remarks. Bren Haase welcomed Patrick Williams, who is the newest member of the Technical Committee; Mr. Inman concurred.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor to the Technical Committee for any changes to the agenda.  
With none forthcoming, Mr. Inman asked for a motion to adopt the agenda.

**Decision: Mr. Haase made the motion to adopt the agenda as is. Mr. Clark seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.**

Mr. Inman iterated the protocol for public comment and reminded all attendees to sign in.

3. Agenda Item 2. Report: Status of CWPPRA Program Funds and Projects (Sarah Bradley, USACE)  
Ms. Bradley provided an overview of the status of CWPPRA accounts and available funding in the Planning and Construction Programs.

Ms. Sarah Bradley, USACE, presented an overview of CWPPRA funds as follows: The fully funded total program estimate since its inception through PPL 1 – 27 is \$2,783 billion. Total projected state and federal sources of funding for all authorized projects in addition to projected Department of the Interior (DOI) funds is \$2.079 billion. A potential gap of \$704 million remains if the Program were to construct all projects to date. Current Task Force-approved funding for projects in Phase I, Phase II and O&M totals \$1.857 billion. Authorized funding obligated to each agency for approved project phases currently totals \$1.756 billion.

Ms. Bradley then provided a summary of construction funding requests which totals \$2,782,739,943. The CWPPRA Program has \$9,033,393 of funding carried from the last Task Force meeting. There will be no changes to the construction requests at today's meeting, so \$9,033,393 will be carried into the fall meetings. Regarding the FY19 Planning Program budget, a total of \$111,860 has been carried over from the last Task Force meeting. Added to that is the allotted \$5,000,000 for Planning activities;

total available funding is \$5,111,860. Today's requested funding for FY19 Planning and Outreach totals \$5,008,132, which would result in a \$103,728 remainder.

Ms. Bradley then presented a pie chart summarizing projects as follows: CWPPRA has authorized 218 projects. There are 158 active projects including 26 in Phase 1 Engineering and Design, 14 in Phase 2 Construction and 5 support projects. There are 113 projects which have been completed and are now in Operations, Maintenance and/ or Monitoring phase. Additionally, CWPPRA has deauthorized 46 projects, transferred 8 projects, and placed 6 in the inactive category.

Mr. Clark asserted that the Sports, Fish and Boating Safety Trust Fund is expected to provide \$80.4 million in federal funding for FY19, which is an increase of \$500,000 from FY18 funding.

Mr. Inman clarified Construction Funding details, asserting that the gap represents projects which have been approved, but are basically in "cue" to be constructed as funding becomes available. He asserted that the CWPPRA Program is fiscally sound.

Mr. Inman called for comments or questions from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered.

#### 4. Agenda Item 3. Report: Electronic Votes and Approvals (Sarah Bradley, USACE)

*Ms. Sarah Bradley reported on recent electronic votes and approvals.*

Ms. Bradley began by explaining that the last Task Force meeting was held electronically because of the two-day government shut down which occurred early in the week of the meeting scheduled in January, and which resulted in travel cancellations.

Ms. Bradley summarized the Task Force meeting, noting that the Task Force unanimously approved all the Technical Committee recommendations. The items approved are as follows:

- a. Minutes of the October Task Force minutes;
- b. Final transfer of the Shell Beach South Marsh Creation Project (PO-168);
- c. Closeout of Terrebonne Bay Demonstration Project (TE-45) with removal of all features except the gabion mats at Reach A and B, at a cost of \$498,730;
- d. Monitoring Budget increase for the Hwy 384 Hydrologic Restoration Project (CS-21) in the amount of \$20,000;
- e. Four projects to proceed to Phase I Construction for a combined cost of \$14,732,575:

<b>PPL 27 Recommended Projects</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Phase I Cost</b>
Mid-Breton Land Bridge Marsh Creation	FWS	\$3,715,465
Bayou Cane Marsh Creation	FWS	\$3,239,930
NE Turtle Bay Marsh Creation and Critical Area Shoreline Protection	NRCS	\$3,852,451
Sabine Marsh Creation Cycles 6 & 7	FWS	\$3,824,731

- f. Projects authorized for Phase II Incremental funding at a combined cost of \$47,294,002:

Recommended Phase II Projects	Agency	Phase II Increment I Cost
Cameron-Creole Freshwater Introduction CU-2	NRCS	\$18,567,073
Caminada Headland Back Barrier Restoration	EPA	\$28,726,929

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered.

5. Agenda Item 4. Decision: 2018 Report to Congress Outline (Kaitlyn Carriere, USACE)

*Ms. Kaitlyn Carriere presented the recommended outline and format for the 2018 Report to Congress for Technical Committee approval.*

Ms. Carriere began by explaining that Congress requires CWPPRA to report on the effectiveness of its projects every three years, specifically citing scientific analysis and benefits to wildlife. She reportedly provided an outline to the Technical Committee several weeks ago for their consideration. The outline provided a general structure for the format of the report, which would reduce the length of the report from 50-75 pages to 16-20 pages. The intent is to have a draft completed in June.

Mr. Clark commended those involved in the preparation of the report, and offered his assistance in regards to fish and wildlife benefits.

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion.

**Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion to approve the outline and format for the Report to congress; Mr. Paul seconded and the motion carried without dissent.**

6. Agenda Item 5. Report/Decision: Selection of Ten Candidate Projects and up to Three Demonstration Projects to Evaluate for PPL 28 (Kevin Roy, FWS) *The Technical Committee considered preliminary costs and benefits of the 28<sup>th</sup> Priority Project List (PPL) project and demonstration project nominees listed below. The Technical Committee voted for 10 projects and may select up to 3 demonstration projects as PPL 28 candidates to be evaluated for Phase 0 analysis, which will be considered later for final selection of projects that will be approved for Phase I (Planning and Engineering and Design).*

Kevin Roy, FWS, provided a review of the 23 projects nominated via electronic voting which occurred February 27, 2018. Ten candidates are to be voted on at these proceedings for recommendation to the Task Force in May. Mr. Roy provided location, details and costs estimates for each of the following:

Region	Basin	PPL 28 Nominees	Agency
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	East Prong Marsh Creation and Terracing	FWS
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	Long Point Bayou Marsh Creation	EPA
4	Calcasieu-Sabine	North Mud Lake Marsh Creation	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Southeast White Lake Marsh Creation	NMFS
4	Mermentau	Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation and Freshwater Enhancement	NRCS
4	Mermentau	Gulf Shoreline Protection at Beach Prong	FWS
3	Teche-Vermilion	Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment	EPA
3	Teche-Vermilion	North Marsh Restoration (North Increment)	NMFS
3	Terrebonne	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection	FWS

3	Terrebonne	West Louisiana Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	FWS
3	Terrebonne	North Bayou Decade Ridge and Marsh Creation	NRCS
3	Terrebonne	Small Bayou LaPointe Marsh and Ridge Restoration	FWS
2	Barataria	East Golden Meadow Marsh Creation	EPA
2	Barataria	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration	FWS
2	Barataria	Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation	EPA
2	Barataria	East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation	FWS
2	Breton Sound	East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West) River aux Chenes to Grand Lake	NMFS
2	Breton Sound	Bayou Terre aux Boeuf Ridge Restoration and Marsh Creation	NRCS
1	Pontchartrain	Bayou Bay Jaune Marsh Creation	EPA
1	Pontchartrain	Miller Bayou Marsh Creation	NMFS
1	Pontchartrain	Central Wetlands Hydrologic Restoration	EPA
Coastwide		Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements	NMFS
PPL 28 Demonstration Project Nominees			Agency
DEMO	Shoreflex II		NMFS
DEMO	Biogenic Oyster Shoreline Stabilization		TBD
DEMO	Marine Gardens/Marsh Armor		TBD

Mr. Inman reiterated the electronic voting process, which occurred after the Regional Planning meetings held earlier this year. He commended the efforts of the work groups which reviewed project nominees and provided information to the voting committee.

Mr. Inman called for comments from the public regarding the projects listed.

Laurie Cormier of the Calcasieu Parish Police Jury, spoke first, iterating the urgent need for protection of the Lake Charles/ Southwest Louisiana area, based on the huge extent of Lake Charles area economic development and the corresponding population increase. She cited economic statistics, and asserted that the need for protection is greater now than in 2012, when the State Master Plan placed Lake Charles in 500-year level protection status. She spoke in favor of several projects: Longpoint Bayou Marsh Creation, East Prong Marsh Creation and Terracing, North Mud Lake Marsh Creation, SE Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Terracing, and North Marsh Restoration (North Increment).

Ralph Libersat, representing Vermilion Parish spoke in favor of three projects: Southeast White Lake Marsh Creation (iterating the necessity of addressing deterioration in that area “early” to maximize project benefit), SE Pecan Island Marsh Creation and Freshwater Enhancement (pointing out its comprehensiveness and cost-effectiveness), and North Marsh Restoration (asserting the urgent need for protection of the eastern side of Freshwater Bayou). As a member of the Cheniere Plain Authority, he concurred with Ms. Cormier, and spoke in general support of the projects in the Calcasieu-Sabine basin.

John Lane with St. Bernard Parish spoke in favor of the East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing project, citing the need for protection of the city of Delacroix as well as recent state and parish investments in the area.

Phil Precht, land manager Louisiana Properties, including Conoco Phillips LLE-Burlington, spoke in support of three projects: Small Bayou LaPoint Marsh Creation, Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation and East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation.

Randy Moertle, representing the Rainey Conservation Alliance spoke in support of three projects: Southeast White Lake Marsh Creation, Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation, and the North Marsh Restoration (North Increment). As a member of the Little Lake Land Company, he spoke in support of the East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation project. He stated that both entities support the Coastwide Hydrologic Improvement project.

Lauren Averill with Jefferson Parish spoke in favor of Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation because it is consistent with other efforts in the area and ties in with other programs. She also iterated the parish's support of the Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements project.

Anne Coglianese, representing the City of New Orleans, spoke in support of Miller Bayou Marsh Creation and Bayou Bay Jaune Marsh Creation projects on the Orleans Landbridge, asserting that it will provide protection for residents of Lake Catherine and a main evacuation route, as well as protection of storm surge into Lake Pontchartrain.

Carol Giardina of the Lake Catherine Civic Association, spoke in support of the Miller Bayou and Bayou Bay Jaune Marsh Creation projects, citing protection for residents of Lake Catherine, business, infrastructure, Hwy 90 evacuation route and natural resources. She asserted that the area is considered the last landbridge between Lake Pontchartrain and the open water of the Gulf, so these projects would protect Lake Ponchartrain as well.

Michael Boatright of Marine Gardens provided an update to the presentation regarding the Marine Gardens/ Marsh Armor demonstration project. He began with a clarification that the structures are to be 600 feet instead of the proposed 500 feet. He asserted that the material is non-porous, non-leaching, and four times stronger than concrete. The material can be color-matched to the environment, with darker color particularly beneficial for bio-accretion. He intends to conduct a demonstration at a plant, which will provide erosion control/ prevention on a levee. Finally he stated that the process methodology is quick and will save time and money.

Devyani Kar of the MRD Coalition spoke in favor of four projects: Bayou Bay Jaune Marsh Creation (citing synergy with existing projects in the area and landbridge protection), Miller Bayou Marsh Creation (benefits to landbridge and existing wildlife there), Central Wetland Hydrologic Restoration and Bayou Terre aux Boeuf Ridge Restoration and Marsh Creation (citing landowner and community support).

Amanda Voisin with Lafourche Parish Government spoke in favor of several projects: East Golden Meadow Marsh creation (citing critical protection for Golden Meadow and a priority of the parish), East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection (emphasizing its augmentation to other projects in the area), West LA Hwy 1 and East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation projects (to protect the un-elevated portion of Hwy. 1), and the Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements project.

Robert Spears with Plaquemines Parish Government spoke in support of three projects: Grand Bayou Ridge Restoration and Marsh Creation, Bayou Terre aux Boeuf Ridge Restoration and Marsh Creation, and Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation.

Leslie Suazo with Ducks Unlimited spoke in favor of several projects. She began with Small Bayou Lapointe Marsh and Ridge Restoration, East Golden Meadow Marsh Creation, and Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation. For those projects, she cited synergy with projects (existing or planned) being invested in by DU/ Conoco Phillips and the parish. She emphasized that dire conditions in the area will require greater funding efforts for large-scale projects. She also expressed support for the

Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements project, pointing out that it would help to sustain marsh creation and ridge restoration projects, and ultimately render projects more cost-effective.

Amanda Phillips with the Edward Wisner Donationspoke on behalf of the West LA Hwy 1 Marsh Creation and the East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation projects, citing protection of Hwy 1 to and from Port Fourchon, and the evacuation route for residents of Grand Isle.

William O’Neal, representing Castex Lafourche LP, concurred with comments previously made by Ms. Voisin, Ms. Suazo, and Ms. Phillips, and expressed full support of the East Golden Meadow Marsh Creation project; he cited synergy with a potential Ducks Unlimited/ Shell Pipeline project on the south side of the levee, and it’s protection not only for area residents but also for oil and gas vendors and service providers out of Port Fourchon, who utilize the area.

Mr. Inman called for further comments from the public. None were proffered.

Kevin Roy was called upon to iterate the conclusions of the Technical Committee as a result of their review of the Demonstration Projects. He began by stating that the only project to obtain a federal sponsor was the Shoreflex II project. The Engineering and Environmental workgroups had concerns about the other two demonstration projects. Beginning with the Biogenic Oyster Shoreline Stabilization project, the concerns were a) the time it would take grow seed oysters on the floating mats before the structure could be placed on the shoreline, b) the structures’ susceptibility to vandalism, c) that it is limited for placement only in areas conducive to oyster production, d) the structure would not increase elevation sufficiently to protect the shoreline from increased wave height, e) relatively high cost, f) similar technology to demonstration project TE-45, and g) the large number of stakes required is not feasible for large-scale projects. Thus, no agency sponsor came forward. Regarding the Marine Gardens/ Marsh Armor project, the concerns identified were: a) potential toxicity of the materials used, b) general lack of clarity about the structural design, c) concerns about equipment needed and equipment transfer to the site, d) confusion about the construction method, and e) uncertainty about what product is to be evaluated. Thus, no agency was willing to sponsor the project.

Mr. Inman called for a motion regarding the demonstration projects.

**Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion that the Shoreflex II demonstration project move forward for further consideration (but not the other two for reasons cited.) Mr. Haase seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

Mr. Inman recessed the meeting at 10:40 a.m. for voting. Mr. Inman reconvened the meeting at 11:15 a.m.; Ms. Bradley presented the results as follows with the ten top-scoring projects highlighted in yellow:

Region	Basin	Type	Project	COE	EPA	FWS	NMFS	NRCS	State	No. of votes	Sum of Point Score
2	BA	MC/RR	Grand Bayou Ridge and Marsh Restoration	5	11	9	2	2	7	6	36
2	BS	MC/TR	East Delacroix Marsh Creation and Terracing	12	9	6	9		12	5	48

2	BS	MC	Breton Landbridge Marsh Creation (West) River aux Chenes to Grand Lake	9		8	12	6	8	5	43
4	ME	MC	Southeast White Lake Marsh Creation	2	5	11	11		11	5	40
4	CS	MC	Long Point Bayou Marsh Creation	10	12			1	10	4	33
	CW		Coastwide Hydrologic Improvements	1		5	4	11		4	21
2	BS	MC/RR	Bayou Terre aux Boeuf Ridge Restoration and Marsh Creation	4	2			8	6	4	20
3	TV	MC/TR	North Marsh Restoration (North Increment)	8			8		9	3	25
3	TE	MC/SP	East Catfish Lake Marsh Creation and Shoreline Protection			12	6	5		3	23
3	TE	MC	Small Bayou LaPointe Marsh Creation	11		7		4		3	22
4	CS	MC/TR	East Prong Marsh Creation and Terracing		7	10			4	3	21
3	TE	MC	West Louisiana Hwy 1 Marsh Creation	7			10		2	3	19
3	TE	MC/RR/TR	North Bayou Decade Ridge and Marsh Creation				3	10	3	3	16
1	PO	MC	Bayou Bay Jaune Marsh Creation	3	6				5	3	14
2	BA	MC	East Bayou Lafourche Marsh Creation		3	3	1			3	7
4	ME	MC/FD/TR	Southeast Pecan Island Marsh Creation and Freshwater Enhancement		10			12		2	22
3	TV	MC	Southeast Marsh Island Marsh Creation and Nourishment		8			9		2	17
1	PO	MC	Miller Bayou Marsh Creation				7	7		2	14
4	CS	MC	North Mud Lake Marsh Creation			2	5			2	7
4	ME	SP	Gulf Shoreline Protection at Beach Prong			4		3		2	7
2	BA	MC	East Golden Meadow Marsh Creation	6	1					2	7
2	BA	MC	Three Bayou Bay Marsh Creation		4				1	2	5
1	PO	HR	Central Wetlands Hydrologic Restoration			1				1	1

				78	78	78	78	78	78	72	468
			check	78	78	78	78	78	78	72	468

Mr. Inman called for questions or comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered. Mr. Inman called for a motion to recommend the projects as voted upon by the Technical Committee for consideration.

**Decision: Mr. Williams made the motion to present the projects as voted upon by the Technical Committee for approval. Mr. Paul seconded the motion, which carried without dissent.**

Mr. Inman acknowledged the significance and benefits of all projects proposed and expressed encouragement for those not selected during these proceedings to resubmit next year.

7. Agenda Item 6. Report/Decision: Upcoming 20-Year Life Projects (Sarah Bradley, USACE). *The project sponsors presented recommended paths forward for projects nearing the end of their 20-year lives.*

Ms. Bradley began with an explanation of the 20-year review process, which actually starts at the 15-year mark for all projects. The Planning and Evaluation Committee begins tracking the projects as they near completion to assess needs and funding requirements that could possibly affect the Construction Program. The Technical Committee is asked to vote on a recommendation to the Task Force on the path forward for the following projects requesting approval for project closeout with no additional cost increase:

TE-28	Brady Canal Hydrologic Restoration	NRCS	2020
BA-02	GIWW to Clovelly	NRCS	2020
TV-14	Marsh Island Hydrologic Restoration	COE	2021

Ms. Bradley also provided a list of projects currently under review (years 15-18) and pointed out that to date 13 projects have been approved for closure at their 20-year mark, one of which has requested an increase in maintenance costs; 6 have been approved for extension, two of which are no-cost time-extensions; one project has been approved to pursue a time extension through the review process. Ms. Bradley presented the 15-18-year projects as informative examples of the continuity of the review process.

Mr. Inman encouraged public opinion about the paths forward for all projects under review, the options of which could be closeout, extensions or transfer.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion to recommend these projects to the Task Force for the path to closeout.

**Decision: Mr. Paul made the motion to recommend the projects to the Task Force for closeout; Mr. Clark seconded, and the motion passed without dissent.**

8. Agenda Item 7. Decision: FY19 Planning Budget Approval, including the PPL 29 Process, and Presentation of FY19 Outreach Budget (Process, Size, Funding, etc.) (Sarah Bradley, USACE) *The P&E Subcommittee presented their recommended FY19 Planning Program Budget development, including the PPL 29 Process.*

Ms. Carriere presented the PPL 29 process with a few minor changes. Unchanged is the following:

- a. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve that the PPL 29 Process include selecting four nominees in the Barataria and Terrebonne Basins; three projects in the Breton Sound and Pontchartrain Basins; two nominees in the Mermentau, Calcasieu/Sabine, and Tech/Vermilion Basins; and one nominee will be selected in the Atchafalaya Basin.

Ms. Carriere provided changes in language of the PPL Selection Process to address project overlap thus:

*“If projects are not sufficiently different, such projects will be combined into one project nominee, and a federal sponsor will be determined. This decision to either combine similar projects or to allow each to move forward will be made at the RPT meeting where the similar projects are proposed. If a mutually agreeable position on sponsorship cannot be determined by overlapping sponsors, voting by the RPT representatives (including agencies and only the parishes within the project basin) will occur to determine sponsorship at the RPT meeting. For non-overlapping projects, a federal sponsor does not have to be identified prior to the coastwide vote.”*

Ms. Carriere also pointed to reference changes regarding CWPPRA Standard Operating Procedures for Coastwide and Demonstration projects. Those changes were provided in Committee binders.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion to accept the PPL 29 Process as outlined by Ms. Carriere.

**Decision: Ms. McCormick made the motion, which Mr. Clark seconded; the motion carried without dissent.**

- b. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY19 Outreach Committee Budget, in the amount of \$452,113.

Scott Wilson provided a presentation (in Committee binders) and a brief verbal summary of Outreach Committee activities, publications and other services. He noted that the budget has remained stationary for several years. Mr. Inman and Ms. McCormick commended the Outreach Committee for their efforts.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered, so Mr. Inman called for a motion to accept the Outreach Committee budget for FY19.

**Decision: Ms. McCormick made the motion, which Mr. Clark seconded; the motion carried without dissent.**

- c. The Technical Committee voted on a recommendation to the Task Force to approve the FY19 Planning Budget (includes Outreach Committee Budget), in the amount of \$5,008,132.

Ms. Bradley presented a line item budget, which she declared was in line with the budget for several previous years, except for the Report to Congress.

Mr. Inman then opened the floor for comments from the Technical Committee and the public. None were proffered; Mr. Inman called for a motion to accept the Planning Budget for FY19.

**Decision: Mr. Paul made the motion, which Mr. Williams seconded; the motion carried without dissent.**

9. Additional Agenda Items (Brad Inman, USACE).

Mr. Inman asked the Technical Committee if there were additional agenda items. None were proffered.

10. Request for Public Comments (Brad Inman, USACE).

Mr. Inman invited further public comment.

Tyler Ortego approached the microphone to defend his demonstration project proposal (Biogenic Oyster Shoreline Stabilization) and emphasized his desire to see a change in the PPL Process, so the questions, concerns, criticisms can be addressed prior to Technical Committee voting. He also questioned the innovation of the demonstration project which was chosen.

Michael Boatright also spoke in defense of his demonstration project (Marine Gardens / Marsh Armor), concurring with Mr. Ortego's comments regarding the PPL Process. He reiterated the money-saving potential of his product, that his product was non-toxic, as well as its scientific principles and its use in other countries.

11. Announcement: Date of Upcoming CWPPRA Program Meeting (Brad Inman, USACE)

Ms. Bradley was called upon to provide dates of upcoming meetings, which she did thus: The Task Force meeting will be held May 24, 2018 at 9:30 a.m. at the Estuarine Habitats and Fisheries Center, 646 Cajundome Blvd., Lafayette, Louisiana.

12. Announcement: Scheduled Dates of Future Program Meetings (Brad Inman, USACE)

May 24, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	Lafayette
September 13, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge
October 11, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Task Force	New Orleans
December 6, 2018	9:30 a.m.	Technical Committee	Baton Rouge

13. Decision: Adjourn

Mr. Inman invited any final comments. None were proffered, so he called for a motion to dismiss.

**Decision: Mr. Clark made the motion to adjourn the meeting; the motion carried and the meeting was adjourned.**